



# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

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

## FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT

### Thursday, 12 November 2015

Subject	Page
<b>PRIVILEGE</b> .....	<b>2821</b>
<b>Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by a Minister</b> .....	<b>2821</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 9 July 2015, from the member for Mudgeeraba, Ms Ros Bates MP, to the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services, Hon. Cameron Dick, regarding a proposed visit to the Robina and Gold Coast University hospitals. ....	2821
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 9 November 2015, from the member for Mudgeeraba, Ms Ros Bates MP, to the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services, Hon. Cameron Dick, regarding a request to participate in shifts at the Robina and Gold Coast University hospitals. ....	2821
<b>SPEAKER'S STATEMENT</b> .....	<b>2821</b>
Drought Relief Dinner .....	2821
<b>PETITIONS</b> .....	<b>2821</b>
<b>TABLED PAPERS</b> .....	<b>2821</b>
<b>MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS</b> .....	<b>2822</b>
Domestic and Family Violence .....	2822
Advance Queensland.....	2823
The Smith Family, Christmas Appeal.....	2824
Gold Coast Light Rail.....	2824
Queensland Economy.....	2825
Home-based Business Grants Program .....	2825
Innovation.....	2826
Premier's Sustainability Awards .....	2826
Food Labelling.....	2827
Mining Industry .....	2828
Department of Transport and Main Roads, Innovation.....	2828
Schoolies Week.....	2829
Mount Isa, Police.....	2829
Shark Control; Surf Life Saving Australia .....	2830

# Table of Contents – Thursday, 12 November 2015

<b>MOTION .....</b>	<b>2830</b>
Broadcast Terms and Conditions.....	2830
<b>FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE.....</b>	<b>2832</b>
Report .....	2832
<i>Tabled paper: Finance and Administration Committee: Report No. 17, 55th Parliament—</i>	
Annual Report 2014-15.....	2832
<b>NOTICE OF MOTION .....</b>	<b>2832</b>
Trade Unions .....	2832
<b>PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS.....</b>	<b>2832</b>
Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance .....	2832
Queensland Economy.....	2833
Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games.....	2834
Advance Queensland.....	2834
Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games.....	2835
<b>QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE .....</b>	<b>2835</b>
Department of Education and Training, Information Technology.....	2835
Department of Education and Training, Information Technology.....	2836
Federal Budget, GST.....	2836
Department of Education and Training, Information Technology.....	2837
Advance Queensland.....	2837
Public Service, Appointments .....	2838
Draft State Infrastructure Plan.....	2838
Organised Crime Commission of Inquiry, Report .....	2839
Taxation Reform .....	2839
Department of Education and Training, Information Technology.....	2840
Paramedics, National Registration.....	2840
Treasurer, Separation of Powers.....	2841
Tourism Industry .....	2842
Laidley Land, Ministerial Responsibility.....	2843
<i>Tabled paper: Correspondence, various dates, between the member for Lockyer, Mr Ian Rickuss MP, and the office of the Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade, Hon. Jackie Trad, and the office of the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, Hon. Anthony Lynham, relating to ministerial responsibility for the management of land at Drayton Street, Jordan Street and Rosewood Laidley Road.....</i>	2843
Infrastructure Projects .....	2843
Medicinal Cannabis.....	2844
Domestic and Family Violence .....	2844
Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital, Ophthalmology Traineeships .....	2845
Hinchinbrook Island, Access.....	2846
Gympie, TAFE Queensland.....	2846
Queensland Police Service, Police Commissioner .....	2847
Ports, Infrastructure.....	2847
<i>Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'LNP 2015 State Council Agenda, Kingaroy 20-22 November 2015' .....</i>	2847
<b>MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.....</b>	<b>2847</b>
Further Answer to Question; Medicinal Cannabis .....	2847
<b>ELECTORAL (IMPROVING REPRESENTATION) AND ANOTHER ACT AMENDMENT BILL.....</b>	<b>2848</b>
Introduction .....	2848
<i>Tabled paper: Electoral (Improving Representation) and Another Act Amendment Bill.....</i>	2848
<i>Tabled paper: Electoral (Improving Representation) and Another Act Amendment Bill, explanatory notes. ....</i>	2848
<i>Tabled paper: Queensland Parliamentary Library Research Brief, dated 30 July 2015, regarding population and electors.....</i>	2848
First Reading .....	2848
Referral to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee.....	2849
Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date .....	2849
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to. ....	2850
Resolved in the affirmative.....	2850
<b>SUSTAINABLE PORTS DEVELOPMENT BILL.....</b>	<b>2850</b>
Second Reading .....	2850
<b>MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.....</b>	<b>2861</b>
TAFE Queensland, Department of Education and Training, Information Technology.....	2861
<b>PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS.....</b>	<b>2862</b>
Public Transport, Fares.....	2862
Cairns Electorate, Rally.....	2862
Lady Cilento Children's Hospital.....	2863
<i>Tabled paper: Article from the Courier-Mail, dated 31 October 2015, titled 'Politics plagues hospital' .....</i>	2863
Capalaba Sports Club .....	2864
<i>Tabled paper: Document, undated, of the Capalaba Sports Club advertisement for Christmas Day buffet. ....</i>	2864
Medicinal Cannabis.....	2864
Compton Road Land Bridge .....	2865
Country Racing.....	2865

# Table of Contents – Thursday, 12 November 2015

<b>Business Foreclosures</b> .....	<b>2866</b>
<b>Remembrance Day</b> .....	<b>2866</b>
<b>Medicinal Cannabis</b> .....	<b>2867</b>
<b>SUSTAINABLE PORTS DEVELOPMENT BILL</b> .....	<b>2868</b>
<b>Second Reading</b> .....	<b>2868</b>
Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a second time. ....	2871
Resolved in the affirmative under standing order 106.....	2871
<b>Consideration in Detail</b> .....	<b>2871</b>
Clause 1, as read, agreed to.....	2871
Clause 2— .....	2871
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to. ....	2873
Resolved in the negative. ....	2873
Non-government amendment (Mr Cripps) negatived.....	2873
Clause 2, as read, agreed to.....	2873
Clauses 3 to 31— .....	2873
Clauses 3 to 31, as amended, agreed to. ....	2875
Clause 32— .....	2875
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Sustainable Ports Development Bill 2015: Amendments to the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources' amendments, to be moved in consideration in detail by the member for Dalrymple, Mr Shane Knuth. ....	2876
Division: Question put—That the amendment to the amendment be agreed to. ....	2877
Resolved in the negative under standing order 106. ....	2877
Non-government amendment (Mr Knuth) negatived.....	2877
Clause 32, as amended, agreed to. ....	2877
Amendment agreed to. ....	2877
Clause 33— .....	2877
Clause 33, as amended, agreed to. ....	2879
Clauses 34 to 65— .....	2879
Clauses 34 to 65, as amended, agreed to. ....	2880
Schedules 1 and 2, as amended, agreed to. ....	2881
<b>Third Reading</b> .....	<b>2882</b>
<b>Long Title</b> .....	<b>2882</b>
<b>PLANNING BILL</b> .....	<b>2882</b>
<b>Message from Governor</b> .....	<b>2882</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Message, dated 12 November 2015, from His Excellency the Governor, recommending the Planning Bill 2015. ....	2882
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>2882</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Planning Bill 2015. ....	2882
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Planning Bill 2015, explanatory notes. ....	2882
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning: Draft Planning Bills 2015—Consultation Report November 2015. ....	2883
<b>First Reading</b> .....	<b>2884</b>
<b>Referral to the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee</b> .....	<b>2884</b>
<b>PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COURT BILL</b> .....	<b>2884</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>2884</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Planning and Environment Court Bill 2015 [1646]. ....	2884
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Planning and Environment Court Bill 2015, explanatory notes. ....	2884
<b>First Reading</b> .....	<b>2885</b>
<b>Referral to the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee</b> .....	<b>2885</b>
<b>PLANNING (CONSEQUENTIAL) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL</b> .....	<b>2885</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>2885</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Planning (Consequential) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. ....	2885
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Planning (Consequential) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015, explanatory notes. ....	2885
<b>First Reading</b> .....	<b>2886</b>
<b>Referral to the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee</b> .....	<b>2886</b>
<b>Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date</b> .....	<b>2886</b>
<b>HEALTH LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL</b> .....	<b>2886</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>2886</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Health Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. ....	2886
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Health Legislation Amendment Bill 2015, explanatory notes. ....	2886
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Food Amendment Regulation (No. ...) 2015: tabling draft. ....	2886
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Food Amendment Regulation (No. ...) 2015: tabling draft, explanatory notes. ....	2886
<b>First Reading</b> .....	<b>2888</b>
<b>Referral to the Health and Ambulance Services Committee</b> .....	<b>2888</b>
<b>Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date</b> .....	<b>2888</b>
<b>TACKLING ALCOHOL-FUELLED VIOLENCE LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL</b> .....	<b>2888</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>2888</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015.....	2888
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015, explanatory notes. ....	2888
<b>First Reading</b> .....	<b>2891</b>
<b>Referral to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee</b> .....	<b>2891</b>
<b>Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date</b> .....	<b>2891</b>

# Table of Contents – Thursday, 12 November 2015

<b>MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.....</b>	<b>2891</b>
Further Answer to Question; Laidley Land, Ministerial Responsibility .....	2891
<b>QUEENSLAND PRODUCTIVITY COMMISSION BILL .....</b>	<b>2892</b>
Second Reading .....	2892
<b>MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS .....</b>	<b>2905</b>
Member for Mudgeeraba.....	2905
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, dated 12 November 2015, titled 'Ministerial Brief for Noting' regarding correspondence from Ms Ros Bates MP and department processing. ....	2905
Alleged Contempt of Parliament by a Minister .....	2905
<b>QUEENSLAND PRODUCTIVITY COMMISSION BILL .....</b>	<b>2905</b>
Second Reading .....	2905
<b>INFRASTRUCTURE, PLANNING AND NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE .....</b>	<b>2906</b>
Reporting Date.....	2906
<b>MOTION .....</b>	<b>2906</b>
Trade Unions .....	2906
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Photograph, dated 24 March, of the member for Capalaba, Mr Don Brown MP; the member for Springwood, Mr Mick de Brenni MP; the member for Mr Coot-tha, Dr Steven Miles MP; the member for Barron River, Mr Craig Crawford MP; the member for Mundingburra, Ms Coralee O'Rourke MP; the member for Thuringowa, Mr Aaron Harper MP; and the member for Pine Rivers, Ms Nikki Boyd MP, shard on Facebook by the member for Barron River, Mr Craig Crawford MP. ....	2906
<i>Tabled paper:</i> News article from ABC Online, titled 'CFMEU and MUA enter merger talks to create "Australia's most powerful union".....	2912
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to. ....	2912
Resolved in the negative.....	2912
<b>SPEAKER'S RULING.....</b>	<b>2912</b>
Same Question Rule.....	2912
<b>QUEENSLAND PRODUCTIVITY COMMISSION BILL .....</b>	<b>2914</b>
Second Reading .....	2914
Consideration in Detail.....	2916
Clauses 1 to 26, as read, agreed to. ....	2916
Clause 27, as read, agreed to. ....	2917
Clauses 28 to 69— .....	2917
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Queensland Productivity Commission Bill, explanatory notes to Mr John-Paul Langbroek's amendments.....	2918
Division: Question put—That the amendments be agreed to.....	2919
Resolved in the negative.....	2919
Non-government amendments (Mr Langbroek) negatived.....	2919
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Queensland Productivity Commission Bill, explanatory notes to Hon. Curtis Pitt's amendments.....	2919
Clauses 28 to 69, as amended, agreed to.....	2919
Schedules 1 and 2, as amended, agreed to. ....	2919
Third Reading .....	2919
Long Title.....	2919
<b>SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT .....</b>	<b>2920</b>
<b>ADJOURNMENT .....</b>	<b>2920</b>
Mount Lindesay Highway Safety Review .....	2920
Skilling Queenslanders for Work, Graduation.....	2920
Bald Hills Memorial Hall.....	2921
Relay for Life.....	2922
Domestic and Family Violence .....	2922
Justices Association.....	2923
Recognise Redlands Sponsorship Program .....	2923
Domestic and Family Violence .....	2924
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Non-conforming petition regarding domestic violence legislation. ....	2924
Queensland Country Women's Association.....	2924
SolairForce .....	2925
<b>ATTENDANCE .....</b>	<b>2926</b>

## THURSDAY, 12 NOVEMBER 2015

---



The Legislative Assembly met at 9.30 am.

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

### PRIVILEGE

#### Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by a Minister



**Ms BATES** (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (9.31 am): Yesterday in the House, the Minister for Health stated—

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.

Records show that no such letter was ever received in my office. I table the correspondence from me to the minister. On 17 September, I had a conversation in a stairwell of the parliament with the minister, thanking him for the opportunity to do shifts at the hospital, immediately prior to my doing a shift at GCU on 19 September. Mr Speaker, I believe the Minister for Health has deliberately misled the House and I will be writing to you to refer the matter to the Ethics Committee.

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 9 July 2015, from the member for Mudgeeraba, Ms Ros Bates MP, to the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services, Hon. Cameron Dick, regarding a proposed visit to the Robina and Gold Coast University hospitals [\[1619\]](#).

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 9 November 2015, from the member for Mudgeeraba, Ms Ros Bates MP, to the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services, Hon. Cameron Dick, regarding a request to participate in shifts at the Robina and Gold Coast University hospitals [\[1620\]](#).

### SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

#### Drought Relief Dinner



**Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, tomorrow evening a bit of rural Queensland will come to the Speaker's Green. Those attending the drought relief dinner will see life-sized fibreglass cattle grazing alongside a John Deere tractor. I take this opportunity to acknowledge the significant support provided by the Rural Press Club, the member for Lockyer and the member for Ipswich West in jointly organising this very important event for Queensland. I am informed that approximately 350 people will be attending tomorrow. The proceeds will go towards helping families and communities in drought-affected regions of Queensland.

A major fundraising element of the evening will be a charity auction. The donation by members and other sponsors of items for auction is very much appreciated. For example, I have donated an original artwork by Jeanette Christianson titled *I am not Emused*, for which members may like to bid. The artwork is on display in the lobby behind me for members to see should they wish to bid on it on the evening. I thank members for their support.

### PETITIONS

The Clerk presented the following paper petition, lodged by the honourable member indicated—

#### Atherton Hospital, Upgrade

**Mr Knuth**, from 62 petitioners, requesting the House to urgently approve the upgrade of the Atherton Hospital [\[1621\]](#).

Petitions received.

### TABLED PAPERS

#### MINISTERIAL PAPERS

The following ministerial papers were tabled by the Clerk—

Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade (Hon. Trad)—

[1622](#) Response from the Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade (Ms Trad) to a paper petition (2477-15) presented by the Clerk in accordance with Standing Order 119(3) from 465 petitioners, requesting the House to introduce an exclusion zone for entertainment events with a minimum buffer zone of five kilometres radius of any zoo, wildlife sanctuary, breeding facility or animal shelter

[1623](#) Response from the Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade (Ms Trad) to a paper petition (2469-15) presented by Mr King, and an ePetition (2407-15) sponsored by Mr King, from 2,131 and 456 petitioners respectively, requesting the House to urgently upgrade the Dakabin Train Station increasing and updating the car park and provide appropriate disability access

Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills (Hon. D'Ath)—

[1624](#) Response from the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills (Hon. D'Ath) to a paper petition (2472-15) presented by Mr Dickson, and an ePetition (2366-15) sponsored by Mr Dickson, from 1,359 and 8,983 petitioners respectively, requesting the House to make legislative changes to the definition of "place of worship" and "religion" to exclude any group or members of a group which advocate violence or seek to promote and impose any form, or part of Sharia Law, and who reject Australian Law and the Constitution

Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy and Water Supply (Hon. Bailey)—

[1625](#) Response from the Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy and Water Supply (Mr Bailey) to a paper petition (2468-15) presented by the Clerk in accordance with Standing Order 119(3) from 361 petitioners, requesting the House to increase the Queensland Government rebate for gas to match the current rebate for electricity

[1626](#) Response from the Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy and Water Supply (Mr Bailey) to an ePetition (2442-15) sponsored by Mr Cramp, from 364 petitioners, requesting the House to provide a dedicated left turn lane from Binstead Way on to the M1

[1627](#) Response from the Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy and Water Supply (Mr Bailey) to a paper petition (2470-15) presented by Mr Mander, and an ePetition (2413-15) sponsored by Mr Mander, from 1,226 and 216 petitioners respectively requesting the House to request the reinstatement of the ability to turn right in and out of Cutbush Road from Stafford Road, Everton Park

[1628](#) Response from the Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy and Water Supply (Mr Bailey) to a paper petition (2466-15) presented by Mrs Stuckey, from 868 petitioners, requesting the House to either reduce the speed limit to 60 kph and put up adequate signage or put in wide speed bumps to deter the excessive speed on Currumbin Creek Road between Pigabeen Road and Connection Road

[1629](#) Response from the Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy and Water Supply (Mr Bailey) to a paper petition (2474-15) presented by Mr Sorensen, and an ePetition (2431-15) sponsored by Mr Sorensen, from 2,929 and 1,640 petitioners respectively, requesting the House to upgrade the intersection of Urraween Road and Maryborough Hervey Bay Road to an acceptable safety standard

[1630](#) Response from the Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy and Water Supply (Mr Bailey) to a paper petition (2475-15) presented by Mr Powell, and an ePetition (2436-15) sponsored by Mr Powell, from 603 and 78 petitioners respectively, requesting the House to prioritise the installation of school flashing lights at Peachester State School

[1631](#) Response from the Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy and Water Supply (Mr Bailey) to a paper petition (2471-15) presented by Mr Harper, and an ePetition (2414-15) sponsored by Mr Harper, from 1,029 and 564 petitioners respectively, requesting the House to resurface and widen Hervey Range Road to allow the safe passage of traffic, including the addition of bike lanes; and upgrade the Granitevale Road intersection to allow safe turning and passing

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

[1632](#) 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 (2465-15) presented by Dr Robinson, from 516 petitioners, requesting the House to engage and consult with the local North Stradbroke Island communities and to commit to adhering to a 2035 end date for mining and to ensure a proper economic transition is planned

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

### Domestic and Family Violence




**Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (9.34 am): Over the past fortnight in Queensland, we have witnessed more alleged cases of horrifying domestic violence. Those incidents have saddened us, frightened us and driven home the fact that we are in the grip of a shocking and perplexing epidemic. The fact that recent events have been so appallingly public has shocked us. These acts are simply unspeakable. However, it has not closed our minds and our hearts to what is going on behind closed doors. We cannot forget the women, men and children who are living terrifying lives in the abysmal shadow of domestic violence. The terrible fact is that each week in Australia, a woman is killed at the hands of her husband or partner, or former husband or partner. That is a fact that should galvanise us all and it is a fact that should shock us into action.

My government, with bipartisan support, has acted quickly with a raft of operational and legislative reforms including changes to the way police deal with domestic violence complaints, increased penalties for breaches of domestic violence and special witness status in courts to protect victims from intimidation. We have allocated an additional \$1.2 million to the team at DVConnect, which fields an extraordinary volume of calls for help each day. There will be two new crisis shelters, one in Townsville and one in Brisbane, and we are trialling specialist domestic violence courts on the Gold Coast.

Today it fills me with great pride to announce another initiative. This one involves the unique participation and cooperation of Brisbane's television news stars. For the first time in history for a government, the faces of the commercial networks—channels 10, 9 and 7—have put aside the fact that their stations compete with each other for ratings to stand side by side in a series of compelling ads designed to help put an end to domestic violence. In a show of generosity on the part of the television networks and as a show of their determination to help campaign against domestic violence, those ads will go to air free of charge as community service announcements. The community service announcements were collaboratively produced by the television networks in partnership with the Queensland government. Each station contributed their time and talent free of charge, with MediaCom, the Queensland government's media booking agency, offering free-of-charge production management. The ads will begin airing in prime time this weekend. Importantly, the ads include a strong message that Queenslanders need to take responsibility and act as good men.

I place on the record my genuine thanks to Channel 7 news presenters Bill McDonald, Shane Webcke and Sharyn Ghidella; Network Nine presenters Andrew Lofthouse, Melissa Downs and Wally Lewis; and Network 10 talent Georgina Lewis, Lachlan Kennedy and Jonathan Williams. Additionally, my government will hold a White Ribbon Day breakfast at the Sofitel on 25 November. I thank the ABC's Matt Wordsworth for agreeing to host that event. My government thanks our TV stars for helping to bring the domestic violence issue out of the shadows. My government thanks you for joining us and joining all Queenslanders in saying enough is enough.

### Advance Queensland

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (9.37 am): I want to report to the House on the outstanding success of last night's innovation and investment reception to promote the government's Advance Queensland strategy. I thank all members who attended, including the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader. There was a lot of energy and enthusiasm in the room, which is precisely the kind of energy and enthusiasm that we need to harness. We heard an excellent address from Wayne Gerard, one of the co-founders of Red Eye Apps and a great supporter of the work being done to stimulate the start-up sector here in Queensland. We also heard from Professor Frank Gannon from QIMR Berghofer, who spoke of the critical importance of commercialising research.

Advance Queensland is all about creating jobs for the future. We have other initiatives and programs that are concentrating on creating jobs now, but we have a dual focus to our Working Queensland strategy of jobs now and jobs for the future. Last night I had the pleasure of meeting some of the best and brightest in the innovation and IT sector who have great ideas on the drawing board or in the process of making their way from the drawing board to commercial reality. Those are ideas such as groundbreaking research involving 3D scanners; an app that can disable a mobile phone if a car is being driven by a P-plater; a heart-rate monitor utilising your mobile phone, and I can confirm everything was normal in my case; an iPad app for cabinet submissions—an app created by Queensland company Speedwell, which is now being used by the New South Wales and federal governments and the Reserve Bank.

While speaking of our best and brightest, I want to mention the achievements of Professor Perry Bartlett from the Queensland Brain Institute at the University of Queensland. Yesterday he was announced as the winner of the 2015 CSL Florey Medal for his breakthrough discoveries in neuroscience and, in particular, his work on dementia. This prestigious award is awarded to an Australian biomedical researcher every two years. Only 10 scientists have received the honour. It will come as no surprise that another Queenslanders, Professor Ian Frazer, has previously received the award for his work on the cervical cancer vaccine.

Professor Bartlett's work has transformed our understanding of the brain. Most recently, in experiments in mice he reversed the effects of dementia and restored learning by stimulating the production of new nerve cells through exercise. Professor Bartlett will start clinical trials on this work next year—work that will be watched closely in a country where more than 300,000 people are living with dementia, and an estimated 1.2 million are carers for dementia patients.

Congratulations and thank you to Professor Bartlett. His discoveries are an example of what we are capable of here in Queensland. Through Advance Queensland, my government is driving innovation and research to help create the knowledge-based jobs of the future.

### The Smith Family, Christmas Appeal



**Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (9.40 am): Christmas is a time to celebrate with our family, friends and loved ones. We also know that Christmas can be a stressful and difficult time for many, especially for families struggling to provide for their children. We all have a part to play in supporting families in our community. If we are to make a difference to the lives of our most disadvantaged and vulnerable children and families, government and the community services sector need to work together.

Community services are a lifeline for Queensland's most vulnerable people, and a strong community services sector plays a vital role in our state's wellbeing. The Queensland government knows how important it is for the community services sector to have a voice. That is why we removed gag clauses from the government's streamlined service agreement and made it easier for the community services sector to focus on service delivery to clients by reducing red tape, making processes and systems simpler and supporting innovative approaches. The community services sector has valuable ideas, and these ideas have and will continue to inform the government's community services rebuilding strategy which will have a clear focus on clients, jobs and skills.

It is through the valuable work of community organisations like The Smith Family that we can reach out to those in need, especially at a time when people need assistance the most. The work of The Smith Family in helping disadvantaged children to have a better and brighter future is recognised and greatly appreciated by this government.

My government is pleased to continue to support the ongoing work of The Smith Family and will today provide \$100,000 to The Smith Family to support their work this Christmas. This year the Smith Family aims to deliver more than 36,000 new toys and 23,500 new books around Australia to help bring smiles to the faces of those children who are most in need.

I encourage everyone to make a difference this Christmas and generously give the gift of goodwill to show those Queenslanders in our community who are doing it tough that they are not alone. Together, we can make a difference.

### Gold Coast Light Rail



**Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade) (9.42 am): The Palaszczuk government has been busy ensuring that the extension of light rail from the Gold Coast University Hospital in Southport to the heavy rail at Helensvale station will be built and completed in time for the Gold Coast 2018 Commonwealth Games. The 12-week request for tender process is at the halfway point and closes on 23 December 2015. The three shortlisted bidders are busy preparing their bids. It is expected a contract will be awarded in early 2016, with construction commencing in April 2016. This will allow the extension to be operational for the 2018 Commonwealth Games.

As members know, the reference design includes three new stations at Helensvale, Parkwood and Parkwood East. It also includes a new 1,000-car-space park-and-ride facility at Parkwood station and a 400-space expansion of the existing park-and-ride facility at Helensvale station and bus interchange. The project links the growing health and knowledge precinct at the Gold Coast University Hospital with Brisbane by rail, creating a seamless connection between the Gold Coast CBD, the university hospital and Brisbane.

I can announce to the House that this week the order was signed for four additional trams, allowing sufficient time for Bombardier Transport to manufacture, test and deliver the trams prior to the commissioning. The additional trams take the number for the extended system from 14 to 18. The trams ordered are the same design as those already operating on the Gold Coast. The trams have a capacity of 309 passengers with 80 seated, and there are allocated spaces for wheelchairs and prams. Each Gold Coast tram is fitted with four surfboard racks and air conditioning designed for Queensland's hot, humid weather conditions. A single tram is equivalent to six standard buses and has the potential to remove 235 cars from the road during peak periods.

I can also advise the House that this week the stage 2 project team and GoldLinQ representatives will host two community information sessions at the Arundel State School hall. The sessions will give residents the opportunity to learn about the project reference design and have their questions about the project answered by the project team. The first session will be held this evening, 12 November, from 6.30 to 8.30 pm. The second is on Saturday, 14 November from 12 to 2 pm. The information sessions have been advertised in local newspapers and over 2,000 letterbox flyers have been delivered to residents in the Parkwood and Arundel areas.



This project has been made possible by the strong commitment from the Palaszczuk government, the Gold Coast City Council and finally the federal government. The federal government is contributing \$95 million, the Gold Coast City Council has confirmed a contribution of \$55.1 million and the Queensland government has identified savings to allow for a state contribution for the construction cost of Gold Coast Light Rail Stage 2. All three levels of government are on board and working together and we are getting on with the job of ensuring that the project is delivered in time for the 2018 Commonwealth Games.

### Queensland Economy



**Hon. CW PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (Treasurer, Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (9.45 am): Four months ago I delivered the first budget of the Palaszczuk government—an unashamedly pro-business, pro-jobs budget. The budget included a range of measures to support Queensland businesses, to boost confidence in our economy and to grow jobs.

Earlier in the week we saw further evidence of how that confidence has returned to the Queensland economy. For the fourth month in a row the National Australia Bank's business monthly survey has found Queensland has the highest business confidence level of any mainland state in Australia. At plus seven it is higher than New South Wales and higher than Victoria. Importantly, the survey also found business conditions have also improved. It shows how businesses are reaching for the stars. It shows that they are reacting to the positive economic agenda of this government.

Yesterday the Westpac consumer sentiment index was released. While these figures at a state level can be quite volatile on a month-to-month basis there are encouraging signs. The survey showed there is confidence about the future, with a 9.1 per cent increase for the subindex on economic conditions over the next five years. Businesses and consumers have reason to feel confident about the future. Economic growth is improving, jobs are being created, business confidence is strong and independent analysts are also starting to take note.

It was particularly pleasing to see the commentary of rating agency Standard & Poor's in their credit update released earlier this week. The headline was 'Ratings on the state of Queensland affirmed at AA+ on improving budgetary performance, outlook remains stable.' It is important to compare what S&P said in terms of its ratings assessment of the previous government. It stated, 'Queensland's budgetary performance has improved to average from weak'—weak being its characterisation of performance under the LNP. S&P went on to state, 'A higher rating may occur with a track record of sustaining operating surpluses.' This compares to S&P's credit update in October 2014, under the LNP, which clearly stated, 'Upside rating potential is unlikely within the next two years.' S&P stated—

In our view, the state's prudent approach to debt management, as well as the development of medium- and long-term fiscal and economic strategies and its prudent expenditure management, demonstrates its financial strength. The government is focused on reducing the state's high debt burden ...

It is particularly pleasing to see recognition from respected analysts like S&P that the Palaszczuk government's first budget has turned the corner on the last three years. S&P conclude—

The stable outlook reflects our expectation that the state's financial management will remain strong and its budgetary performance will continue to improve compared to recent years.

The Palaszczuk government intends to maintain this momentum. Queensland has the highest forecast growth of any state across the forward estimates. Last month Queensland Treasury's trend gross state product figures showed the Queensland economy grew at 1.3 per cent in the June quarter 2015 to be 2.2 per cent higher over the year.

This is the highest quarterly growth since December 2011 when Labor was last in government. Since the state election around 1,320 full-time jobs per month have been created in Queensland. In trend terms that is more than 34,000 jobs created since January. The budget and its pro-jobs, pro-growth agenda that we have set down is making a difference, and I expect to see the positive economic and fiscal direction that we are setting will continue to deliver for Queensland.

### Home-based Business Grants Program




**Hon. KJ JONES** (Ashgrove—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games) (9.49 am): I am pleased to advise the House that, because we were so overwhelmed by Queensland small business owners wanting a piece of the action of our home based small business program, we have brought forward \$1 million in grants. We want to provide the support that new and emerging small business owners need to make their business thrive.

This government is determined to work with the private sector to grow jobs for Queenslanders, and that is exactly what this program will do. Today I announce that 200 home based entrepreneurs from right across the state will receive funding under our Home-based Business Grants Program—part of our Advance Queensland strategy. This program provides up to \$5,000 in support to stay-at-home parents running a home based business. These businesses include documentary filmmakers, children's clothes designers and mobile app developers.

Today I will be meeting with 'mumpreneur' and owner of kid's clothing line Merry-Ishi, who is among our 200 grant recipients. We want to support home based business owners who are also balancing the demands of work and family life to grow their business. Small business have been crying out for help with business planning, mentoring and coaching, and marketing including branding strategies and social media and digital strategies.

Since we launched this program we have received more than 1,300 applications—85 per cent have come from women. The businesses that we are benefiting through this program are located right across Queensland, from up and down the coast to as far west as Longreach. We want to see Queensland's small business sector grow, and this program is a tangible way that we can help the entrepreneurs of tomorrow.

### Innovation

 **Hon. LM ENOCH** (Algeria—ALP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Science and Innovation) (9.51 am): The Palaszczuk government's \$180 million Advance Queensland initiative is an investment in the future of Queensland. We are encouraging Queensland businesses from all industry sectors to embrace the opportunities provided by the growing digital economy.

Queensland is in the midst of an innovation boom. Technology is transforming all aspects of society, and every part of our lives will be touched by these changes. Driverless cars, wi-fi coffee machines and 3D printed body parts are just some of the coming technological advances that we know about. Because of this innovation, we find ourselves at an important juncture when it comes to the future direction of our state.

Right now, we have the opportunity to build an economy based on high-growth, knowledge-intensive businesses that can compete globally in a world increasingly driven by technology. As a state, we need to embrace these changes and make them work to our advantage. But we also need to lead them—being the driver of science and innovation and realising the benefits.


We know that Queensland, and Australia, needs to be more business savvy. Studies show that when it comes to entrepreneurship Australia ranks 29th globally, lagging behind Singapore, China and the United States. On top of that, a 2013 study showed that only seven per cent of Australia's tech start-ups are actually based in Brisbane.

Our role as a government is to work with the private sector to provide the all-important seed funding that will get start-ups on their feet and give them a chance to grow and become a Queensland success story. The \$76 million Advance Queensland Business Investment Attraction package will support SMEs and start-ups to bring new ideas to market and increase the investment ready 'deal flow' into the angel and venture capital sectors.

Part of this package, the Business Development Fund, was announced by the Treasurer, Curtis Pitt, last month, and it will help a new generation of Queensland businesses turn great ideas into commercial realities. It aims to make businesses aware of the importance of adopting digital technologies and improve competitiveness and productivity, as well as provide practical education.

Advance Queensland is creating jobs now and jobs for the future. It is boosting productivity and increasing the rate and growth of start-ups and other businesses. It has been estimated that innovation and digital transformation has the potential to generate \$136 billion and 500,000 jobs annually—and, in the process, change the way we live, work and play. I am so proud to be part of a government which is setting the scene for Queensland's digital future as a great place to live, work, invest and do business.

### Premier's Sustainability Awards

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef) (9.53 am): This government is committed to helping Queenslanders develop technologies that reduce environmental impact, foster new business and jobs, and bring economic benefit to the community. It is important that we embrace change in the way we go about our everyday lives, and I am very pleased to say recently I was reminded of just how many of us are moving towards a more sustainable future.

The 2015 Premier's Sustainability Awards continue to grow in stature, with nearly 120 nominations across 10 categories. Teys Australia, the country's second largest red meat processor, led the pack, taking out the top prize. The meat processing giant is working to dramatically reduce its carbon footprint with two new state-of-the-art wastewater treatment systems at its facilities in Beenleigh and Rockhampton. I was pleased to visit the Rockhampton site with the member for Keppel a little while ago. Teys Australia also won the Business Eco-efficiency Award.

This year's awards saw the introduction of a brand-new category, the Young Achiever's Award, to recognise the contribution towards a sustainable future by a Queensland under the age of 25. I am delighted that Bindi Irwin, who has done so much to inspire others, including my three kids, was the first recipient. Other winners included Nambour Rugby Union Football Club for turning an old landfill site into an organically certified sporting oval; Robert McVicker, whose luxury home exports more electricity and rainwater than it consumes in the member for Logan's seat; and Mount Pleasant Station, which has dramatically improved the landscape through sustainable grazing practices.


One of the many honours for me as the Minister for Environment was presenting the Queensland Minister's Award for Leadership in Sustainability to Alby Wooler, the founder of the Junior Landcare movement. Mr Wooler embodies the spirit of the Premier's Sustainability Awards, by encouraging young people to get involved in the Landcare movement. Alby established Junior Landcare in 1992 and continues to steer the program today as President of the Capricorn Coast Landcare Group.

Thanks to his efforts, generations of young people have been inspired to get involved and make a difference in locally sustainable, resource efficient conservation activities. Mr Wooler introduced the Passport Program to formalise Junior Landcare activities and to reward participants and encourage others to become involved. Under the program, Junior Landcarers earn passport stamps for participating in days like Clean Up Australia Day and National Tree Day. I will say it again—well done, Alby.

Each category winner received a fancy trophy designed and created by Queensland artist Mick Zalesky using recycled materials to symbolise new beginnings for sustainable growth. Winners also received \$2,500 to support ongoing sustainability projects. I would also like to acknowledge the outstanding contributions made by all 30 finalists from across Queensland who were recognised for their tremendous efforts in striving for excellence in sustainability, innovation and eco-efficiency.

If we are to continue to enjoy our Queensland way of life, we must move towards a more sustainable future. The Premier's Sustainability Awards were a clear sign that Queenslanders are devoting their time to a better future.

### Food Labelling

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (9.57 am): The Palaszczuk government is a government which delivers on its election commitments. We went to the people with a specific platform and we are now implementing that platform. In this light I am pleased to announce that later today I will introduce into the parliament the Health Legislation Amendment Bill 2015, which will require large food outlets to list the kilojoules contained in food that they sell. This legislation will deliver on one of our election commitments in the Health portfolio.

While many national fast-food outlets and supermarkets in Queensland are already displaying some kilojoule information instore and online, we want to ensure consistency across our state. These new arrangements will apply to businesses that either have 20 outlets in Queensland or 50 nationally. These include fast-food chains, snack food and drink chains, bakery chains, cafe chains and supermarkets. But that said, we also want to see other food retailers adopt the measure in the interests of allowing consumers to make a more informed choice.

These new requirements will be rolled out over a 12-month period following the passage of the legislation. During this transition period, Queensland Health will be working with business to achieve compliance. While the factors behind obesity are complex, the widespread availability and consumption of unhealthy food is driving the increasing rates of obesity in Queensland. In 2014, 30 per cent of Queensland adults consumed takeaway food at least once a week. This is more prevalent among young people, with 48 per cent of adults aged 18 to 24 eating fast food at least once a week.

We know from research that many members of the community greatly underestimate the amount of energy, saturated fat, sugar and salt in processed food. Kilojoule menu labelling will ensure Queenslanders can make informed choices at the point of sale. These amendments are based on laws which are already in place in New South Wales. Since the introduction of these laws in New South Wales, consumers are purchasing, on average, food which has 15 per cent fewer kilojoules. We aim to achieve similar results here in Queensland through the delivery of this important election commitment.

## Mining Industry



**Hon. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (9.59 am): Mr Speaker, as you know, our resources industry plays a vital role in providing economic prosperity and jobs for Queensland, particularly in regional areas. The Queensland Resources Council estimates the resources sector contributed more than \$64 billion to Queensland's economy last financial year. That is why this government is investing in initiatives that will ensure the sustainable and responsible development of the resources sector.

Here in Queensland, the Palaszczuk government is investing heavily in innovation because that is what will underpin improved productivity and reduced costs. Just last week the Acting Director-General of the Department of Science, Information Technology and Innovation addressed my resources round table about our \$180 million Advance Queensland initiative. I take every opportunity I can to encourage the resources sector to take up the opportunities Advance Queensland offers. Under this program, funding of up to \$50,000 per project is available to help businesses with the cost of hiring a graduate to work on an innovative project. I have been personally urging the resources sector to make the most of this, and I repeat that now: get in quick, as the second funding round is now open and closes on 29 January next year.

I have had a great response from industry and I am very excited about what this will mean not just for the resources sector but also for our world-leading mining equipment, technology and services sector, of which Queensland can be very proud. Our mining technology sector is one of the factors that makes Queensland a global resources leader. That is why this government invested \$6 million plus staffing support to get the new national mining technology growth centre here in Queensland, right next door at QUT. It will work with researchers and industry to find solutions to the mining industry's challenges. With Advance Queensland and the national METS growth centre here, this cements Queensland's position as a mining technology innovation hotspot. Most importantly, it will draw more knowledge capital, more investment, greater productivity improvements, increase trade, and ultimately strengthen our resources sector, and with that strengthen Queensland.

## Department of Transport and Main Roads, Innovation




**Hon. MC BAILEY** (Yeerongpilly—ALP) (Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy and Water Supply) (10.01 am): The Palaszczuk government is a government focused on new ideas and innovation and, importantly, bridging the gap between great ideas and the jobs they can lead to. The Department of Transport and Main Roads has an ongoing focus on innovation and supports us in this venture from internal research and development, promoting an innovative culture, through to collaborating with external researchers. It is one reason why TMR has shown strong support for the Palaszczuk government's Advance Queensland program.

Advance Queensland provides a range of opportunities for TMR including the discovery of solutions to transport system problems; the discovery of new, or improvement to existing, transport products and services; capacity building in TMR and the transport sector more broadly; and the establishment of new partnerships and collaborations. I can advise the House today that TMR, through the Advance Queensland Innovation Challenges program, has provided a challenge to the Office of the Queensland Chief Scientist. The topic of TMR's challenge is transport solutions which focus on better managing road traffic operations through real-time data. Not only is there the potential to make better use of existing information sources; we may be able to access the wide variety of emerging sources across society.

I would also like to take the opportunity today to congratulate the department on its success at the recent Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport awards. This included winning the Excellence in Safety Award for the Wide Centre Line Treatment on Queensland Highways project. Members may have already seen that being rolled out on the Bruce Highway and elsewhere where there is a separation of different lanes by a metre—a simple but brilliant idea. The department won the Excellence in Transport Policy, Planning and Implementation Award for the Transport Network Reconstruction Program. This follows TMR also receiving an award at the World Road Association's 25th congress in Seoul, Korea for Mr David Hind's paper titled 'Risk management in action'. It was one of 750 papers submitted worldwide. I congratulate him and our staff on their great achievements. This is an unprecedented achievement, and it confirms TMR's role at the leading edge of risk management in the recovery from natural disasters.

As the Minister for Main Roads and Road Safety, I am proud to work with our staff. Research and development and following innovation opportunities are critical to developing our transport system and meeting future customer needs. The Palaszczuk government recognises and acknowledges the expertise in our Public Service, and TMR is certainly up to the challenge.

### Schoolies Week

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Communities, Women and Youth, Minister for Child Safety and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (10.04 am): Next week will see the beginning of the schoolies holiday period, with tens of thousands of year 12 school leavers expected to converge on popular tourist destinations throughout Queensland. While our government does not encourage young people to attend schoolies, we are committed to ensuring that the schoolies holiday period is as safe as possible for school leavers, local residents, businesses and the wider community.

The Queensland government will be delivering local community safety responses at the Gold Coast, Airlie Beach and Yeppoon as part of the statewide Safer Schoolies Initiative, a whole-of-government initiative led by my department of communities. Additional police, emergency services, local law and licensing officers will also be patrolling schoolies locations. Chill-out zones and first-aid treatment centres will be available to support the safety of vulnerable young school leavers.


In addition to specialist support services, more than 1,000 dedicated volunteers will be giving up their time to help deliver vital safety and support services during schoolies. I was so pleased to hear that this year half of the volunteer workforce will be represented by returning volunteers who come back year after year to help keep young people safe. This includes Joan and Greg Darlington, who will be returning to volunteer for the third year. Both Joan and Greg do street patrols and walk-homes at the Gold Coast during schoolies week, sometimes finishing at 2 am, to ensure vulnerable schoolies are kept safe. Before they signed up to volunteer they did not believe in the tradition of schoolies. However, both Joan and Greg now support young people coming together to celebrate the end of their schooling and think they are very well looked after due to the Gold Coast schoolies community safety response.

We will also see Kat Deacon returning to schoolies as a volunteer for the eighth time. Kat started working with Red Frogs in 2008 to pursue her passion for helping young people. Kat will be returning to Australia from overseas specifically to work with Red Frogs at schoolies and will be leading a team of 35 volunteers in the 24-hour Red Frogs call centre.

To further strengthen our commitment to keeping young people safe, this year we are partnering with Our Watch to support the current domestic violence campaign 'The Line' to encourage healthy and respectful relationships by challenging and changing those attitudes and behaviours that lead to violence against women. Our Watch will have a visual presence at schoolies on Saturday, 21 November where they will engage with young people through the distribution of key messages focused on respectful relationships.

I am really look forward to visiting the Gold Coast to meet the wonderful volunteers and see the response in action. Keeping Queenslanders safe is one of the Palaszczuk government's highest priorities, and I thank all those involved in the delivery of the schoolies community safety responses for their hard work in looking after our young school leavers.

### Mount Isa, Police

 **Hon. JR MILLER** (Bundamba—ALP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services) (10.07 am): I am pleased to update the House today on the hard work of the Mount Isa police over the last few months as part of a special operation designed to curb youth crime and antisocial behaviour. Recently there have been a number of disturbing incidents which have been worrying to me and worrying to the whole community. After the Pioneer police beat was deliberately burnt down in August, the Palaszczuk government convened urgent roundtable talks to develop a plan to tackle these issues. As part of the whole-of-government Mount Isa action plan, the Queensland Police Service established Operation North Respect to target youth crime, support local police, enhance community safety and restore community confidence.


I am pleased to say that the first phase of the operation has now concluded with some encouraging results. As part of the operation, which ran from 3 September to 18 October, police charged 316 people with 405 offences. They also conducted over 3,000 street checks and 222 curfew checks which resulted in 21 curfew breaches. The operation also targeted under-age consumption of alcohol and other alcohol fuelled incidents, with 118 liquor infringement notices issued and nearly 900

litres of alcohol tipped out by police. Seventy traffic infringement notices were also issued. This is a fantastic effort by police in a relatively short amount of time. I want to put on the record my deep appreciation of the Mount Isa police for their proactive work. I also want to thank the extra police who were deployed from across the northern region to support their Mount Isa colleagues in this operation.

I have been heartened by the positive response from the community as a result of Operation North Respect. This would not have been possible without the cooperation and support of the Mount Isa Regional Council, in particular Mayor Tony McGrady. I also want to acknowledge the member for Mount Isa, Robbie Katter MP, for his strong representations to me on behalf of his community.

In the lead-up to the school holidays, local police will continue to partner with other government agencies, local government and the community to tackle these issues head-on. I have seen firsthand the positive and proactive efforts of the Mount Isa police and the PCYC working with the city's youth, and I have no doubt that this hard work will continue to pay off in Mount Isa.

### **Shark Control; Surf Life Saving Australia**

 **Hon. WS BYRNE** (Rockhampton—ALP) (Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries and Minister for Sport and Racing) (10.10 am): As members of the House would know, a young surfer, Sam Morgan, is currently being treated in the Gold Coast Hospital following a terrible attack by a bull shark on the New South Wales north coast near Ballina. The thoughts of the entire House are with him and his family and we hope for the absolute best for him.

Given the attention on this terrible attack and with summer now upon us, I would like to remind the House that measures are in place to prevent shark attacks on Queensland beaches. Generations of Queenslanders and visitors to our shores have enjoyed some of Australia's best beaches. I want swimmers to have confidence in our beaches, whilst always being mindful of their personal safety. I can inform the House that drum lines and shark nets are in place off 85 beaches along the Queensland coast. For decades, Queensland's Shark Control Program has made it safe to swim in our surf. Since the program began in 1962, there has been only one shark fatality at a shark control beach in Queensland. The Shark Control Program catches 600 to 700 sharks every year, on average. This year to date, 558 sharks have been caught by the program this year.


Queensland is renowned for its beautiful beaches, and people come here to swim and recreate all year round. When it comes to protecting swimmers, there is a longstanding, bipartisan consensus in this House. Swimmer safety is the No. 1 priority and that is why this government is committed to the Shark Control Program. Shark control equipment remains in place throughout the year, as sharks are along the coast at different times all year round, including the whale season et cetera. The Department of Agriculture and Fisheries also operates a free, 24-hour hotline—1800806891—if anyone notices a sea creature which has become entangled in a shark net or a drum line.

Away from the shark nets, this government also supports surf lifesaving clubs. Local clubs and statewide groups—like Surf Life Saving Queensland, the Royal Life Saving Society of Queensland, Surfing Queensland and Swimming Queensland—receive funding from Sport and Recreation Services. During the past five years, the Department of National Parks, Sport and Racing has given more than \$3.5 million to the sport of surf lifesaving. Surf Life Saving Queensland has 30,000 active members and is one of Australia's largest volunteer organisations. Their volunteers are a very familiar sight on our beaches every summer, and we thank them for their incredible work.

I wish all Queenslanders and visitors to our beaches a safe and happy summer in the surf, whether they are in North Queensland, along the Sunshine Coast or on the Gold Coast. There are no absolutes in life. However, Queenslanders can be assured that the Palaszczuk government maintains its commitment to all prudent and feasible measures to ensure their safety.

## **MOTION**

### **Broadcast Terms and Conditions**

 **Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (10.12 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

That the Broadcast Terms and Conditions including the conditions of use circulated in my name be approved by the Legislative Assembly pursuant to s.50 of the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001, effective immediately.

---

### Broadcast Terms and Conditions

#### 1. Notice to all users—Parliament of Queensland Act 2001

This broadcast is protected by the powers, immunities and rights of the Legislative Assembly, but further publication of the broadcast (in whole or in part) is not similarly protected.

The broadcast of proceedings is not the official record of the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly or its committees and cannot be used to contradict, add to or impugn the accuracy of the official reports of debates (Hansard). (Section 57 of the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001 provides that the reports of the debates (Hansard) are the accurate record of what happened in the Legislative Assembly). Therefore, the broadcast material should not be quoted or used in any proceedings such as legal proceedings.

#### Further Publication

Under sections 50 and 58 of the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001, the Legislative Assembly and its committees has authorised further publication of the broadcast subject to the conditions set out below under the heading "Conditions of Access." The further publication of the broadcast in contravention of any of the conditions set out under the heading "Conditions of Access" is a contempt of Parliament under section 58 of the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001.

#### 2. Conditions of Access

The Legislative Assembly authorises the further publication of this broadcast of the proceedings of the Queensland Parliament, subject to the following conditions:

1. The material must only be used for the purposes of fair and accurate reports of proceedings and must not in any circumstances be used for;
  - i. political advertising, election campaigning or any advertising campaign that would normally require at law a broadcaster to announce who has authorised the material;
  - ii. satire or ridicule; and
  - iii. commercial sponsorship or commercial advertising;
2. Reports of proceedings must provide a balanced presentation of differing views;
3. Excerpts of proceedings are to be placed in context so as to avoid any misrepresentation;
4. Excerpts of proceedings which are subsequently withdrawn may be rebroadcast only if the withdrawal is also rebroadcast; and
5. Points of order, and matters claimed to be points of order may be rebroadcast except:
  - i. statements in respect of which a member claims misrepresentation or otherwise seeks withdrawal, and which are subsequently ordered to be withdrawn, or are voluntarily withdrawn, are not to be rebroadcast; or
  - ii. if the House or the Speaker or Committee Chairperson, in accordance with the Standing Rules and Orders and practice of the Legislative Assembly, orders that a statement be expunged or deleted from Hansard, either at the time that the statement was made or at a later time, the statement, the Speaker's or Chairperson's direction and the proceedings relating to the matter, are not to be rebroadcast.

(Details of any order of the Speaker or the Legislative Assembly, or any practice, relevant to Condition 5 above are available from the Office of the Clerk of the Parliament.)

#### 3. Breach of Conditions of Access

Use of the broadcast material in contravention of a condition imposed by the Legislative Assembly or its committees will constitute a contempt of Parliament.

#### 4. Disclaimer

Users must accept this disclaimer.

The information provided is made available in good faith and is derived from sources believed to be reliable and accurate at the time of release on the Internet. However, the information is provided solely on the basis that listeners will be responsible for making their own assessment of the matters discussed herein and are advised to verify all relevant representations, statements and information in the official reports of debate (**Hansard**).

Changes in the circumstances after the material is placed on the Internet may impact on the accuracy of the information. Additionally, materials may be maliciously vandalised. No assurance is given as to the accuracy of any information contained after publication on the Internet.


Each user waives and releases the State of Queensland acting through the Legislative Assembly and the Parliamentary Service and its servants to the full extent permitted by law from any and all claims, whether in negligence or otherwise, relating to the usage of material or information made available through these pages. In no event shall the State of Queensland acting through the Legislative Assembly and the Parliamentary Service and its servants be liable for any incidental or consequential damages resulting from use of material. The State of Queensland acting through the Legislative Assembly and the Parliamentary Service and its servants do not accept liability for any injury, loss or damage, whether in negligence or otherwise, incurred by reliance on the information provided in the audio broadcast and the associated web pages or information incorporated into them by reference.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

## FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE


### Report

 **Ms FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (10.13 am): I lay upon the table of the House report No. 17 of the Finance and Administration Committee. This annual report covers the work of the committee between 27 March and 30 June 2015. I commend the report to the House.

*Tabled paper:* Finance and Administration Committee: Report No. 17, 55th Parliament—Annual Report 2014-15 [\[1633\]](#).

## NOTICE OF MOTION

### Trade Unions


 **Mr LANGBROEK** (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (10.13 am): I give notice that I shall move—

That this House:

1. expresses its concern over the influence of unelected trade union officials upon this government;
2. notes particularly the interim report of the Royal Commission into Trade Union Governance and Corruption handed down on 15 December 2014;
3. notes that the CFMEU and its officials have been adversely mentioned in that report;
4. notes that Mr Michael Ravbar, Queensland State Secretary of the CFMEU, remains a member of the ALP national executive, and that the CFMEU remains affiliated with the Australian Labor Party (Queensland Branch); and
5. calls on the government to desist from meeting with any unions or trade union officials who are currently under investigation by the Royal Commission into Trade Union Governance and Corruption until its final report has been released and all investigations into alleged criminal behaviour by trade union officials have been finalised.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

### Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance

 **Mr LANGBROEK** (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (10.14 am): This is a government that clearly has no idea of what it is doing. It is obvious that it is worse than a do-nothing government; it is making life harder for Queenslanders. It has no economic agenda, it has no plan for building the job-creating infrastructure the state needs, and its ministers are crumbling under the weight of their inexperience and their mega portfolios. We have seen it time and time again this week, even from some of the government's most experienced ministers. We have even seen it this morning in ministerial statements. We heard the glowing selective commentary from the Standard & Poor's report from the Treasurer, where he was speaking about the fact that under the previous Labor government when we inherited a situation our economy was weak. There was no mention of the fact that previous Standard and Poor's reports about a weak performance when we were in government were because of Labor's poor budget management. We were the ones who did the hard work. We were the ones who got the debt down from a prospective \$85 billion to \$75 billion.

But the best thing about today's announcement from the Treasurer is what he did not read from the Standard & Poor's report. We have heard so much about the vaunted debt reduction strategy of the government, the debt action plan. What did Standard and Poor's have to say today in the report they released? I will not read a selective quote; this is the full sentence from Standard & Poor's in their rating update. They said—

We expect Queensland's debt action plan will not substantially lower its consolidated non-financial public sector debt burden, as its most significant measure—

and this is very critical and it something we have been saying from the start—

will simply transfer debt from one subsector within the NFPS to another.

So there it is being called out for what it actually is—a rort, a scheme conjured up by this Treasurer to try to fool the people of Queensland. Of course it is not just the Treasurer who has been kidding the people of Queensland that they are actually getting up to things in their portfolios and know what it is happening. We have had the education and tourism minister who has had to put out one, two, three or possibly four tourism investment guides—4.0 is obviously what we are going to see next. Are we up to version 4? And we have had revelations of IT bungles and disasters returning to plague Labor.



Today we had the education and tourism minister talking about her role as small business minister and spruiking her small business credentials. All you have to do is ask Nick Behrens from the Chamber of Commerce & Industry Queensland, the peak body for small business, about what he thought of the government's response to their red-tape-reduction paper. He said that this minister basically came on and, in his words, 'just blamed the other mob'. In relation to her committee that is going to meet every three months, he said, 'If you are going to reduce red tape, a committee that's going to meet every three months ain't going to cut it.' And that is what we say about this government—it ain't going to cut it.

### Queensland Economy



**Hon. CW PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (Treasurer, Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (10.17 am): It gives me great pleasure to follow the shadow Treasurer, who clearly loves selectively quoting. They will do anything to suggest that this government has no economic plan, when in fact their only economic plan was to copy ours. That is the worst part about it—they have no plan and they cannot even be convinced.

I sat across the table from the global heads of Standard & Poor's. I know what their view of our budget was. I have had that direct conversation and they are impressed with what we have done. They are impressed with the budget. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition continues to talk about the fact that their non-financial public sector measure of debt is the measure. Let me be clear: if he thinks that the general government sector debt is not the important measure, if he thinks an operating balance is not the important measure, he should go and tell Mike Baird and every other state and territory in Australia, which uses the same measure that this government is using.

If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition had paid attention, he would know that last week we held the Northern Queensland Economic Summit, which brought together nearly 300 delegates. A large number of them were international investors and Queensland based companies, together with mayors and federal government agencies—all coming together to focus on economic opportunity in Queensland. We saw high net worth individuals; we saw local people like Rod Lamb from the Ella Bay resort; we saw start-ups all coming together. Those are the opportunities that are going to help create future opportunities in Queensland. There was an exchange of ideas. I can say that when the Leader of the House went to Darwin he spoke very clearly about what we were doing in Queensland and it was remarked to him that Queensland has set the bar through exactly the sorts of conversations we need to develop Northern Australia.

The Northern Queensland Economic Summit was an unqualified success according to all across-the-board. Those opposite should start asking some people who used to be members of their party at a federal level who said that they had never seen anything as good as this. I think those opposite have to ask themselves some real questions. They are a rabble. They have no idea where they are going. A few things we did last week: QIC organised—

**Mr Nicholls:** Who? Tell us who. Tell us who.

**Mr McArdle:** Who was it?

**Mr PITT:** Would you like to know who that was? I will tell the honourable members later. I do not think they will be very happy. The QIC agribusiness strategy was launched, which of course is about ensuring that we can continue to develop our beef industry for which we know there is growing appetite throughout China, Japan and Korea.

**Mr Minnikin** interjected.

**Mr PITT:** INQ in Townsville, a very important start-up platform—all of these things are intrinsically linked, all coming off the back of the very successful Northern Queensland Economic Summit.

**Mr Minnikin** interjected.

**Mr PITT:** Those opposite are just wallowing in the fact that they failed in their three years and they added \$14 billion of debt when we are paying down \$9.6 billion. They just do not like it.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Before I call the member for Currumbin, I inform the member for Chatsworth that at this stage it is looking like he may be the first person on the list to be warned under standing order 253A. I would urge you to be more careful in your interjections. I now call the member for Currumbin.

**Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games**

**Mrs STUCKEY** (Currumbin—LNP) (10.22 am): Today I ask tourism minister, Kate Jones, to come clean and give a guarantee to our 13 regional tourism organisations when she meets with them at 1.30 today that their funding will remain at 2014-15 levels and is secure for four years. A minister who referred to RTOs as 'regional tourism operators' in one of her releases and the industry as the 'leaning tower of Pisa' now has an opportunity to ensure RTOs that her promise to fund TEQ \$100 million a year for four years includes them. The minister falsely claims at every opportunity that the LNP were going to cut tourism funding by flashing around a graph with no validity. She said she has given surety to Tourism and Events Queensland regarding funding over four years, boasts of boosting funding, yet cannot guarantee core funding at 2014-15 levels over four years for organisations that work miracles to stretch their funding dollar to support tourism in their regions. I commend all of them for putting their heart and soul into attracting tourism into their regions and for completing their 20-year Destination Tourism plans last year to highlight their unique attractions, their hero experiences and future needs to grow and prosper.

In estimates when I asked whether the minister would give assurances that RTOs would keep current funding allocations for four years, she ducked and weaved without giving an answer. Subsequent calls for her to assure RTOs they would not face cuts have gone unanswered. RTOs are understandably anxious about their future and want some answers. They have met several times to discuss this issue amongst themselves and have sought clarity from the minister and TEQ but have not received a satisfactory answer.

On the eve of Queensland's prestigious tourism awards one would think the minister could stand up for these hardworking organisations and give them an assurance. This minister does not get tourism. She is too busy playing politics with it. She bragged about the Cairns tourism investment summit but did not even realise the front cover of her glossy tourism investment guide was 10 years out of date and versions 2 and 3 had mistakes. We are eagerly awaiting version 4.

Under the LNP the TIAU was established and was firing. Over 100 projects came through this unit from 2012 to 2014 seeking government guidance, with 25 identified as showcase investments and seeking investment opportunities. We began to aggressively market scores of shovel-ready projects seeking investors. This minister was further embarrassed when asked how many phone calls the Tourism Investment Attraction Unit had received on the line advertised on the website, a line that had been disconnected.

Labor needs to lift its game and its infrastructure freeze and lift the burden of red tape. An LNP government would reinvigorate tourism investment. This minister needs to prove that she is a tourism minister in more than name only and give a lot more confidence and assurance to those people in regions. We understand the importance of tourism across this great state. It is a pity the minister does not get it.

**Advance Queensland**

**Hon. LM ENOCH** (Algester—ALP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Science and Innovation) (10.24 am): At the beginning of this year when Queenslanders cast their vote to end the destructive and, thankfully, short-lived Newman LNP error, they elected the Palaszczuk Labor government with a vision to deliver the knowledge-based jobs of the future. The vision that we took to the election in January, which we are implementing with a \$180 million investment, is our Advance Queensland plan. This Labor plan is all about creating jobs by positioning our state as a place where entrepreneurs are not only welcomed but embraced. The Palaszczuk government's Advance Queensland plan places innovation at the heart of our economy to ensure Queenslanders' research and entrepreneurial ideas translate into new products, services and jobs.

Last night I had the great honour of joining the Premier and parliamentary colleagues at the first-ever Advance Queensland innovation and investment reception. The reception brought together the people behind Queensland's latest start-ups and growth businesses, with investors and members of the Advance Queensland expert panel. I was excited to talk to some of our best and brightest minds about how we position Queensland in this unprecedented era of change.


Labor's Advance Queensland plan is unashamedly about delivering jobs now and jobs for the future. How does this contrast with the way members opposite view the world? If the LNP had won the last election, there would have been no Advance Queensland plan, no investment in innovation and no recognition of Queensland's unique position in the Asia-Pacific and the tropics, which will be the epicentre of global growth in the coming decades.

**Ms Trad:** And there'd be no assets.

**Ms ENOCH:** I take that interjection; there would also have been no assets. We know there would have been no investment in innovation. If we just take a look at the 2015 state council agenda for the LNP, their state conference, we see not one item on their agenda is referencing innovation. There would certainly have been no understanding of the need for collaboration between businesses, government and our researchers despite the fact this increases the likelihood of successful innovation by upwards of 70 per cent. No, there would have been none of that.

All we have seen from the LNP since the election has been personality politics. Whilst the Palaszczuk Labor government has focused on policies to diversify our economy and create jobs through our Advance Queensland plan, the LNP is obsessed with old-fashioned political point-scoring and playing the person not the policy. Queensland has outgrown that kind of politics. The people of this state rejected that style of government, which was more focused on sacking public servants, including 950 in my own department, than on creating the jobs of the future. Since coming to government, we have restored a consultative and collaborative approach to leadership. Unlike the LNP, which seems content to live in the past and ignore the reality of digital disruption, the Palaszczuk Labor government will stay focused on our \$180 million Advance Queensland plan to make our state an attractive investment destination with a strong innovation and entrepreneurial culture.

### **Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games**

 **Mr SPRINGBORG** (Southern Downs—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (10.27 am): After nine months in office we are still waiting for a plan from this fledgling Palaszczuk government. Anything that resembles a plan just evaporates overnight. Most of it cannot even last a few hours let alone a few days. As we come towards the end of this parliamentary sitting week, some nine months into the tenure of this government, it is very important that we reflect upon the *Queensland Tourism Investment Guide of 2015-2016*. Who can forget its first iteration, launched towards the end of last week with half the Gold Coast missing? To give some credit, the Minister for Tourism sprang into action and found a new photo. So she actually put the up-to-date picture of the Gold Coast on the front page. So we can at least give a tick to the Minister for Tourism for that. Then of course we looked through it and we found that the so-called, no longer existing BaT tunnel was a part of that.

Not to be outdone with regard to the speed of light, the Minister for Tourism sprung into action and the next day launched iteration No. 3, or C, minus the BaT tunnel but also minus Gold Coast Light Rail mark 2 and also minus Cross River Rail. But not to be outdone, within 10 minutes of that being exposed in this parliament it disappeared from the website. It was not shredded in any way whatsoever and it was not pulped: it just went away. It is a bit like *Animal Farm*. Everyone remembers *Animal Farm*, the George Orwell satire on communism. During the night I have been working to help the Minister for Tourism with iteration No. 4, or D. We can all agree on the front page, but if you leave it for too long we might get more skyscrapers on the Gold Coast and we might have to update the front page. We have left the rest blank, but we have some colouring-in pencils so that when the Minister for Tourism is on the plane to China next week—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Leader of the Opposition, you have had a pretty good go. I think you are now verging on the use of a prop. I think you should put it down, and then I invite you to continue with your speech.


**Mr SPRINGBORG:** Mr Speaker, given that it has been nine months and nothing has happened yet, maybe sitting on the plane for nine hours with some blank pages and some colouring-in pencils and a highlighter—but there are no highlights yet so you will not need that.

The unfortunate thing is that the tourism minister goes overseas next week, and after nine months she has absolutely nothing to sell for the state of Queensland. That is a very, very sad indictment on this government.

## **QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE**

**Mr SPEAKER:** Question time will conclude at 11.31 am.

### **Department of Education and Training, Information Technology**

 **Mr MANDER** (10.31 am): My question is to the Minister for Education. I refer to the latest education IT bungle and I ask: will the minister advise if the hacking of the education department's IT system has gone beyond the personal details of TAFE students and includes private and personal details of state school students and their parents?

**Ms JONES:** I would like to refer to the statements that I made yesterday. This is currently a police investigation which is being undertaken by both the Queensland police and the Federal Police, and I will not be adding anything on the public record that could jeopardise those investigations. Further, I can assure all members—

**Mr Bleijie** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Kawana, the member for Everton has asked a question. The minister is answering the question and her answer is relevant. I would urge members to desist from interjecting. I call the minister.

**Ms JONES:** In addition, I can assure all members of the House that all reasonable steps have been taken by the Department of Education and Training.

### **Department of Education and Training, Information Technology**

**Mr SPRINGBORG:** My question without notice is to the Premier. Is the Premier aware that education department officers are currently calling parents to advise them that sensitive personal information about their children, including complaints of sexual assault, has been hacked?

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** Mr Speaker, I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. The Minister for Education advises me that that is the case and that yes, that is happening.

### **Federal Budget, GST**

**Mr POWER:** My question is for the Premier. Will the Premier update the House on the government's position on proposals to increase the GST, and is the Premier aware of any alternative positions?

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I would like to thank the member for Logan very much for the question. The issue of the increase of the GST on Queensland's families being put forward by the federal government is of deep concern to families across this state. I am very deeply concerned, and under my government we will not support any increases to the level of GST because we know the impact that that would have on low and middle income earners. It is an unfair tax, and we will stand by Bill Shorten and federal Labor in relation to this issue because we do not support it. I am very concerned that I have not heard anything from those opposite. They have been completely silent about their position on the federal government's plan to broaden the base of the GST. Do they support it or do they not?

We know that there is an LNP conference coming up next weekend opening with, I am told, a paddock party and the opening address will not be by the Leader of the Opposition, but the member for Nanango. I want to know what this paddock party is; the member for Nanango is obviously auditioning because we do not hear from the Leader of the Opposition until later in the day.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Premier, one moment. There is too much frivolous interjection. Member for Albert, you may actually beat the member for Chatsworth and be first on the list if you persist. I call the Premier.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** We know that the Leader of the Opposition will not be featuring until the last day, and we know that he has outsourced his questions to the potential Leader of the Opposition over there, with the member for Everton asking the first question today. He does not want to do his job in this House.

There have been no motions in this House about the GST. At the end of the day we know that the federal government has taken away over \$18 billion of forward money in health and education in this state, and now we see the Treasurer at the federal level saying, 'It's not our idea to increase the GST; it is the idea of the states.' Let me make it very clear that it is not the idea of this state to increase the GST and it will not happen under my watch. When I go down to COAG next month, I will be making sure that Queensland's position that we do not support the increase of the GST is put very clearly. I would like to know what the position of those opposite is. Will they be talking about it at the LNP state conference—

*(Time expired)*

**Mr SPEAKER:** I also preliminarily warn the member for Mermaid Beach. You are very close and I do hear every word you say.

Before I call the Leader of the Opposition for his next question, I am informed that in our gallery we have students from the Merrimac State School from the electorate of Mudgeeraba observing the proceedings.

### Department of Education and Training, Information Technology

**Mr SPRINGBORG:** My question without notice is to the Minister for Education. Now that the Premier has confirmed that parents of children have been contacted about their personal sensitive information being hacked, will the minister now confirm that this hacking extends beyond TAFE Queensland to children within the state school system, and why has it taken the minister so long to inform parents and the public of Queensland as to this fact?

**Ms JONES:** Can I be very clear that the Chief Information Officer absolutely went public on day one from the very first moment that this was made known in relation to TAFE and the Department of Education and Training. It is there in black and white. We said that on day one. We have always said that and we have maintained that. I would like to assure all honourable members that throughout this process the Department of Education and Training staff have been working very closely with the Queensland police and the Queensland government Chief Information Officer in relation to what the appropriate steps are to deal with this criminal activity. This is a criminal activity that happened to government agencies which we have been up-front about since day one. As I have said every single day in parliament this week, I will always act on the advice of the Queensland police and the Chief Information Officer, and that is exactly what I have done, as have staff of the Department of Education and Training.

**Mr SPRINGBORG:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. On the point of relevance, the minister did not answer as to whether—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Leader of the Opposition, the minister has answered the question. She has resumed her seat. That is all the information I understand the minister proposes to provide to you.

Before I call the member for Lytton, I am informed we have students from Trinity Catholic College from Lismore, New South Wales observing proceedings from the public gallery this morning.

### Advance Queensland

**Ms PEASE:** My question is of the Premier. In relation to the Advance Queensland strategy, will the Premier please advise the House of a website initiative associated with the strategy and whether any other websites have been drawn to her attention?

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I thank the member for Lytton for the question. Once again, I thank the honourable members of the House who attended the Advance Queensland reception last night. We know that Advance Queensland will drive the jobs of the future through innovation, through start-ups and through collaboration. Last night there was so much energy in the room. We were also able to talk about a new website that has gone live today. I thank the Minister for Science and Innovation for making that happen.

The website is a unique online navigation tool that will allow Queensland start-ups, businesses and researchers to share their ideas and innovations together. The tool will help a Queensland start-up with an emerging product or service and will help a researcher seeking to bring an idea closer to market to promote their work and connect with investors. I urge all honourable members to look at that website and to encourage people out there to use that navigation tool. We will be able to monitor progress and update the House. It will also provide an opportunity for people to be part of a dynamic network—one that enables them to connect with experienced entrepreneurs and accelerator programs that can help with turning an idea into a commercial success. I commend the minister for that website. It is a very encouraging website. I encourage all members to have a look at it.

Someone has drawn my attention to an alternative website, the LNP website. Today the Leader of the Opposition got up in this House and talked about the tourism brochure. I had a look at the Liberal National Party website. It is called 'the party for all Queenslanders'. We know that is not really the case; that did not work very well. There is a picture of the Story Bridge, which is very nice. There is a picture of the Whitsundays and the Great Barrier Reef. There is another image I could not place. I was wondering, 'Where is that image from? Is it perhaps from the Mackay electorate? Is it perhaps from the Gregory electorate? Is it Mount Isa?' I was not quite sure. I was not familiar with the image. It turns out that it is the construction camp in Western Australia between the towns of Newman and Port Hedland.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Thank you, Premier. You have had a pretty good go as well in relation to your use of props. I urge you to put it down.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I think it is a party for all of Queensland and Western Australia!

**Mr SPEAKER:** Premier, two wrongs do not make a right. You should put that prop down as well. You are invited to continue with your answer.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I urge the LNP to check their website images. Perhaps before they launch an attack they might want to make sure their own house is in order.

### **Public Service, Appointments**

**Mr LANGBROEK:** My question without notice is to the Treasurer. At the last sittings the opposition asked for the terms and conditions under which former Labor staffer Paul Inches had been contracted as the official 'union whisperer' on Labor's energy company mergers, and I ask: will the Treasurer now outline the terms and conditions of the contract, given that Mr Inches was terminated following our asking the question?

**Mr PITT:** I am happy to answer the member's question. I thank him for it. The question he asks is, yet again, not about substantive policy issues but about muckraking around any other roles people have previously had over their careers. The question goes to the heart of our electricity mergers, so I will deal with that particular component.

Mr Inches was brought in on a short-term contractual arrangement, which is not at all unusual across government. As we have promised, we will be providing our update to the people of Queensland around the progress and outcomes of our merger process at the midyear review. If the member opposite fails to understand that after, I think, the 10th time I have said that to him and those opposite in this chamber, then he really needs to start having a good, hard look at himself. We made it very clear at budget time what we would be doing.

The reason Mr Inches is no longer required is that his work is done. We are progressing. Those opposite have suggested that we are not going ahead with mergers. They have done everything they can to try to destabilise the process around electricity company mergers. Those opposite continue to talk about whether these mergers should or should not go ahead and about how the process will work. The reason we are having the conversation about merging these entities is that they are still in public hands. They are still government entities which we want to see work effectively and efficiently for Queensland.

During budget estimates I was asked what our savings are expected to be as a result of these mergers. My response then was very clear, as it is again today. The modelling prior to the election talked about there being \$150 million in expected savings on an ongoing basis, and beyond that we would be seeing future savings. The \$150 million was a Treasury figure. If those opposite continue to suggest that (a) the mergers are not happening and (b) we are not going to be able to achieve the savings, they are essentially slighting Queensland Treasury's modelling.

We have said that we will give that update to Queenslanders at the midyear review. I guarantee the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that these mergers will be happening. I make no bones about it. There is no conspiracy. The mergers will be happening and they will be producing savings to the people of Queensland and to those businesses which are now, of course, remaining in public hands for the long term. That is something that everyone on this side of the House is very proud of.

### **Draft State Infrastructure Plan**

**Mrs GILBERT:** My question is for the Deputy Premier. Will the Deputy Premier please update the House on consultation on the State Infrastructure Plan? Is the Deputy Premier aware of any alternative policies?

**Ms TRAD:** I thank the member for Mackay for the question. Of course, when I announced the draft State Infrastructure Plan I said that there would be targeted consultation over a six-week period. We are well underway with that consultation process. I am pleased to advise the House and particularly the member for Mackay that a consultation process is occurring in Mackay today. I am sorry that the member for Mackay cannot be there, but I do understand that the sessions have been extremely well attended.

I understand that the draft State Infrastructure Plan has been very well received by the sector particularly and by the community. In fact, the other day I had someone stop me at the ATM to commend me on it and to say that they were really enjoying going through it and working with their colleagues to assess the contribution they could make for the future.

Already sessions have been held in Brisbane, Gold Coast, Toowoomba, Sunshine Coast, Cairns and Townsville. Further sessions are yet to come. As I have said, there has been tremendous interest in our plan for infrastructure for the future. In fact, I understand that requests for the draft State Infrastructure Plan already outnumber the former premier's book sales to date. In fact, we are up to our second print run.

In terms of any alternative plans, which the honourable member asked me about, I have been trying to search for an alternative infrastructure plan from those opposite. I did turn to the agenda and resolutions of the 2015 LNP state council meeting. I am trying to find any mention of infrastructure, even if it is just a motion. There is a motion to thank Tony Abbott for his service, but there is not a motion to thank the federal government for contributing to Gold Coast Light Rail Stage 2. There are 10 LNP members representing the Gold Coast, but there was not one motion about Gold Coast Light Rail Stage 2 or any other stage—stage 1, 2 or 3, nothing. There are 10 members, but there was no mention of Gold Coast Light Rail Stage 2. The LNP has members representing the Sunshine Coast, but there was no mention of Sunshine Coast rail duplication. There was no mention of infrastructure whatsoever.

But what it really does come down to is that this state council meeting is a 'Kingaroy cup': it is all about who is positioning themselves for the leadership. We know that the member for Maroochydore's SEC has a motion to say that the LNP needs to communicate its achievements better, because God knows it is not doing it right now because there are none! Then there is the Clayfield branch which has a motion to say that the primary objective of government is to pay down debt—not to create jobs, not to build infrastructure, not to provide hospitals but pay down debt. It is the Clayfield dream that just will not die. This is about asset sales pure and simple. But, when it all comes down to it, this is about the coronation of the new LNP queen—the 'member for Kingaroy', Deb Frecklington.

### **Organised Crime Commission of Inquiry, Report**

**Mr BLEIJIE:** My question without notice is to the Minister for Police. I ask: has the minister sought the advice of the Police Commissioner as to whether or not he agrees with the disappointment that Deputy Commissioner Ross Barnett expressed over the findings of the Byrne report into organised crime given his absence at the time of its release?

**Mrs MILLER:** I thank the member very much for the question. In relation to operational matters of the Queensland Police Service, I do not have discussions with him in relation to these issues. I was on the Gold Coast yesterday with the Queensland Police Commissioner launching the body worn video cameras, but at no stage did I discuss Deputy Commissioner Ross Barnett.

### **Taxation Reform**

**Ms HOWARD:** My question is to the Treasurer and Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations. Will the Treasurer please update the House on the Commonwealth's proposed tax changes and how they will affect Queensland?

**Mr PITT:** I thank the honourable member for her question. There has been a lot of posturing in recent weeks around the GST. In amongst all of that we certainly have not seen any commitment by the new coalition leadership team now that we have seen Tony Abbott and Joe Hockey shown the door. With Mr Turnbull and Mr Morrison we have not seen any indication whatsoever that there is a commitment to restoring the \$18 billion in health and education funding which was cut. Tax reform must provide long-term certainty. It must provide certainty to the states that are the deliverers of health and education—two very important service areas—and we need to know that we can meet the known service delivery requirements for Queenslanders over the long term. This is a critical issue that has gone missing in the debate. The debate has been hijacked. It is all about the GST and will they or won't they. We have said from the start that we must see those funding cuts which were part of the 2014 Hockey horror show budget restored—that is, the \$18 billion that was part of the \$80 billion slash-and-burn exercise across the country.

The GST is a regressive tax, especially when compared to something like the Medicare levy, which has had some very good airtime thanks to Queensland and Victoria's proposals. We do not support the Turnbull government's proposal for either an increase to the GST rate or a broadening of the base. We certainly do not appreciate the manner in which the Turnbull government has aired its suggestions around increasing it to 15 per cent, although if you believe what it says is true perhaps there is an element of truth to the fact that as a parting gift Mr Hockey, throwing hand grenades on the way out, has dropped the story about what his plan was and now Mr Turnbull and Mr Morrison are back-peddalling at a rate of knots to suggest what is happening. Let me make it clear: the Commonwealth cannot act unilaterally. It cannot act unilaterally when it comes to tax reform and particularly as it relates to the GST. When it comes to the GST, it does not have our agreement to make any changes and therefore no changes will be happening as long as we have a say in the matter.

There has been a lot of talk about the upcoming LNP conference. Let us look at one of the agenda items. Motion 25 says that this state council of the LNP calls for a moratorium on the lease or sale to foreign investors of ports, railways, telecommunications and strategic infrastructure until further notice

for national security reasons. This is interesting because this is not based on anything else; it is all about national security. Members should note that it goes directly in line with what the Leader of the Opposition has been saying. This is a 'for now' position. It is a 'for now' and maybe Queenslanders will come around. For the opposition leader for the last time: Queenslanders want these in public hands. They are going to stay in public hands and even your own branch have no faith in you.

*(Time expired)*

### **Department of Education and Training, Information Technology**

**Ms DAVIS:** My question is to the Minister for Education. The Attorney-General has described the hacking of the department's IT system as nothing more than the release of white pages information, and I ask: is the hacking of sensitive information about students, including sexual assaults, nothing more than a 'white pages' incident?

**Ms JONES:** As I said before, we are taking this matter very seriously and we have done so from day one. From day one the Department of Education and Training has been working hand in glove—

**Ms Davis:** This is about the safety of children.

**Ms JONES:** Exactly. It is about the safety of children, and that is why I am acting on the advice of the police. When the police and the Chief Information Officer say to me that we should not be feeding the people who are trying to undertake a criminal activity—and we are not unique in Queensland because this is happening—

**Ms Davis:** This is about the safety of children.

**Ms JONES:** Exactly, so I will always act in the best interests of the people of Queensland and in this instance taking the advice and listening and acting on the advice of the Queensland police and the Chief Information Officer is the appropriate thing to do. I will continue to take their advice and act on their advice.

**Ms Davis** interjected.

**Ms JONES:** I also take this opportunity to assure everybody in this House—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Minister, one moment. Member for Aspley, you are now warned under standing order 253A. You know the rules. You have asked the question. The minister's answer is relevant to your question. Your interjections are not appropriate. You are now warned under standing order 253A. I urge you to desist. I call the minister if you wish to continue.

**Ms JONES:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. At all times the Department of Education and Training has worked hand in glove with the Queensland police and the Chief Information Officer. They have been working together and we have been taking their advice on what is appropriate to say publicly so we do not add any fuel to the fire with regard to this criminal activity. I can assure all Queenslanders that we are taking all reasonable steps and taking that advice from the experts to ensure that nothing that we do adds to the problem that is not only happening here in Queensland but also happening to the Australian government. We certainly will not do anything that could jeopardise a police investigation into this criminal activity.

### **Paramedics, National Registration**

**Mr HARPER:** My question is directed to the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services. Would the minister please update the parliament on the Australian Health Workforce Ministerial Council's proposal for paramedic national registration?

**Mr DICK:** I thank the member for Thuringowa for his question. As I have said in the parliament on many occasions, as someone with a long career as a paramedic he would know that for five years going back to 2010 paramedics in Australia have been advocating to be part of the National Registration and Accreditation Scheme. Since I became the Minister for Health earlier this year I have been advocating that at every health ministerial council I have attended and I am pleased to say that last Friday at the COAG Health Council—the meeting of all state, territory and Commonwealth health ministers—there was an agreement to move forward with the registration of paramedics under the National Registration and Accreditation Scheme. A strong position was taken by Queensland and the Queensland Labor government and the Victorian Labor government. In fact, it was not opposed by any state or territory except New South Wales, which has some challenges in relation to the education and training pathway, but it has not closed its mind to it. The only jurisdiction that opposed it of course was the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth dissented from the decision. The only jurisdiction in Australia that does not employ a paramedic wanted to oppose it, but we are used to that from the Commonwealth.



We are used to the Commonwealth opposing things. It opposed a proposal that I had at the ministerial council meeting to establish a national framework about health policy in our country. After it trashed the National Health Reform Agreement in the 2014 budget—ripped it up with \$11.8 billion coming out of Queensland—it opposed a framework. We had to water that down. I do not expect leadership from the opposition on this. I do not expect that from the opposition. There is strong leadership, as the Premier said, for the LNP for Queensland and Western Australia, so we know they are willing to stand up for Western Australia. Just look at their website! Today students from Merrimac in Mudgeeraba have seen the Deputy Leader of the Opposition name a public servant in here—someone who has no right to defend themselves, no capacity to respond to the attacks in here. After the sanctimony and hypocrisy yesterday from the member for Surfers Paradise, he is willing to attack a public servant today. That is what we expect.

If the Commonwealth wants to oppose registration, it should also oppose a GST on health care. That is what we expect the LNP to do. That is what we expect the Commonwealth to stand against because, under an increased GST, those with the least pay the most. It is the weak, the vulnerable and the poor who carry the burden of a disproportionate tax payment under that system. We do not support it. We ask those members opposite to stop attacking public servants in here. They have done it in successive weeks, led by their leader and deputy. I ask them to stop doing that and stand up for Queensland. Say no to an increase in the GST and say no to a 15 per cent tax on health care, which will make vulnerable people crumble under that tax pressure.

### **Treasurer, Separation of Powers**

**Mr WALKER:** My question is to the Treasurer. I ask: does the Treasurer intend to review his involvement in proceedings of the independent Queensland Industrial Relations Commission given the commission's recent request to him to explain whether his direction to the commission relating to the important issue of award modernisation may have impermissibly breached the doctrine of the separation of powers between the executive and the judicial arms of government?

**Mr PITT:** I thank the honourable member for his question. If the member had indeed read that decision he would note that there is some commentary at the beginning of that decision, which the member is referring to. However, if he goes to the end of the decision it rules out that that was indeed the case. So if he read the entire decision, it would be very clear that it rules it out.

Earlier, we had a suggestion from the shadow Treasurer that there was selective quoting going on regarding the S&P report. I would argue that we need to have a very close look at what the entire decision says. What does this decision mean? It is a good opportunity for me to update the House on the process. As is my ability under the Industrial Relations Act, I made a ministerial request that went to the very heart of what this government is trying to do and that is undo the damage that was made by the previous government when it comes to local government workers across Queensland.

The entire award modernisation process was a process that the former government went hell for leather into. Thankfully, we were able to change many of the aspects of the award modernisation process as it related to other areas but, when it came to local government, the ship had sailed. So what we did was say—

**Mr Walker** interjected.

**Mr PITT:** No, we wrote a ministerial request saying that we did not want to see any individual worker any worse off than pre the award modernisation process. It was very clear and we are seeing now a difference of legal opinion.

During the last sitting I made a statement to this House. I could not have been clearer in that statement. The statement was that, if they had not taken notice of and had due regard to the ministerial request, it was very clear that we would be appealing the decision. That is exactly what we are doing. We are going to be appealing the decision.

**Mrs Frecklington** interjected.

**Mr PITT:** I hear the member for Nanango yet again harping on about the separation of powers. Maybe she should look up what the separation of powers means, because when we are doing this we are following the appropriate channels. The member might ask the member for Mansfield, who is trained in the law, in order to understand the process. We are following due process. We put in place a stay to ensure that the award cannot be used. We are now going through an appeal process.

If the member for Nanango wants the top job, she has a lot of learning to do. Maybe the LNP conference in Kingaroy might be a good start. She can show them how to build a bonfire and then after that they can throw the current opposition leader on it, because that is what they are doing in terms of his leadership.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Treasurer, I do not think that is relevant.

**Mr PITT:** Mr Speaker, I would like to wrap up.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Treasurer, I would ask you to withdraw those comments. They are unparliamentary.

**Mr PITT:** Mr Speaker, I withdraw. I will wrap up by saying—

*(Time expired)*

### **Tourism Industry**

**Mr STEWART:** My question is to the Minister for Tourism. Will the minister outline to the House the importance that tourism plays in the Queensland economy?

**Ms JONES:** I thank the honourable member for the question and I know how passionate he is about tourism. Recently, we were all very fortunate to be in Townsville with over 400 operators and businesses from the tourism industry who were there talking about the future.

**Mr Springborg:** Please fill in the blanks.

**Ms JONES:** I take the interjection from the Leader of the Opposition, who less than an hour ago stood in this parliament and said that in China there was nothing that I could sell about Queensland. What? The Great Barrier Reef? World-class beaches? World-class rainforests? When it comes to tourism, the Leader of the Opposition might not think that Queensland has anything to sell, but I certainly do. Let us talk about blanks. What we saw—

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Members, the minister's answer is relevant.

**Ms JONES:** Let us talk about blanks, because here I have for 2015—

**Mr Bleijie** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Kawana, you may go on the list. I do not want to put you there, but you may if you persist.

**Ms JONES:** Let us talk about blanks, because on the 2015 state council agenda—their little love-in on 20 to 22 November—

**Ms Trad:** Coronation.

**Ms JONES:** Coronation for the honourable member for Nanango. Do members think that there are any motions about tourism? One minute tourism is a pillar and then, poof, it is gone. Tourism no longer exists in their minds. The reason we know that is from the comments this morning of the member for Currumbin. She said that she had no idea—no idea—where this table regarding the funding cuts that were going to be delivered for tourism under the former LNP government came from. I can tell the member for Currumbin that it came from her chairman.

**Mrs STUCKEY:** I rise to a point of order. I find the minister's comments untrue and offensive and I ask her to withdraw.

**Mr SPEAKER:** There has been a request to withdraw.

**Ms JONES:** I withdraw. I have in my hand a document that was handed to me by the former minister's chairman of the Tourism Queensland board. That is why it has on it 'TEQ funding outlook'. It came from the TEQ board. One of the first meetings that I had with them was about the funding cuts that were going to be delivered by the LNP government. When I went back to check to see if there were any CBRC decisions, any budget decisions to fill that black hole—cutting it from \$100 million to \$50 million—I saw no money had been secured.

So we saw an LNP government that pretended to our communities that it cared about tourism—one of the fastest growing industries in Queensland. Again, today in the *Courier-Mail* we saw great data in regard to visitor accommodation and how much more money is being generated, creating jobs for Queenslanders—

**Ms Palaszczuk:** Down the Gold Coast.

**Ms JONES:** Yes, down the Gold Coast—right across Queensland. We have seen from the LNP that it does not promote tourism. It cut the funding in half.

When it comes to tourism in this country, I will always fight to ensure that Queensland is the jewel in the crown. We know, as does Tourism Australia, that we are spending \$20 million promoting the Great Barrier Reef and coastal communities next year because, when it comes to tourism, we know

that Queensland is the powerhouse. Unlike my predecessor, I will fight for the industry. I will fight to get the money that will secure growth. I will fight to ensure that we are growing jobs in this important sector that is delivering working Queenslanders with a security—

*(Time expired)*

### **Laidley Land, Ministerial Responsibility**

**Mr RICKUSS:** My question is to the Minister for Natural Resources. I table an email that I received from the Deputy Premier on 20 October advising me that the Minister for Natural Resources was responsible for land at Laidley. I also table a letter that I received from the chief of staff of the Minister for Natural Resources on 3 November advising me that the minister was not responsible and that the Deputy Premier was responsible.

*Tabled paper:* Correspondence, various dates, between the member for Lockyer, Mr Ian Rickuss MP, and the office of the Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade, Hon. Jackie Trad, and the office of the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, Hon. Anthony Lynham, relating to ministerial responsibility for the management of land at Drayton Street, Jordan Street and Rosewood Laidley Road [1634].

I ask: can the minister advise the House if the Deputy Premier is wrong and his chief of staff is right, or his chief of staff is wrong and the Deputy Premier is right?

**Dr LYNHAM:** I thank the member for his question. I will take the question on notice and will have a response to the member shortly.

### **Infrastructure Projects**

**Mr RYAN:** My question without notice is also to the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines. Will the minister outline how major projects are being facilitated under the Palaszczuk government?

**Dr LYNHAM:** That was a very clear question from the member for Morayfield and I thank him for his very clear question. I am with him: this government is clearly committed to economic development. We are clearly committed to creating jobs. To ensure major projects progress in a timely manner with certainty, project proponents need streamlined and effective assessment processes. In my portfolio the role of the Coordinator-General is pivotal in delivering on this objective—and, might I say, in relation to the debate later on today, an independent Coordinator-General. I am also pleased to advise the House that the Coordinator-General, Barry Broe, last week made his 500th statutory decision. The underlying decision rate is 2.1 times the historical rate, a rate that has been sustained over time even during this year when market conditions have not been strong. This means twice as many approvals and environmental impact statement assessment times have been reduced by 57 per cent. Here is a really interesting statistic: in the first six months of this current government there were 50 per cent more decisions in state development areas than in the first six months of the LNP government. So much for 'can do' and so much for their own branding as a pro-development and pro-infrastructure government because there was no development and no infrastructure when those opposite were in the House. Even in the state council—I have had a read of that—is there any talk about infrastructure at Kingaroy? Nothing at all.

Let us look at what is happening under Labor. Three new projects have been declared coordinated projects this year and are now going through EISs, all of them in Northern Queensland: the Lindeman Great Barrier Reef Resort Project—

**Ms Jones:** Tourism!

**Dr LYNHAM:** A wonderful tourism resort—Stanbroke's Three Rivers Irrigation Project—one would think those opposite would, but we are looking after the north, we are looking after agriculture; and the APT Pipelines Limited NT Link Project. Again we are looking after the resources-rich north-west corner of our state. One of the Coordinator-General's most recent decisions was on Rio Tinto's South of Embley Project in Cape York. I hope this goes ahead very soon when we have acknowledgement from Rio Tinto. Other recent notable decisions made by the Coordinator-General under the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act include the evaluation report for the Red Hill coalmine near Moranbah—a coalmine in Moranbah, what a wonderful thing; seeking additional information for the EIS for the Sunshine Coast airport expansion; and releasing the draft EIS for the \$6.7 billion China Stone Coal Project in the Galilee Basin. There are fifteen coordinated projects worth \$24 billion. We are a government that prides itself on jobs, development, infrastructure and economic prosperity.

### Medicinal Cannabis

**Mr KNUTH:** My question without notice is to the Minister for Health. Will the minister outline how Queensland will work with other levels of government in medical cannabis trials and explain how the Queensland government will participate in cultivation trials of medical cannabis to achieve both medical and economic benefits to this state?

**Mr DICK:** I thank the member for his question and his ongoing interest in health matters. As the honourable member knows, we have committed to participating in a trial of medicinal cannabis for young people, in particular young people who face the challenge of epilepsy that is drug resistant. We have committed to be a part of that. We are working with New South Wales. We anticipate investing \$3 million in that. That clinical trial will start next year. That will be conducted through the Lady Cilento Children's Hospital. The details of that are being finalised, but that is the framework and we anticipate that will be the investment and the trial will be conducted at Lady Cilento.

Our government is looking very carefully at medicinal cannabis. As the honourable member would know, the honourable Premier made the announcement about our commitment earlier this year after three years of non-engagement with that issue in Queensland. The previous government refused to engage with the issue of medicinal cannabis. The Premier acted very quickly after the election to announce, following consultation with her first minister colleagues in New South Wales and Victoria—the premiers of New South Wales and Victoria—our participation to give a pathway of hope to people. That is a clear example of the Premier's leadership on display.

Since then, the member for Dalrymple will know, there has been a number of changes in policy across Australia. Victoria has received a report from the Law Reform Commission which sets out a possible regulatory pathway and Victoria has agreed to that. The Commonwealth has made some decisions and that was discussed at the health minister's council meeting last Friday that I mentioned earlier in question time. We are looking at all of those things. We are looking at those very carefully. I am looking at that very carefully as the Minister for Health. We are looking at the changed regulatory environment, both at a national level and also at a state level and what that means for Queensland.

It is moving quickly, but what the honourable member can be assured of is that we see medicinal cannabis as a pathway of hope for people for a number of conditions. The decision of the government for the time being is in relation to the paediatric space—caring for children who have illness—but we are reviewing—

**Mr Dickson:** Are you serious?

**Mr DICK:** I welcome the interjection from the member who did nothing in three years as a minister in that government to progress it. He has now come on board. I am very pleased that the member for Buderim now supports it after doing nothing for three years as a cabinet minister. I welcome him to the debate. We are going to look at that regulatory framework and consider what that means for Queensland. When we have considered that further we will have more to say publicly about that.

### Domestic and Family Violence

**Mr FURNER:** My question is to the Attorney-General and the Minister for Justice. Will the Attorney-General please update the House about the work being done to combat domestic and family violence?

**Mrs D'ATH:** I thank the member for his question. The government continues its work aimed at reducing the incidence of domestic and family violence and increasing the safety and support of victims. As this House knows, we recently passed legislation to establish the Domestic and Family Violence Death Review and Advisory Board. I can advise that the work continues in earnest on the establishment of the independent Domestic and Family Violence Death Review and Advisory Board to enhance current review mechanisms for domestic and family violence related deaths.

I am pleased to announce that advertisements were placed in state, regional and metropolitan newspapers over the weekend seeking expressions of interest from suitably qualified representatives of non-government entities for appointment to the board. That process closes on 20 November. The government has also released a discussion paper in relation to strangulation and the circumstance of aggravation. The *Not now, not ever* report made recommendations that the Queensland government introduce a circumstance of aggravation of domestic and family violence to be applied to all criminal offences and to consider the creation of a specific offence of strangulation. The views of all Queenslanders have been sought on these recommendations through the release of a discussion paper. Consultation on the paper was originally due to close on Friday, 23 October 2015. I have listened

to the stakeholders' requests for additional time due to the complex nature of these issues affecting Queensland's criminal justice system. Accordingly, I extended the consultation for a further four weeks. The new closing date for submissions on the discussion paper is Friday, 20 November.

I can also advise that the specialist domestic and family violence court trial commenced on 1 September 2015. Following a significant increase in the number of protection order applications being brought right across this state, but specifically in Southport, a revised model involving the appointment of a second magistrate commenced on 2 November. The revised model involves two magistrates running adjacent courts with separate lists. One court hears applications five days a week, the other court is dedicated to hearings as well as breach mentions. Early indications are that the new model has been very well received with reduced waiting times and improved services for victims and respondents. Additional resources, including court staff, duty lawyer services, prosecutors and court support workers have been allocated to support the expansion of the trial to a second magistrate. The introduction of the additional support services has meant that the room that Rosie's, an outreach service, used for serving tea, coffee and food to court users is now not available. The Southport Magistrates Court is working with Rosie's to find a solution so that its volunteers can continue to offer a highly valued support service while accommodating the needs of our vulnerable people who are the victims of domestic and family violence.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Before calling the member of Moggill, I am pleased to announce that we have visitors from the Mount Ommaney Probus Club, in the electorate of Mount Ommaney, observing our proceedings from the public gallery.

### **Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital, Ophthalmology Traineeships**

**Dr ROWAN:** My question without notice is to the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services. I ask: given that a recent accreditation report by the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Ophthalmologists has recommended slashing the number of trainee positions in ophthalmology from three to one at the Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital, why is it that Queensland's biggest public hospital has been judged as an appallingly bad training centre for future eye specialists by this team of independent accreditation experts?

**Mr DICK:** I thank the member for Moggill for the question. Of course, the answer is that I have been the minister for seven or eight months and the member's opposition leader was the minister for 1,000 days. I hope the member has asked the Leader of the Opposition what happened in that three years. I take those reviews very seriously. There is only so much I can do quickly to rectify problems that I have inherited from those members opposite.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr DICK:** They might laugh about the failed commissioning of the Lady Cilento Children's Hospital. We are still waiting—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Thank you, members.

**Mr DICK:** Queue the crickets. There has been nothing from the Leader of the Opposition. He has not tabled cabinet papers about the \$500 million that he said was fully costed and was there.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Thank you, Minister. Member for Toowoomba North, you are now warned under standing order 253A for your frivolous interjections. I urge you to stop. Member for Albert, you are also warned under standing order 253A for your frivolous interjections. I urge you to stop. I call the minister.

**Mr DICK:** We are still waiting for the cabinet documents that said the \$500 million was there for the wait-time guarantee—that it was fully costed and that the money was there—but there has been nothing from the Leader of the Opposition. He likes to put these things about and put them on the parliamentary record, but he does not follow up.

I say to the member for Moggill that I take these things seriously. We will work with the hospital and health service. Recently I met with representatives of the college to discuss those matters. We will look at how we can improve things for that hospital, which is an important hospital in our system. However, one thing this government will not be doing—and the member for Moggill will know a lot about this—is reintroducing the death penalty. Last night in this House, we heard a comment from the member for Moggill—

**Dr ROWAN:** I rise to a point of order. In terms of relevance to the question, my question was very specific in relation to the slashing of the number of trainee positions in ophthalmology from three to one at the Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital. My point of order is based on relevance.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Thank you, member for Moggill. Minister, I urge to make your answer relevant. Do you have anything further to add which is relevant to the question?

**Mr DICK:** Yes, Mr Speaker. We will review those matters. As I have said, we have already met with the college. However, after almost a century since the Labor government abolished the death penalty in Queensland, we will not follow the disgraceful path that the member for Moggill has suggested, that is, its reintroduction.

### **Hinchinbrook Island, Access**

**Mr RUSSO:** My question is of the Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef. Will the minister advise the House how the government is responding to local community concerns in Lucinda and Halifax to provide tourists with more options to access Hinchinbrook Island?

**Dr MILES:** I thank the member for Sunnybank for his question and his interest in Queensland tourism, the reef and tourism jobs. The Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service has responsibility for managing a combined area of over 12 million hectares of parks and forests across Queensland. I think we can all appreciate that managing an area about half the size of Victoria will have significant impacts on local communities, especially jobs in tourism, and requires careful planning. Therefore, when I came to office I was disappointed to learn that the previous government put on hold a number of management planning processes that were underway, including the comprehensive review for the Hinchinbrook area, which was being finalised in 2012 when the LNP came to office. The former LNP government put a stop to that process, despite all the consultation that had occurred and the 600 submissions received from the community on that draft plan. That is more submissions than people who have bought Campbell Newman's book.

That astounded me and it left the community struggling to resolve a longstanding concern in relation to ferry permits to transfer people to and from magnificent Hinchinbrook Island, which has impacts on the tourism industry in the region and the jobs it supports. I thank the member for Sunnybank for bringing this to my attention. I am pleased to hear that, while his focus is on the people of Sunnybank, he still has an ear to the ground where he grew up in beautiful North Queensland. It is a shame that the member for Hinchinbrook was not able to progress this issue in the three years that he was in office—

**Mr Cripps:** I wrote to you about it.

**Dr MILES:**—but he did write to me, subsequent to the member for Sunnybank raising it with me. I am pleased to report that, thanks to the advocacy of the member for Sunnybank, Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service is hard at work to find a solution to the problem.

This government is not afraid of consultation. We will take into account the extensive feedback already received from the community in relation to the Hinchinbrook Island National Park management plan. I have instructed the QPWS to revive the previous management plan review and, in the meantime, to address the Lucinda and Halifax communities' immediate concerns over the lack of options for ferry transfers to and from Hinchinbrook Island, and amend the management plan consistent with the submissions already received regarding this matter.

### **Gympie, TAFE Queensland**

**Mr PERRETT:** My question without notice is to the Minister for Training and Skills. I ask: will the minister please explain why, despite numerous requests this year, an unused building on the Gympie campus of TAFE has not yet been leased to the University of the Sunshine Coast so that it can offer additional courses to meet the strong growth in student demand for 2016?

**Mrs D'ATH:** I thank the member for his question. When it comes to TAFE, it is Labor governments that stand up for TAFE and our TAFE assets. I am very proud that one of the first initiatives of this government was to get rid of the Queensland Training Assets Management Authority so that we could take back ownership of our assets, which could then be used by TAFE.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Members, it is getting close to the end of question time. I urge you to listen to the minister's answer. I call the minister.

**Mrs D'ATH:** We are developing a 10-year asset management plan to ensure that we get the best use out of our TAFE assets. Those are the TAFE assets that those on the other side were happy to run down and leave sitting empty so that they could flog them off.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Minister, one moment. Member for Everton, you are now going to join the other members on the list under standing order 253A. I urge you to desist with your continuous interjections, which are not being taken. I now call the minister.

**Mrs D'ATH:** We are working on developing a 10-year asset management plan so that we can make sure that we get the most out of our TAFE assets on campuses right across the state. We are making sure that, first and foremost, TAFE has access to its own premises and is not being pushed out for others. I have made it clear numerous times that in the meantime, while we are developing that plan, the government will continue to consider any proposals that are brought forward. If that fits in with our overall values and objectives, which is first and foremost looking at whether—

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mrs D'ATH:** Do they want to hear the answer to the question from their side? Clearly they do not.

**Mr SPEAKER:** One moment, Minister. Member for Kawana, you have had a pretty good go at interjections. If you persist, you will go on the list. I call the Attorney-General.

**Mrs D'ATH:** Mr Speaker, I am trying to answer a question from their side—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Please answer.

**Mrs D'ATH:** I have made it clear that TAFE Queensland and the department of education will continue to consider proposals that will come forward in relation to the use of TAFE assets that are currently either empty or under-utilised. First and foremost, we will look at whether they are facilities that TAFE itself will be utilising now or in the near future. Secondly, we will look at what the proposal is and whether it fits in with the training objectives and community needs for the area. We will also look at the length of time that the organisations coming forward are proposing. For example, are they looking at leasing something for 99 years? We will weigh up all of those things. We have made it clear that we are happy to have those conversations and, as I understand it, those conversations are occurring.

### Queensland Police Service, Police Commissioner

**Mr STEVENS:** My question is to the Minister for Police. Given that the report of Michael Byrne QC detailed failings of the Police Commissioner to properly direct resources, does the minister have confidence in her Police Commissioner?

**Mrs MILLER:** Yes.

### Ports, Infrastructure

**Mr BROWN:** My question is to the Minister for Ports. Will the minister update the House on any new policy proposals concerning the lease or sale of our ports and other strategic infrastructure?

**Mr SPEAKER:** Minister, you have one minute.

**Mr BAILEY:** I thank the member for Capalaba, who has been a great supporter of and fighter for retaining our public assets, for his question. I can confirm that this government has kept its ports and strategic assets in public hands as we promised Queenslanders. It is great to see that, as part of the state council agenda—I table the LNP state council agenda for the benefit of members and in case any members of the opposition have not received it yet—the Warrego SEC will put forward a motion calling for a moratorium on the lease or sale to foreign investors of ports, railways, telecommunication and strategic infrastructure. They are endorsing our policy. It is fantastic to see that. I hope the member for Warrego will be supporting her SEC.


*Tabled paper:* Document, undated, titled 'LNP 2015 State Council Agenda, Kingaroy 20-22 November 2015' [1635].

That is not all in my portfolio. The Glass House SEC is going to move that the state council of the LNP support a policy where electricity charges are for usage only and should not apply to the supply or line component. In other words, let us not fund—

*(Time expired)*

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

### Further Answer to Question; Medicinal Cannabis

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (11.31 am): Earlier in question time I indicated to the member for Dalrymple that there had been discussion at the ministerial council meeting on medicinal cannabis. Out of an abundance of clarity, I want to make sure that the member knows that there has been discussion at the ministerial office level. I have had informal discussions with ministers about it. It was not formally on the agenda at the ministerial council meeting. I did not want to mislead the member by saying that. It is on the COAG agenda. That is how it will be progressed. There is informal discussion amongst ministers to see how that can be progressed. I just wanted to clarify that for the member for Dalrymple.



## ELECTORAL (IMPROVING REPRESENTATION) AND ANOTHER ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### Introduction



**Mr KATTER** (Mount Isa—KAP) (11.32 am): I present a bill for an act to amend the Constitution of Queensland 2001 and the Electoral Act 1992 for particular purposes. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee to consider the bill.

*Tabled paper:* Electoral (Improving Representation) and Another Act Amendment Bill [1636].

*Tabled paper:* Electoral (Improving Representation) and Another Act Amendment Bill, explanatory notes [1637].

The Electoral (Improving Representation) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2015 proposes to change the number of electoral districts for the state by increasing the number of members of the Legislative Assembly from 89 to 93 to improve representation; improve the establishment of the Electoral Commission of Queensland by way of the bipartisan support of a parliamentary committee; and improve redistribution of electoral districts by the appointment of a non-judicial appointee with qualifications and experience in applied demography.

**Mr HINCHLIFFE:** I rise to a point of order, Mr Speaker. The private member's bill that is being presented by the member for Mount Isa appears to be substantially the same as the private member's bill that has been dealt with by the House this session. I seek your guidance on that.

**Mr SPEAKER:** I propose to let the member for Mount Isa continue with the first reading stage of the bill. I will then consider the proposal, as I am not aware of the bill, and then I will make a determination.

**Mr KATTER:** The bill importantly ensures that Queenslanders will have more equitable and improved access to representation. It takes into consideration the dispersal of the population throughout the state and the number of members of the Legislative Assembly increasing in South-East Queensland. There is evidence that population density is continuing to increase in South-East Queensland and that certain areas in rural and remote Queensland are experiencing declining populations. I table a research paper relevant to the bill titled 'Population and electors'.

*Tabled paper:* Queensland Parliamentary Library Research Brief, dated 30 July 2015, regarding population and electors [1638].

The two issues of density and distance, among other things, highlight the distinct difference between the challenges encountered by members providing representation in rural and regional electoral districts and those encountered by members providing representation in South-East Queensland. For example, my electoral district of Mount Isa covers 570,502 square kilometres, over 30 per cent of the entire state of Queensland. Ensuring equitable access to representation in expansive rural electoral districts as well as regional electoral districts in Queensland should not be undervalued. It is equally important as ensuring equitable access to representation for those residing in more densely populated South-East Queensland. Giving people the real ability to bring their grievances and concerns to the attention of a local member as well as providing people with a voice in the deliberations of the Legislative Assembly is vital to delivering good government in Queensland.

Unless this bill is passed, the next redistribution due in 2016 will most likely result in more rural and regional seats being lost to South-East Queensland. Whilst it is acknowledged that there is a legitimate need to provide for representation in South-East Queensland due to the increasing population, we must also maintain and improve representation in rural and regional electoral districts. Rural and regional electoral districts really are where the engine room of Queensland's economy is situated. On this point, the bill is also about ensuring the Queensland parliament does not become South-East Queensland centric.

Major issues like the rural debt, the impacts of fly-in fly-out workforces on small towns and the need to improve essential services like health in remote locations must not be put at risk of going unnoticed by the Legislative Assembly. I encourage all members, especially those in South-East Queensland, to think seriously about their role in maintaining and improving representation across the state which is needed to ensure good government for all Queenslanders.

### First Reading

**Mr KATTER** (Mount Isa—KAP) (11.35 am): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.



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

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

**Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date**

**Mr KATTER** (Mount Isa—KAP) (11.37 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

1. That under the provisions of standing order 136, the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee report to the House on the Electoral (Improving Representation) and Another Act Amendment Bill by 30 November 2015; and
2. That so much of the standing and sessional orders be suspended to ensure that all remaining stages of the Electoral (Improving Representation) and Another Act Amendment Bill be completed by 5 pm on 3 December 2015.



**Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (11.37 am): I rise to oppose this motion that would see this private member's bill reported back on in a very short time frame. I have already raised the concern that this bill may contravene standing orders given that it may be considered to be the reconsideration of a question that the House has already considered this session. I note the Speaker's ruling that he will consider that matter and report back to the House.

That aside, the time frame that we are talking about is significantly shorter than the time frame we think would be appropriate and acceptable to consider this bill. This is a matter that has been discussed and debated in some form, but the bill potentially has different complexities. If Mr Speaker allows this bill to be considered by the parliament, then it needs to be considered by the parliament through a proper and fulsome committee process that allows the opportunity for those people who were consulted the last time we looked at these issues to be consulted again. It should not be a shortened process that brings the bill back at the end of this month and does not allow the proper opportunity for engagement and consultation to occur. I do not believe that this shortened time frame is appropriate. I would ask that members of the House support me in making sure that our committees function properly and appropriately by having an appropriate time frame.



**Mr KNUTH** (Dalrymple—KAP) (11.39 am): I fully support the motion. It is about improving representation. It is different to the previous bill that has been put forward. Madam Deputy Speaker, obviously you are aware that we have a redistribution coming up and I believe that we have a time frame of February. You have to remember too that this is a desperate situation because we see a big disadvantage in rural and regional Queensland. In 1986 we had 17,500 constituents; now we are going to have 34,000. We are also going to see three to four seats abolished. We do not have the time frame. We have seen urgency motions pass this House for bills that were insignificant. This is a significant bill and it is important to the representation of Queensland.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Ms Grace): Member for Dalrymple, sorry to interrupt you, but there is just too much audible conversation. I am struggling to hear the member for Dalrymple and I do want to hear what he has to say. Would members please resume their seats if they are in passage ways against the standing orders? If you have conversations to have, member for Everton and member for Mount Ommaney, I suggest that you take them outside. The member for Dalrymple has the call.

**Mr KNUTH:** The people of Queensland have a big interest in this bill because they have been telling us that they want representation. That is what this bill is about. I fully support it and we need to get this through.




**Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade) (11.41 am): I just want to address the timing issue that has been presented by the member for Mount Isa in relation to reporting back on this private member's bill. From the outset, I do understand the motivation and the genesis for the desire for a speedy and prompt consideration of the private member's bill before the House. I do understand that there will be a redistribution process commencing early next year by the Electoral Commission of Queensland. But I think that we do this bill and the people of Queensland a disservice by not giving it appropriate attention, and that is pending Mr Speaker's ultimate analysis of whether or not this bill is substantially the same as another private member's bill that has already been dealt with by this House.

In relation to the Electoral Commission's determination around new boundaries, that process will commence early next year, but it will take some time for the ECQ to gather all the data that it needs, to gather the population predictions it needs and to start conveying to the people of Queensland draft boundaries which will probably be by the middle of next year. Given that there is that flexibility in the time frame, I think that there is scope for us to think about the parliamentary committee having a bit more time to consider this bill in these circumstances.

If we were to think about meeting the time frame of 30 November, as has been put by the member for Mount Isa, the Leader of the House has advised that we may need an additional parliamentary sitting in order to consider the report and the bill after the parliamentary committee reports back to the House. I think that we have the flexibility and the time to give the committee an additional amount of time in which to consider the bill before the ECQ commences its determination around the draft boundaries. As I said, those boundaries will not be out in February. The initial work commences in February. The boundaries will not be out until midway through 2016, so I do think we have time.

I want to convey to both the member for Mount Isa and the member for Dalrymple that I do have sympathy for their motivation in this respect. But I do want to absolutely convey that I think that there is time to give the parliamentary committee and this parliament and the people of Queensland a bit more time to consider fully a constitutional change. I do think that there is flexibility and capacity. This bill proposes a constitutional change and we should give such a significant change due consideration through a reasonable time frame.

 **Mr KATTER** (Mount Isa—KAP) (11.44 am), in reply: I first make the comment that these things are typically judged on substance over form, and we feel that the substance of this bill is significantly different or adequately different to that of the previous bill so that it can be reconsidered. As to the timing, I accept and acknowledge the arguments put forward by the Deputy Premier. But, on balance, obviously we feel that there is great impetus to have this resolved sooner rather than later.

It may be seen as an important interest in respect of Queensland to look after the timing, but we feel so far in this process that in rural and regional Queensland, particularly in those western areas, our interests have been forgotten. That gives impetus to having that time frame before that redistribution starts. That is where we see the importance. Obviously we have made it pretty clear to this parliament how important this is to us, which is why we feel so strongly about that time frame.

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

**AYES, 45:**

**LNP, 42**—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, Watts, Weir.

**KAP, 2**—Katter, Knuth.

**INDEPENDENT, 1**—Gordon.

**NOES, 43:**

**ALP, 43**—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, Palaszcuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Pyne, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.


Resolved in the affirmative.

## SUSTAINABLE PORTS DEVELOPMENT BILL

### Second Reading

Resumed from 11 November (see p. 2789), on motion of Dr Lynham—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Mr HART** (Burleigh—LNP) (11.52 am), continuing: It is a pleasure to recommence my speech from last night. I was talking about the hypocrisy of the Labor Party for voting down the deferral motion moved by the member for Hinchinbrook. It was interesting last night that during his contribution on the motion the minister said it was very important that we continue with the debate to finalise the bill last night. In fact, he said—

... I argue strongly that this bill should proceed today and not be deferred to a later date ...

Immediately after that the bill was deferred because the minister or somebody had something more important to do. One minute the reef is very important to the Labor Party and the next minute it is tossed in the long grass and we are back debating it again today.

As I said last night, this government is very hypocritical. It talks about how important the reef is. It has introduced this bill, which is basically a copy of the 2014 LNP bill with a couple of things deleted, but it stood in here a couple of days ago and talked about the massive expansion it wants to see happen

at the port of Townsville. You would tend to think, if all those stories are true, that expansion will do some sort damage to the reef, but the government does not seem to worry about that so we will just get on with it, apparently.

The committee found on its travels around Queensland that the port of Cairns is a real concern to the people of Cairns. They really want to see the port expanded up there and for it to be a priority port. That is why it flowed through to the recommendations made by the committee. Why do the people of Cairns want to see the Cairns port expanded? Because it is the lifeblood of Cairns. The people who spoke to our committee talked about the shipping activity that happens there.

**Mr Pitt** interjected.

**Mr HART:** I hear the member for Mulgrave interjecting under his breath. I want to go back to something that the member for Barron River said last night. In his contribution to the motion he said that the Cairns development project was very important to the Labor Party and had the full backing of the Labor Party. How surprising is that when we see that the member for Mulgrave, who is next door, removed the funding for that project. You would tend to think that, if the government really supported the Cairns development project, it would have kept the funding there instead of taking it out of the budget, but that is what the member for Mulgrave did. He took the money away. The member for Barron River should be aware that his government really does not support the Cairns redevelopment project, but the people of Cairns do. The people of Cairns want to see the port expanded. This notion that an allowance of 50,000 cubic metres per project is going to help or 150,000 cubic metres over four years is going to help is absolute nonsense.

I was interested to hear the member for Mirani talking about Port Alma. I think it would be really good for Port Alma to have an allowance of 50,000 per project for capital dredging or 150,000 over four years, because I think Port Alma could really benefit from it. It is really important that the minister answer the question posed by the member for Hinchinbrook. Why is it okay for the port of Cairns to have an extra allowance of 50,000 cubic metres or 150,000 over four years? Why is it not possible for every other port in Queensland that is very close to the World Heritage area to have exactly the same?

While I am on the subject of 50,000, it is important to put that into the context of what was going to happen with the Cairns Shipping Development Project. The Cairns Shipping Development Project is looking at widening the shipping channel into Cairns. Its proposal is to widen, deepen and lengthen the existing outer shipping channel. The current width of 90 metres is proposed to be widened to 130 metres. The declared depth would go from 8.3 metres to 9.4 metres. That requires 4.4 million in situ cubic metres of capital dredging. 150,000 is just not going to cut it. It is nowhere near enough to keep this port active.

The people of Cairns want to see the port active because the port is used for a lot of things. When we were in Cairns we heard that all of the fuel for Cairns comes into the port, and at the moment those ships cannot make it in except on high tide. They are bringing in fuel for the airport. Imagine if those tankers could no longer get in because of the problems with the port. There could be issues with the fuel supply at the airport. There could also be problems with the fuel supply for our navy. They are just a couple of things that the people of Cairns are really concerned about. During our hearing up there we had numerous people talk to us about those issues.

We heard that Cairns has been progressively expanded over the years. Mr Vico, the general manager of planning and infrastructure from Ports North, told us that typically the history of Cairns channel has been one of expansion. The Cairns channel was expanded in the sixties from a width of 25 metres to 40 metres; in the early seventies from 45 to 60 metres; and in the early nineties from 60 to 75 metres, where it is now. It has been progressively expanded over the years.

If we do not allow for the Cairns Shipping Development Project to go ahead, which is what I am really concerned about, we are going to see Cairns eventually stifled when ships are no longer able to go in there. Cairns is represented by three Labor members at this time in this chamber and you would think they would be looking after the best interests of Cairns and they would be putting forward what is best for Cairns, but they are in fact not. We heard from three members of the Maritime Union of Australia while we were there—Mr Gallen, Mr O'Shane and Mr Rainbow.

**Mr Crandon** interjected.

**Mr HART:** Yes. They fully support the ongoing capital dredging of the port—

**Mr Pitt** interjected.

**Mr HART:** I will just read what they said, member for Mulgrave, so you are across what the union up there thinks about your activities in this particular bill. I asked Mr Gallen—

Have you consulted with your local members of parliament? Have you given some feedback ...

His response to me was—


Exactly like you are saying, we do have an entry permit to a few of them.

That is, they have an entry permit to a few of the Labor members. He continued—

Curtis Pitt and his dad live up here and Pyne is just around the corner. We have not until now because this committee will be making the recommendations, but we will also be making recommendations to them plus the member for Cook plus the member for Barron River, Craig Crawford. We will be making strong recommendations.

I would have thought those union members would have been in since that date we were in Cairns and maybe they would have spoken to their local members and their local members would then be trying to do what is best for Cairns. But we saw the local members actually vote against what could have been very good for Cairns in this House last night. They are not standing up for the residents of Cairns, and that is why we need a member from Burleigh to stand up for the people of Cairns—because their members are not standing up for them. In fact, some of their members are even sponsoring petitions that call for the port of Cairns to not be dredged at all. That is the lengths they are going to because they are captured by their radical green mates. They are completely captured by them and they are not doing what is good for the people of Cairns.

We will be supporting this bill, as the member for Hinchinbrook said, because it is basically a copy of the 2014 bill that the member for Callide put forward. There are a few things I would have preferred to have seen in it. I would have preferred to have seen a review date that we had in our bill but it was removed by the Labor Party. Apart from that, I am supportive of the issues that this bill covers. I am interested to hear the contributions from the other Labor members who will stand up here and talk on this bill, but I am more interested to hear what those three local members have to say about it. If they were doing the right thing, they would have been standing up for the people of Cairns last night but they clearly were not.

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef) (12.02 pm): The Sustainable Ports Development Bill is an important milestone in our campaign to save the Great Barrier Reef. It delivers on commitments we made to the people of Queensland and commitments we made to the world at large through the Reef 2050 Long-Term Sustainability Plan. The bill is a substantial achievement. I congratulate the minister and all those who have worked tirelessly to bring it about. The bill protects the Great Barrier Reef primarily by banning the dumping of port related capital dredge spoil in the reef World Heritage area, greatly limiting the number of ports that can be built along the reef coast and concentrating development in four major existing ports in the best locations with the best channels. I spoke about some of the impact of dredging and dumping yesterday when I spoke against the opposition's irresponsible motion to defer consideration of this bill. As irresponsible as the motion was, I do thank the opposition for providing me with two opportunities to speak about this important matter.


Earlier this year we learnt that the previous LNP government spent millions of taxpayer funds on polling and advertising to downplay the threats facing the Great Barrier Reef and to try to shore up their reputation on reef protection and management. Budget figures show the previous government earmarked \$2.4 million for its so-called 'Reef Facts' advertising campaign. Part of this strategy was explicitly to counter the campaign by conservation groups drawing attention to the impact of ports and dredging on the reef and to downplay these impacts in the LNP's public messaging about the state of the reef.

But the ALP came to government with a suite of election commitments designed to protect the Great Barrier Reef from the impact of dredging and dumping because, unlike the LNP, we accept the evidence about the damage this causes to the sensitive reef ecosystems. On coming to government, we acted quickly to have those commitments embedded in the Reef 2050 Long-Term Sustainability Plan. The House has already heard what those commitments are, and I remind members opposite that, as much as they might try to claim this as their own, our first action on coming to government was to rewrite the LTSP and the commitments singled out by the World Heritage Committee were the commitments made by the Palaszczuk Labor team at the state election.

While welcoming the port measures and the ban on dumping of capital dredge spoil, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN and indeed many delegates specifically noted these measures were still to be translated into legislation. That is why the World Heritage Committee requires Australia and Queensland to report back next year on the steps we have taken to implement the long-term sustainability plan. We are being watched closely to see if we live up to our promises, if we will turn our words into action. Here we are—it is action time and where is the LNP? Squibbing and squirming, desperately trying to block these important reef protections. No wonder Queenslanders did not trust them to protect the reef. They were right not to trust them.

I recently had the opportunity to meet with Germany's Minister of State, Professor Dr Maria Bohmer. In her role as chair of the World Heritage Committee, she played an invaluable role in the negotiations around the Great Barrier Reef in the lead-up to the Bonn meeting. I am grateful for the leadership and passion she brought to the cause, and it was a pleasure to have her here on our side of the globe. Minister Bohmer came to Queensland late last month to see the Great Barrier Reef in all of its glory for herself. After fighting for conservation of the reef's outstanding universal values, she has now seen some of them firsthand, including the pristine white beaches and sparkling aqua blue waters of Whitehaven Beach. I was proud to update her on the progress we are making to implement the long-term sustainability plan, including the next milestone—putting our words into action on ports and dredging in the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area.

Make no mistake: the international community is watching and Queenslanders are watching, waiting to see us deliver on our promises. I am proud to be part of a government that delivers on our promises and is serious about protecting the reef. That is demonstrated in this bill before the House. I commend the minister and I commend the bill to the House.

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade) (12.08 pm): It is with a great sense of pride that I get up to make a contribution on the bill before the House—the Sustainable Ports Development Bill. I put on record my gratitude and thanks particularly to Minister Lynham for bringing this bill to the House, for his work with the Minister for Environment and Minister for the Great Barrier Reef, and for his work across government, with civil society and with the conservation groups to get this bill to a position where it has such a significant amount of support both inside and outside government.

Considering a lot of the information and misinformation that has been conveyed in this House in relation to this bill, I think it is important that we put paid to some of the suggestions that we hear from those opposite such as a substantive amount of this bill being the work of the LNP. Quite frankly, the issues that UNESCO considered when it made its determination not to put the Great Barrier Reef on the in-danger list were significant and the industrialisation of the Great Barrier Reef coastline was one of them. The differences between the bill that we are currently debating and the bill that was presented to the previous parliament, the 54th Parliament, under the former deputy premier, the member for Callide, are significant. Firstly, there was no legislative prohibition on the dumping of capital dredge spoil in the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area. There was no legislative prohibition on capital dredge spoil dumping; let's make that clear. Additionally, there was a restriction of further development to the port limits unless the minister responsible, the member for Callide at the time, gave a ministerial direction. So yes, there was a limit in terms of port development to a limit until the member for Callide, in his role as the former deputy premier, decided that he would like to extend that.

Additionally, the World Heritage Committee was incredibly impressed by the fact that the Palaszczuk Labor opposition made a commitment to legislatively protect the Fitzroy Delta to say that this incredibly important part of the World Heritage coastline, of the Great Barrier Reef coastline, would be saved from any future industrialisation, and that was incredibly important. It is very important that we crystallise the differences because those opposite like to talk about all the work they did in this space, but all the work they did in this space was repudiated last year at UNESCO. This year the Queensland and Australian governments got a completely different reception. The reason there was a completely different reception at UNESCO is that there was a completely different government in Queensland. My ministerial colleague, the Minister for the Great Barrier Reef, has already outlined some of the elements that Labor committed to at the election that went into the long-term sustainability plan that made that plan the tipping point for UNESCO deciding not to put the Great Barrier Reef on the in-danger list. They were things like obviously the legislated prohibition on dumping of dredge spoil, the \$100 million commitment by this government to work towards water quality improvements that would see an 80 per cent reduction in nutrients and a 50 per cent reduction in sediment run-off into the Great Barrier Reef. They were critical elements to the long-term sustainability plan and critical considerations for UNESCO. Additionally, our commitment to bring back world-class vegetation management laws was a consideration and strengthened the hand of the Australian and Queensland governments at UNESCO. Let us not forget that. Additionally, our commitment to be led by the scientists and the experts in relation to this and not the politics which we are seeing played out here today made UNESCO confident about our capacity and our commitment to work towards protecting the Great Barrier Reef.

I am immensely proud that I was given the honour by the Premier of going to UNESCO to argue Queensland's case alongside my colleague the Minister for the Great Barrier Reef. At the UNESCO hearing it was incredibly unusual to hear every single ambassador to UNESCO make a contribution to

this debate. All of them made a contribution to this debate, which was unheard of. It was led by the ambassador for Portugal, who is a very influential individual on the UNESCO committee. In his statement at UNESCO, alongside other ambassadors, he said the delegation 'stated that the election of a new government in Queensland had positive outcomes in that the challenges faced by the reef were addressed'. It would not have been done under those opposite, but UNESCO came back with a positive scorecard in terms of our ability to manage the challenges facing the reef because of the election of the Palaszczuk Labor government.

**Mr Powell** interjected.

**Ms TRAD:** I will take that interjection from the member for Glass House. It is my understanding that when he fronted up to UNESCO, the member for Glass House tried to get a motion up in UNESCO that supported the Queensland government but no single ambassador would support it. He was incredibly impotent when it came to UNESCO and putting the Newman government's case around the management of the reef.


Let me just say this: the Great Barrier Reef is a natural asset that belongs to the world and it is going to take more than politicians to save it. It is going to take civil society. The contribution by civil society in the campaign to address the challenges faced by the Great Barrier Reef is critical and it was acknowledged by every single ambassador at UNESCO. We need to acknowledge their efforts in this respect. I do want to pay tribute to the World Wildlife Fund and Greenpeace because we need everyone working together. I will not do what those opposite did, which was to come into this place and vilify civil society for deciding to stand up and fight for what is right. We need to be working together. Every single ambassador to UNESCO said they liked the way the Queensland and Australian governments were working together and they wanted us to work with civil society in order to address the challenges faced by the Great Barrier Reef, not be thugs, not to come into this place and call them extremists, not to come into this place and say they did not have a role in terms of addressing the future of the Great Barrier Reef.

We have a big challenge ahead of us in terms of the Great Barrier Reef. We have an incredibly big responsibility in terms of managing this incredible natural asset for future generations, for the Queensland economy and for the 70,000 jobs that depend on the Great Barrier Reef. We need this asset not only because of its intrinsic environmental value, but because it is what defines Queensland as different from every other state and territory in Australia. People come to Queensland for the Great Barrier Reef and we want the world to keep visiting Queensland because of the Great Barrier Reef. It is only Labor governments that will put their shoulder to the wheel, that will work with the scientists and work with civil society—

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Ms Grace): Order, members!

**Ms TRAD:** It is only Labor governments that will be directed by science, will work with civil society and will meet the challenges that face us together.

 **Mr SEENEY** (Callide—LNP) (12.19 pm): Listening to the member for South Brisbane reminds me of that famous quote from Margaret Thatcher, 'The only problem with socialism is that sooner or later you run out of other people's money.' The only problem with the socialist left running this Labor government is that sooner or later they will run out of other people's achievements to take credit for. Sooner or later they will have to do something for themselves. For the member for South Brisbane to speak the way she did about this particular issue and the work that has been done around the Great Barrier Reef is fundamentally absurd, and she knows it. We all know it. The media know it, which is why they never carry the absurd comments that they make. Those comments are tailor-made for the philosophical zealots in West End who are blind to anything but their own fantasies. I know that what we see in this parliament is not going to stop. These people are going to stand up here day after day, as they have done for months, and try and claim credit for things that they could not achieve when Labor was previously in government—and which I confidently expect they will not achieve in the years to come—but they take credit for the achievements and the work that we did in the time that we were in government.

When we came to government the Labor government's proposal for Abbot Point, for example, was to dredge and dump 35 million cubic metres of sediment to build an artificial island and connect it to the mainland. One of my favourite memories is when I went down to Canberra to meet with Labor environment minister Tony Burke. I unrolled the map of Abbot Point on his desk and I said, 'This is what is proposed: 35 million cubic metres and nine new coal terminals. We are going to wipe the lot. It is off the table. We are not going to do that. We are going to proceed in a more measured, incremental way.'

That was the start of a new approach to the Great Barrier Reef and to the challenge of ensuring that we protect what every Queenslander loves while bringing about the development that every Queenslander needs. That is the fundamental issue that the socialist left and the member for South Brisbane never address. Everybody loves the Great Barrier Reef. Every Queenslander loves the Great Barrier Reef. You do not have to be part of the socialist collective and have spent your life in Young Labor to understand how wonderful it is and to care about the Great Barrier Reef. We all care about that. The difference is that the rest of us also care about the Queensland economy. The rest of us also care about providing jobs and economic growth for our kids.

For the sake of the record, the draft Queensland Ports Strategy was released by me on 24 October 2013. It was part of a public consultation process around a strategic assessment which I always thought did not do justice to the body of work that was involved. In consultation with UNESCO and the federal government, we agreed to undertake the strategic assessment that the former federal government would not do. As my ministerial colleagues will recall, I often said that it was so long, complex and complicated that we would never get to the end of it. But we did, and the strategic assessment was signed off by the federal and state governments on 11 August 2014. The Ports Bill arose out of that. I do not put my hand up and say that I take credit for many things, but I stood firm on the point that we had to have a stand-alone piece of legislation for ports for two reasons (1) because the nature of Queensland's geography meant that there were always going to be ports needed adjacent to the Great Barrier Reef; and (2) the economic future of Queensland depended on those ports being able to be developed and operated properly. The ports legislation that we proposed was about ensuring that we found the balance between protecting the reef that every Queenslander wants and providing the jobs and the economic growth that every Queenslander needs.

For the member for South Brisbane and the member for Stafford and all these other nameless Labor members to come in here and read speeches that are written by someone who does not understand what has happened to get to this point is patently absurd. You cannot get to this point in the nine months that the Labor government has been in power; it is not possible. It took us three years to get through the strategic assessment process. It took three years to get through the consultation process. It took three years to get to the point where we could introduce the bill into parliament on 25 November 2014. Just as it is impossible to get to that point in nine months, so it is impossible to address the concerns that UNESCO had in six months—

**Mr Powell:** Concerns that came from their mismanagement of the reef!


**Mr SEENEY:** Exactly! I was coming to that, member for Glass House, but thank you for pre-empting me. That too needs to be remembered in terms of history. Why did UNESCO become concerned? Why was UNESCO involved at all? Because the former Labor government launched into the construction of three LNG plants on Curtis Island in the port of Gladstone without any consideration of World Heritage values, without any consideration of marine park values and without telling anybody. We all know that the undue haste that was involved in establishing the LNG plants was repeated across the establishment of that whole coal seam gas industry. That is when UNESCO became involved and they started to express justifiable concern. What was the Labor government's response? Leo Zussino, the chair of the Gladstone Ports Corporation, wanted to shift the boundary of the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area so that Gladstone was not in it. That was his suggestion; that is what he wanted to do. 'That will save us worrying about it.'

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SEENEY:** Yes, he is the unofficial member for Gladstone. This guy here who sits in the House is a wooden puppet with a rubber stamp. Leo Zussino is the member for Gladstone. He was the one who wanted to address UNESCO's concern by shifting the boundary. When we came to power we said, 'No, we are not going to do that. We are going to work through this process with the federal government. We are going to do the hard yards.' And by gee, there were some hard yards! There were some long meetings involved and there was enormous effort put in by not just my ministerial colleagues, but by some departmental staff. I would love to give them the recognition they deserve, but the vindictive people who sit over there would only use that as an opportunity. Some of those individuals put their heart and soul into the strategic assessment and the public consultation process which were necessary to bring together all of the stakeholders through the ports strategy and the drawing up of the Ports Bill. Ours was a little different, and the member for Hinchinbrook has gone through those differences.

I believe that our planning processes were much stronger. The priority ports development areas that we proposed are much better planning instruments than the overlays currently proposed in this bill. There are a whole range of those sorts of details that will be lost in this debate, but it does not matter.

What matters most is that we have in place the framework that is necessary to demonstrate to the world that every Queenslanders is protecting the Great Barrier Reef and that we have in place a legislative provision to ensure we can have the development that every Queenslanders needs at the same time as we protect the reef.

 **Mr MILLAR** (Gregory—LNP) (12.29 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution to the debate of this bill. There are no ports in the electorate of Gregory; nevertheless, ports play a pivotal economic role in our region. The main ports servicing Gregory are Gladstone for the north and Brisbane for the south.


This bill covers the priority ports of Townsville, Abbot Point, Gladstone and Hay Point-Mackay, which represent trade worth about \$30 billion and shifted 77 per cent of the total throughput of all Queensland ports in 2013-14. It is easy to see how important these ports are to our economy. Gregory uses our ports for coal, one of the major exports out of the Bowen Basin to customers in South-East Asia; cotton, grain and pulses to our valuable Indian market; and the ever-expanding horticultural industry.

This bill needs to provide the flexibility to expand. That does not mean to the detriment of the Great Barrier Reef. I think everybody in this House—certainly those on this side of the House—believes that we need to protect the Great Barrier Reef, but regional Queensland certainly does have a growing economy. I believe that we are on the verge of enormous growth in our food and fibre exports to South-East Asia, so we need the flexibility to ensure our ports can cope with a potential increase in port activity.

Yesterday I listened to the member for Hinchinbrook articulate very well his argument and demonstrate his understanding of the issue. I thought the amendments he proposed were worthwhile. I also listened to the member for Callide, who has been very involved in this and is very passionate about getting this right. I certainly will not repeat what those members said, but I believe that they absolutely had the right intentions—to make sure we get right this piece of legislation relating to an important piece of infrastructure in the Queensland economy. We need to do that because Queensland is on the doorstep of South-East Asia, and our key access point to that area is our ports.

I have heard the views of the people of Cairns who believe that they need the opportunity to expand their economy. Their economy does rely on the tourism industry. When people think of Cairns they do think of the tourism industry, but the sugar industry there is also very valuable. The federal government is looking at Northern Australia for potential export opportunities in the ever-growing South-East Asian market. Cairns is in the area to take advantage of that. We needed to give Cairns some opportunities and some flexibility to increase their economy.

Finally, I thank the committee—chairman Jim Pearce, deputy chair Michael Hart and the members for Keppel, Gladstone and Dalrymple.

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Yeerongpilly—ALP) (Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy and Water Supply) (12.32 pm): I rise to speak in support of the historic Sustainable Ports Development Bill 2015. In doing so, I acknowledge the very hard and excellent work of the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, Dr Lynham, and the Minister for the Great Barrier Reef, Dr Miles. I also pay tribute to the support over a long period of time, in the last term of parliament, of the Deputy Premier, who was at the forefront of the campaign to maintain the balance between protecting our reef and the environment and ensuring our economic future.

This bill will strike an important balance in that regard in terms of sustainable port development that also meets our national and international commitments to protect the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area. The Queensland and Australian governments jointly released the *Reef 2050 long-term sustainability plan* in March this year, in response to UNESCO's requirements about coastal development threatening the values of the Great Barrier Reef. Parts of the reef are undeniably under pressure. The Reef 2050 Plan is Australia's overarching framework for protecting and managing our great national and international icon over the next 50 years.

The bill represents a significant step in implementing our port related election commitments as set out in the Reef 2050 Plan. The bill will facilitate a number of important port activities, subject to appropriate environmental restrictions, and will maximise environmental outcomes in terms of protecting the reef. Importantly, it will ban the sea based disposal of port related capital dredge material into the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area and restrict major capital dredging to four priority ports, being Abbot Point, Gladstone, Hay Point-Mackay and Townsville.

I can assure the member for Gregory that this bill means that development within Gladstone harbour can be undertaken, subject to relevant environmental approvals being obtained—for example, the further deepening of the existing Clinton Bypass Channel, which is required to ensure the continued



safe passage of vessels including larger, capesize vessels. As it is a capital dredging project, dredge material will be disposed of on land, most likely at the existing Western Basin bund area at Fisherman's Landing. I note what a terrific job the new chair of the Gladstone Ports Corporation, Leo Zussino, is doing. I think it is a sad day when the member for Callide just cannot help himself and vilifies somebody who has contributed an enormous amount to the Gladstone area's economic development over 20 years. Development and maintenance of export facilities—

**Mrs Frecklington** interjected.

**Mr BAILEY:** I hear a bit of a buzz-saw. I am not sure where it is coming from. Development and maintenance of export facilities at the ports of Hay Point and Abbot Point will also continue under the bill, subject to relevant environmental approvals being obtained.

In late October 2015 the North Queensland Bulk Ports Corporation, which is responsible for these ports, released its *Sustainability plan 2015+*. The plan outlines North Queensland Bulk Ports' approach to sustainability. The plan will also form a key platform for future business activities of the port. I welcome its release.

Development will also be allowed to proceed at the port of Townsville, which is a vital and strategic trading port of North Queensland. As I announced earlier this week, the tender for supply and construction of Townsville's berth 4 redevelopment project is currently open for submissions. The upgrade of berth 4 is of significant economic importance for the port of Townsville as well as the region and will facilitate access for larger, Panamax size vessels. Work will kick off in early 2016, involving a substantial number of local new jobs for the Townsville economy, with the new upgraded facility expected to commence operations late in 2017.

Another important project for Townsville is the proposed port expansion project, which involves construction of a number of additional berths and construction of a new outer harbour necessary to accommodate the port's forecast long-term trade increases. The port's CEO, Ranees Crosby, pitched this project at last week's very successful Northern Queensland Economic Summit in Cairns. There were about 280 attendees present.

As Minister Lynham has outlined, there has been significant consultation undertaken about the future regulation of development at the port of Cairns. I acknowledge his excellent work in that regard. I am pleased that the port of Cairns will be provided with the flexibility it needs to develop within specified parameters, as set out in proposed amendments to the bill.

The bill also provides Ports North with the opportunity to continue working with state and federal government agencies to recalibrate its environmental impact statement for the Cairns Shipping Development Project to involve incremental channelled works that support the growth of the Cairns region. The Palaszczuk government recognises that the port of Cairns supports economic activity at a regional level and is a key component of the North Queensland tourism industry. I note the 70,000 jobs up and down the reef that are dependent upon environmental protection.

The Palaszczuk government is committed to protecting the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area while allowing sustainable development, consistent with the Reef 2050 Plan and our commitments to UNESCO earlier this year. The balance struck by this bill is critical to the future of Queensland.


I welcome the constructive approach taken by both business and environmental groups in engaging with us on this bill. Last week in Cairns I had the great pleasure of standing up with Minister Lynham, the lead minister on this. We were joined there by WWF. Half an hour later I sat down with the CEO of the Cairns Chamber of Commerce. Both of them were very supportive of our approach of not only protecting the environment but also protecting our economy.

This is one of the great differences between this government and the opposition and one of the defining issues in terms of the recent election campaign. It is our view that protecting the environment is an essential part of economic development. You have to have both of them. This is the 21st century. It is old thinking—it is 20th century thinking—to be running around saying, 'You should do over the environment and the economy is the only parameter.' There is not an issue that is clearer than this and there is no clearer issue of policy failure than the opposition's mishandling of this issue when it was in power. It thought economic development could come at the price of doing over the Caley Valley Wetlands. That is what it thought. That is why it paid the price. That is why it is in opposition, because it could not get the balance right. It is absolutely critical that in protecting the environment we also protect our economy and the 70,000 jobs that depend on the Great Barrier Reef, and let us hope, given our very progressive position on this, that there will be more tourists coming to Queensland. I note the work of the Minister for Tourism in that regard. We are positioning ourselves well for a revival of tourism

in Queensland and the reef is going to be a very important part of that equation, especially with the Australian dollar back down around 70 cents. The attraction for us to get a new wave of tourism in Queensland, particularly environmental tourism, is very important. If we get that right, those tourists and their relatives and their friends will be coming back and coming back and coming back to Queensland for many years to come. So let us not trade-off the environment. Let us not get into the false dichotomy of trading off the environment for the economy. It is short-term thinking. It is 20th century thinking. It is a clear example of the failure of the previous government. That is why it is in opposition; that is why it is not on this side of the chamber. It does not understand that the community demands that of any modern government. They expect them to get that balance right.

In closing, I want to thank all of those ordinary Queenslanders who fought hard and who campaigned for the protection of the Great Barrier Reef. I want to thank those environment groups who led those campaigns but particularly those hundreds of thousands of ordinary Queenslanders who signed petitions, who lobbied local newspapers and lobbied local MPs, who were vocal about protecting their icon. I want to thank every single one of them. This is a great outcome. This is not only an outcome that is great for the reef but also a great outcome for their courage and their persistence in standing up for something they care deeply about. This is a win for the people of Queensland and it is the right policy position. We are getting the balance right between protecting the economy and protecting the environment. I commend the bill to the House.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Ms Grace): Order! Before calling the member for Clayfield, I welcome to the gallery students and teachers from John Paul College in the electorate of the member for Springwood.

 **Mr NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (12.42 pm): Madam Deputy Speaker, I am happy to join with you in welcoming the students and their teachers here and I hope they leave better informed about the great work that the former LNP government did to protect the Great Barrier Reef during its term in government, setting up and doing all the hard yards. If there is one invaluable lesson for students, it is that you have to do the hard graft in the first place and after that you will get the credit for it. You cannot just waltz in having said nothing for three years and then claim credit, as the member for Yeerongpilly has just done. I do not remember the member for Yeerongpilly standing up a year ago and saying, 'I need to do something about the Great Barrier Reef.' I do not remember him turning up at the scientific committees or doing the hard work or making any representation in relation to that. I do not remember the member for Mount Coot-tha doing it. What I do remember is coming to office in March 2012 and being presented with the very first significant infrastructure challenge that the government had to face at that time—that is, as I said yesterday, a proposal approved by the previous Labor government to develop the port of Abbot Point by taking 35 million cubic metres of dredge spoil out of the port of Abbot Point and disposing of it at sea.

That was the very first issue. Of such concern was it that the member for Callide, myself and the former premier sat down immediately and pulled out that map that he referred to that he took down to Tony Burke, together with the then chief executive of North Queensland Bulk Ports Corporation, and went through what a travesty it would be if that was allowed to go ahead. Not only was it environmentally a tragedy for the reef; it was economically a tragedy for the state of Queensland as well. It would have consigned Queenslanders to a dreadful environmental outcome, a challenge to the reef and a challenge to the finances of the state. In fact, it was so economically under thought that subsequent to being elected in 2012 one of the first things that also started happening was question marks about the planning that went into it in the first place by the people who were supposedly going to use it—companies like Rio and others who had signed up for the early stages of development of it.

When we think back to the history of it, it is important to put on record exactly what the government that was elected in 2012 faced at that time, and that is also endorsed by the Reef 2050 Long-Term Sustainability Plan itself. Page 31 at clause 3.4 of that document states—

After two years of analysis, comprehensive strategic environmental assessment reports for the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area and adjacent coastal zone ... were endorsed by the Australian Minister for the Environment under the EPBC Act in August 2014.

August 2014—not any time after February 2015 but August 2014, and it was two years worth of work before that going back to August 2012 when that work was commenced after UNESCO had placed the Great Barrier Reef on watch in 2011. Let us remember who was in government in 2011.

**Opposition members:** Labor!

**Mr NICHOLLS:** It was Labor at both the state and federal level. It is sort of reminiscent of the loss of the AAA credit rating. Who was in power at that stage?

**Opposition members: Labor!**

**Mr NICHOLLS:** Labor. It was in recognition of that challenge that the then LNP government undertook the work in order to lead to the endorsement by the Australian minister of the comprehensive plan—a comprehensive plan that also followed the North-East Shipping Management Plan released in late 2014 to provide an integrated approach to shipping management for the ships that traverse the Great Barrier Reef and use the channel to come into the state to provide the goods that we all enjoy such as the TVs on the wall here and probably the paper that this is being printed on. All of that comes in through ships through the Great Barrier Reef. It just does not materialise here. It has to come in via a ship.

**Mr Cripps:** *Shen Neng 1. Remember the Shen Neng?*

**Mr NICHOLLS:** We remember the *Shen Neng 1* that hit the shoal. We remember all of those things. So that was put in place by the LNP government. In September 2013 there were five capital dredging projects either planned or under assessment that the then newly elected coalition government in Canberra determined would not be allowed to dispose of their dredge material in the marine park—all done under the stewardship of the conservative coalition in Canberra as well as the LNP in Queensland. Why do I make those points? Why is it important to remember the history? Because it is important to acknowledge that no-one has a mortgage on concern on the Great Barrier Reef. No-one has a mortgage on a concern of the environment—not this side of the House, not that side of the House. We all jointly have a responsibility in relation to the Great Barrier Reef. I have never sailed a coal ship through the Great Barrier Reef, but I have done a fair bit of scuba diving on it. I love it! My kids love going fishing on it. Tourists like travelling the world to come here. We have taken friends and colleagues up and down that reef. Indeed, in November last year when the G20 leaders were in Cairns for what I think was one of the most successful finance leaders' meetings ever held they went out onto the Great Barrier Reef and marvelled at its great beauty. So we all have a responsibility in order to protect the Great Barrier Reef. I acknowledge that groups like WWF and others have the interests of the reef at heart, but we are all responsible for it and we have all taken respective care and, I would submit much more, that that work accelerated between 2012 and 2015 after the reef was put on the watch list by UNESCO.

This bill, which in many respects reflects the Ports Bill that was introduced by the member for Callide in November 2014, should be supported. Yesterday, we discussed a potential delay of just over 4½ months to allow the EIS process to proceed so that we could give the people of Cairns some indication of what the economic future might hold for them in Cairns. But today, that motion having been put and defeated, this bill should proceed, because it acts to protect the reef and it implements the commitments that were made and the policies that were put in place by the former government. There are changes and the member for Callide has outlined the changes in relation to the planning process, in relation to the overlay plans and some other changes in relation to strict prohibitions as opposed to ministerial decision-making that have been put in this bill. I acknowledge that those changes have been made and they have been through the committee process.

The concerns that have been expressed by this side of the House in relation to the challenges of this bill, and particularly the challenges affecting the port of Cairns, are reflected also in the committee report. I must say that that report is one of the most remarkable committee reports that I have ever seen released. I commend certainly the LNP members of that committee for their consistency in terms of the outcome of that report. Obviously, the report shows the challenges that exist in relation to the regulation of the port of Cairns and what is the going on. As I said yesterday, when it comes to the proposals around the 50,000 cubic metres of spoil that is allowed to be moved in any one project and the cumulative 150,000 cubic metres over four years, the science seems to be pretty thin on the ground. As I said yesterday, that seems to be a case of horsetrading. Nonetheless, it gives people in Cairns some hope for the future.

I would say also that the provision of the protection of the EIS gives them some hope, although, given the government's actions in withdrawing \$40 million worth of funding for the proposed cruise ship expansion that was being considered there, there is less hope than there was. But it should not be beyond the wit of us all, and in particular the government and Ports North, to come up with a solution that meets the environmental requirements under the reef plan and that meets the economic needs of the people of Cairns.

I particularly want to pay tribute to the member for Callide and the member for Glass House, who worked so diligently in getting us to the stage where the government is now currently able to bring this bill forward. I acknowledge—I think we all should—that the reef is a great possession of all of us. We all owe it to protect it and to do it in the most sensible way possible for the benefit of all Queenslanders.



**Mr POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (12.52 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution to the debate on the Sustainable Ports Development Bill 2015. I was not going to. I was not intending to speak to the bill today, because I thought that, finally, we might have a situation in Queensland where both sides of politics could take a bipartisan approach to managing and protecting what has to be the world's, the nation's, this state's most precious environmental asset, the Great Barrier Reef. That had been my hope—that we could have had true bipartisan support for something as precious as the Great Barrier Reef. Unfortunately, what I heard this morning compelled me to rise to make a short contribution, because what I heard again was those opposite choosing to politicise the Great Barrier Reef for no other benefit than their own political gain. Yet again, we heard another case of Labor revisionists trying to rewrite history, trying to take the credit for the hard yards, as the member for Clayfield said, that were done under the LNP government of the last three years.

I want to reflect on a couple of things that the member for Callide said. It does require a bit of a history lesson. When we came into power in March 2012, I recall the member for Callide referring to the spaghetti of mines, railway lines and ports that were proposed to be developed across this state of Queensland. Basically, put a mine out in western Queensland and draw a line to the coast. Yet under the Labor government of Peter Beattie and Anna Bligh, you could pretty much be guaranteed that you could build a new port or you could expand an existing port. In terms of resource development, rail corridors and port development in this state, there was no planned approach to what was going on.

We also had this concept that we have heard the Deputy Premier speak of about not disposing dredge spoil in the World Heritage area. Why were we in this situation in the first place? The only ones who had been doing it were those opposite. They did it in Gladstone and that is what drew the attention of UNESCO in the first place. Not only that, they also failed to mention to UNESCO that they were going to be building three LNG plants on Curtis Island but they intended to dispose of dredge spoil at Abbot Point. Anyone who wants to try to rewrite the history of the Great Barrier Reef and what we have done to protect it here in this state needs to be reminded that in March 2012 the existing plan for Abbot Point would have seen 35 million cubic metres of sediment disposed of adjacent to the Great Barrier Reef. The members opposite were going to create another island in the Great Barrier Reef.

It was not the Labor Party, it was not this government that took the necessary steps to address those very genuine concerns of UNESCO and it certainly did not happen in the nine months since January this year. As the member for Callide mentioned, there were two long years of developing a strategic assessment. Initially, that process started with the then federal minister, Tony Burke. I recall, like the member for Callide does, some rather robust but in the end very positive discussions around how we could progress this issue and get the best outcome for the Great Barrier Reef. Those discussions continued with the new federal environment minister, Greg Hunt. For two years we worked on the reef 2050 report that the member for Clayfield referred to. As the member for Callide mentioned, all of that culminated in November last year with the introduction of the Ports Bill.

When it comes to the reef, I think it is important that Queenslanders also hear the LNP's legacy. Faced with what we had in Gladstone, we established the Gladstone Healthy Harbour Partnership—a partnership of community, environmental and Indigenous groups and industry all sitting around the table restoring confidence for the people locally, across our state, across our nation and, indeed, across the world when it comes to our management of that crucial port. We expanded that process further and recently there was the release of the first report card for the Mackay-Whitsunday water area. That was an initiative created under the LNP government. The eReefs, which the Minister for Environment crows about, started under the LNP government. Perhaps one of my most pleasing achievements, in partnership with my then ministerial colleagues the member for Hinchinbrook and the member for Toowoomba South, was the establishment of best management practice programs with our grazing and cane industries—working with them not against them to together provide economic benefit for our farmers and environmental protection for the reef.

I want to pick up some comments that were made by the Minister for Environment. He talked about hosting European ministers. The process took far more than that. It took trips to Europe by Minister Hunt and me to meet with people like Irina Bokova, Kishore Rao and Fannie Dubois. It took the hard yards of each and every departmental staff member who worked in either State Development or EHP over those last two years. Like the member for Callide, I acknowledge those. I also want to acknowledge the hard work of Ambassador George Mina in Paris, who spent many long hours working with the UNESCO ambassadors.

Those opposite say that they protect the environment. They produce glossy brochures and glib one-liners, but at the end of the day they never did. If you look at their track record, they gave hollow platitudes to the conservation groups. To protect the environment, you need to get the balance right.

You need to do the hard yards. You need to make sure that you are backed by rigorous scientific evidence. You need to make sure that your legislative protections have the rigour to stand up in a court of law, have the rigour to ensure that you can provide economic benefit to this state so that not only my kids and my grandkids can have jobs but also my kids and my grandkids can enjoy the Great Barrier Reef. Anyone who suggests that I or anyone else on this side of politics does not want to protect the Great Barrier Reef is just off their rocker. No-one—no-one—is interested in destroying the Great Barrier Reef in this state. We need to take the politics out of the Great Barrier Reef and start working together to ensure that the next generations can thoroughly appreciate it as much as we have.

Debate, on motion of Mr Powell, adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 pm to 2.30 pm.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Ms Farmer): I advise members that there is a photographer from the *Courier-Mail* who will be around the chamber over the next little while taking photographs.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

### TAFE Queensland, Department of Education and Training, Information Technology



**Hon. KJ JONES** (Ashgrove—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games) (2.30 pm), by leave: Today I have been made aware that sensitive information regarding the ongoing criminal investigation into the hacking of TAFE and the Department of Education and Training data has been made public. The unauthorised release of this information is deeply concerning and has been provided publicly against the consistent advice of the Queensland Police Service and the Queensland Government Chief Information Officer.

As a consequence, today the director-general has referred the unauthorised disclosure of this information to the CCC for investigation. The Police Commissioner has reiterated to me today that, given there is an ongoing threat from this criminal activity, I should not disclose further information consistent with the statements I have made to this House throughout the week. However, as there has been an unauthorised disclosure of information today, he has approved the release of the following: in relation to the Department of Education and Training, more than 600 records dating back to 2013 were accessed illegally. I can confirm no financial data, such as credit card information or bank details, have been accessed.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr Bleijie** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the member for Kawana to cease interjecting.

**Mr Bleijie** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Cease interjecting!

**Ms JONES:** However, in relation to records deemed to be of a more sensitive nature, the department has contacted 16 people to alert them to this cyber crime. I can confirm that all of these matters dating back to 2013 were dealt with appropriately at the time. From the moment that TAFE Queensland and the Department of Education and Training became aware of the hack they have worked with police and the Queensland Government Chief Information Officer and appropriate authorities. I have also followed the advice of the Queensland police and the Queensland Government Chief Information Officer at all times in relation to this criminal matter. I can assure all members of the parliament that my focus has always been on acting in the best interests of the people affected by this criminal activity.


**Opposition members** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Kawana will cease interjecting or I will warn him under standing order 253A.

**Ms JONES:** As the responsible minister, I can assure the member for Kawana and all Queenslanders that I will not act contrary to the advice that I receive from the Police Commissioner, from police, in relation to an ongoing criminal investigation and no responsible minister would. I have acted and always will continue to act in the best interests of Queensland children and parents.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

### Public Transport, Fares

 **Mr EMERSON** (Indooroopilly—LNP) (2.34 pm): In less than two months—in January—Queensland will return to the bad old days of Labor when it starts to hike up public transport fares again. Everyone will remember when Labor was last in power its policy was annual 15 per cent fare hikes. At the time the transport minister, the now Premier Anastacia Palaszczuk, was the one who was putting them up. Year, after year, after year Labor increased fares, seeing them rise more than 50 per cent in just three years. When the LNP came to power we kept our election promise to end Labor's 15 per cent annual fare increases. Last year for the first time in Queensland history the LNP implemented a statewide five per cent fare cut. This year, in 2015, we also froze fares—that is, there was no increase at all. But with Labor back in power fares are about to rise again.

The budget has fares going up by 2.5 per cent. This is almost twice the current inflation rate. Two weeks ago, latest economic data was released that showed Queensland's inflation rate continues to be 1.5 per cent, a figure that has remained consistent since Labor came to power at the beginning of the year. So fares are budgeted go up by 2.5 per cent, but the inflation rate prior to the budget was and remains 1.5 per cent. There is some hope for Queensland's public transport users that they will not be slugged a fare rise almost twice the inflation rate, but only if the transport minister, Jackie Trad, stands by her comments to the budget estimates committee. What did the transport minister tell the estimates committee? I quote—

Our commitment to the people of Queensland was that public transport fares would go up by CPI and they will go up by CPI.

She also told the committee—

The election promise that we made—

Let me say that again—

The election promise that we made, which is that fares would go up by CPI, is exactly what we will be delivering come 1 January.


Finally, she also said—

I do want to reassure the committee that the commitment that we made at the time of the election in relation to fare increases of 1.5 per cent will be honoured on 1 January this year. It will only increase by CPI.

This is the question: will the transport minister keep her clear commitment to the estimates committee and ensure that public transport fares only go up by the inflation rate or will it go up, as the budget shows, by 2.5 per cent, almost twice the CPI rate? The transport minister could not have been clearer. She told the estimates committee it was an election promise. She told the committee fares would go up by just 1.5 per cent.

The transport minister needs to come out today and assure public transport users that fares are only going up by 1.5 per cent in January. If she does not, everyone will know that Labor has broken an election promise and has returned to the bad old days of massive fare hikes under Labor.

### Cairns Electorate, Rally

 **Mr PYNE** (Cairns—ALP) (2.37 pm): On Saturday, 31 October, around 300 Cairns residents gathered as part of the Australia says Welcome rallies that took place around Australia to celebrate inclusion, tolerance and human rights. This was in response to emerging racial and religious intolerance in our community. Hatred on the basis of race or religion is always wrong. It always creates injustice and often leads to tragic consequences. Surely we have not forgotten what happened to Jewish people during the Second World War. Surely we have learned from Northern Ireland and, indeed, our own history, from the experience of hatred between Catholics and Protestants. Today, it is hatred of the Muslim minority that is gaining force. We gathered on the 31st to say that this form of hatred in our city of Cairns must stop.

We all condemn terrorist groups. However, Australian groups that respond to such evil with hatred to all of Muslim faith show great ignorance. They are entrenching a cycle of hatred. The actions of the terrorists and the hateful racists become part of a vicious cycle of hate where one feeds the other. We now have a situation in this country where violent terrorists are saying to our young Muslims, 'You are not a part of this country. Australia hates you.' In a tragic irony, this message is now also being spread by far right groups. They are also saying to those young Muslims, 'You are not a part of this country. Australia hates you.' This is a recipe for disaster.


Let us be clear, there is only one antidote to this sickness in our society and that is to say to Muslim Australians, young and old, 'Yes, we value you. We embrace you. Yes, you are an important part of the present and the future of this country.' In doing this, we ourselves are practising one of the central tenets of all religions: 'Do unto others as you would have them do unto you.'

Leaders in this place must show strength not weakness. As former Black Flag frontman Henry Rollins said—

Weakness is what brings ignorance, cheapness, racism, homophobia, desperation, cruelty, brutality, all these things that will keep a society chained to the ground, one foot nailed to the floor.

If sometimes I seem disengaged in this place, it is because I find some of the exchanges pretty ordinary. However, I congratulate members on both sides of the House for maintaining support for a diverse multicultural community. I have no doubt there are votes in playing the race card in parts of Queensland, and the refusal of anyone here to play that card reflects well on all members of the 55th Parliament. Recently, in delivering an Australian flag to a Cairns school, I warned that our flag can be used either positively or negatively. It can be used either to unite us or to divide us as a people. Let us all use our flag, our anthem and our institutions to unite all who call this county home.

### Lady Cilento Children's Hospital

 **Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (2.39 pm): A few weeks ago the obsequious health minister, the Hon. Cameron Dick, during his private member's statement about the Lady Cilento Children's Hospital attempted to cast aspersions upon me as the member for Moggill. I will not be reduced to an agenda of the lowest common denominator by the member for Woodridge's spurious, reprehensible and misleading agenda as it pertains to the Lady Cilento Children's Hospital. I table an article from page 42 of the *Courier-Mail* of Saturday, 31 October 2015, which is predominantly a fair version as to the commissioning and eventual opening of the Lady Cilento Children's Hospital.

*Tabled paper:* Article from the *Courier-Mail*, dated 31 October 2015, titled 'Politics plagues hospital' [[1639](#)].

The analogy goes something like this: as a doctor, sometimes you inherit a patient at five minutes to midnight who is extremely unwell, often tachycardic, hypotensive, hypothermic, who is in multiorgan failure with oliguria, who is septic and who is, in essence, in colloquial terms, flatlining. The ability of any individual to turn around such a catastrophic clinical situation is often near impossible. So too was the case that the LNP inherited from Labor and the Bligh government, in which the member for Woodridge served, in relation to the Lady Cilento Children's Hospital when the LNP came to government in 2012. Despite the best endeavours of many to rectify the poor public policy planning decisions emanating from the failed Beattie and Bligh Labor years with respect to health, the commissioning of the Lady Cilento Children's Hospital remains one of the greatest failed legacies of Labor's previous term in government.

As the royal commission has heard in relation to trade union governance and corruption, the CFMEU held an unlawful strike in relation to the Lady Cilento Children's Hospital. Grave concerns have also been raised about so-called welfare funds and how they have operated under the direction of the CFMEU and other unions. In fact, it is possible that so-called hardship payments were made, from a fund linked to the CFMEU, to workers on an illegal strike at the then Queensland children's hospital.


If there is any shame in this place, it is the protection racket exercised by the Palaszczuk government cabinet members towards the CFMEU. Labor continues to protect alleged criminality and unethical conduct. It is time the Labor Party took a principled stand against those elements of the union movement and their government that do their general party membership and union membership a great disservice. Truth and reality are mutually exclusive for the member for Woodridge. He would be better represented as a David Irving caricature in his own 21st century Orwellian paperback.

Tonight, the world's greatest rock and roll band will flick the switch on another world tour in Brisbane. I want to acknowledge current band members and pay tribute to the riff maker, Malcolm Young, given his recent ill health and forced retirement. However, as the member for Bundamba's international comrade in arms, the former Panama military dictator General Manuel Noriega found out in 1989, continuous AC/DC can be an effective means of dealing with recalcitrant socialists. Perhaps the member for Rockhampton could use this as an internal Labor management strategy, along with his other Labor Unity colleagues, with respect to the CFMEU aligned member for Bundamba's ongoing disgraceful and shameful conduct. Dirty deeds indeed, but they are not done dirt cheap with this Labor government controlled by the CFMEU and other Labor bosses.

*(Time expired)*

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Ms Farmer): Order! I will thank the Leader of the House to direct his conversations through the chair or not have conversations.

### Capalaba Sports Club

 **Mr BROWN** (Capalaba—ALP) (2.42 pm): Today I rise to talk about a local club in my electorate. I know many members talk about the good things that local clubs do in their areas, but unfortunately this is not one of those times. In May of this year, the Capalaba Sports Club sacked all of its casual workers, many of whom were sacked unfairly because they had over 12 months continuous service on a regular roster, which meant that they were in breach of the fair work agreement. Those workers were given a choice: they could take up employment with HospitalityX, which is a subsidiary of AWX. Currently, AWX is under investigation for malpractice against migrant workers and has been part of a 7.30 report, not once but twice. They slipped through an agreement with eight employees from New South Wales that took away every single penalty from those workers. It was a take-it-or-leave-it approach and the workers were forced on to an unfair agreement that took away all their penalties.

I was approached by many of the workers and many members of the club. I am a member of the bowls club myself. I approached management and asked them to reverse their decision. I wrote to them. For two months I was ignored by board members. The workers' union, United Voice, and I rallied to the charge and organised a meeting. Three hundred locals turned up to protect weekend penalty rates.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr BROWN:** I hear the interjections. Are members opposite for or against weekend penalty rates? This is an important issue for workers. We rallied to the charge and 300 locals gave up their Saturday to protect workers. United Voice sued HospitalityX to get access to its wage records. It did access those wage records and it is not a pretty picture for 46 employees. Every single employee has lost their penalty rates. However, I am happy to report that the campaign was successful for 12 workers, because 12 workers were given hush money.


Twelve workers did not get penalty rates. On Saturdays they were paid \$25.80 an hour; they should have been paid \$28.65. On Sundays they were paid \$28.30 an hour; they were supposed to be paid \$33.43. On public holidays they were paid \$33.30 an hour; they were supposed to be paid \$45.75. Thirty-four other workers did not get a single cent extra at any stage.

The Capalaba Sports Club is now advertising its Christmas Day specials. On Christmas Day, casuals will be working at the Capalaba Sports Club who will not be paid a cent more than they are getting right now. I do not want the club to be the Grinch of this Christmas. It should reverse its decision and bring back penalty rates, because it is the legal minimum to give back night-time penalties, weekend penalties and public holiday penalties. Those on the other side should listen, because we stand up for workers' penalty rates and they do not.

*Tabled paper:* Document, undated, of the Capalaba Sports Club advertisement for Christmas Day buffet [\[1640\]](#).

(Time expired)

### Medicinal Cannabis

 **Mr KNUTH** (Dalrymple—KAP) (2.45 pm): I rise to speak to the House on an issue that has the potential to provide economic benefits, health benefits and research opportunities in Queensland. Currently, the cultivation of cannabis is prohibited in Queensland. This also includes the cultivation, possession and use of cannabis for the relief of pain by terminally patients and by children with drug-resistant epilepsy. Medical cannabis has many other benefits, but that is not what I am here to speak about today.


In the last few months, as the federal government moves closer to legalising the cultivation of medical cannabis, I have been approached by farmers in my electorate who tell me that they would embrace the opportunity to work with the government as growers of this new emerging medical crop. The warm and wet Atherton Tablelands is well situated climatically for the production of medical cannabis and, despite over 80 per cent of the state being in drought, this small area in my electorate, adjacent to the Wet Tropics, has reliable rainfall and consistent annual averages with well-drained fertile soil. The Atherton Tablelands is an ideal place to become the centre of cultivation for growing medical cannabis in Queensland. The area has the capacity to grow consistent crops. The emerging hydroponic industry in Tolga is a strong testament to the availability of good agricultural ground, secure growing conditions and reliable supply.



I make one point clear: I am not supporting the legalisation of cannabis as a recreational drug. I support legalising a new crop that will bring not only much needed pain relief and health benefits to those who need to use it, but also an alternative crop for Queensland farmers. The more we support new agricultural industries in Queensland, the greater our state will be.

Queensland is leading the way in the research and development of new and innovative medicines. Recent headlines showcase just how well the state is performing in research and development. The National Health and Medical Research Council has awarded a total of almost \$54 million to 84 projects. In the very recent nationwide announcement of competitive research funding, the National Health and Medical Research Council also revealed that it would fund two new collaborative centres of research excellence at the University of Queensland. Queensland has everything that is needed to cultivate, process and trial medical cannabis. I urge the state government to move out of its comfort zone and embrace the opportunity to become a leader in this new industry.

### Compton Road Land Bridge

 **Mr PEGG** (Stretton—ALP) (2.49 pm): I want to speak about the fauna structures on Compton Road adjacent to the Karawatha Forest and Kuraby Bushland Reserve. Whilst these fauna structures are well known to many locals, I am sure there are many people who drive under the land bridge along Compton Road each day unaware of what this bridge does and how it helps to protect our native wildlife.


Back in May I joined with members of the Karawatha Forest Protection Society and community members for a walk and talk on animals and birds using the Compton Road land bridge by Professor Darryl Jones from Griffith University. I think I can speak for everyone who attended and say that it was great to have someone like Professor Jones, who is an expert on environmental issues, to come with us on this walk and hear about the success of the Compton Road land bridge.

Compton Road was developed from a two-lane road to a four-lane road back in 2004. These plans to widen the road rightly raised significant community concerns about the impact on the fauna in the adjacent Karawatha Forest and Kuraby Bushland Reserve. In response to these concerns raised by the community, the Karawatha Forest Protection Society, local wildlife agencies, the state government and then councillor Gail MacPherson, a range of wildlife crossing structures were installed, including: a 15- to 20-metre-wide and 70-metre-long land bridge with soil, vegetation and landscape features; fauna exclusion fencing; glider poles which are vertical poles spanning the length of the land bridge, which provide landing pads and launch opportunities; three canopy bridges comprising poles and rope bridges suspended above traffic; two wet culverts for stormwater management and wildlife passage; and two fauna underpasses comprising concrete underpasses with fauna-friendly running tracks. The objective of these structures was to reduce roadkill, enhance connectivity, maintain genetic diversity and enable the dispersal and recolonisation of wildlife, effectively attempting to reduce the impact on wildlife of the larger road.

The great thing about these structures is that they have been a fantastic success. As of this year, five fauna overpasses have been established in Australia, predominantly in northern New South Wales and South-East Queensland. Of these overpasses, the Compton Road fauna structures are the most intensively studied of all of these structures.

I commend everyone involved, and particularly the members of the Karawatha Forest Protection Society, for their work in establishing these structures and also their ongoing stewardship. I particularly want to mention Paula Ross and Alf Lacis. I hope that community members might consider joining the Karawatha Forest Protection Society on one of their future walks. I commend all those involved in ensuring that these structures were established and continue to educate the community about the benefits they provide for natural wildlife.

### Country Racing

 **Mr SEENEY** (Callide—LNP) (2.52 pm): Country towns and country people remember well what the last Labor government did to country racing. The Queensland Country Racing Committee is now fighting a rearguard action to ensure that this particular Labor government cannot again strip the heart out of country racing across Queensland.

The statistics have been put before this House before. We would do well to remember that country race clubs conduct some 279 race meetings each year—a lot more race meetings now than when the former Labor government was in power. Some 12,000 horses participate in those races, with country clubs spending \$1.3 million in advertising the racing industry in Queensland. The Queensland


Country Racing Committee has collected figures that indicate some 10,000 people are employed in country racing. The country racing clubs are an essential part of the fabric of rural communities right across Queensland.

The races this weekend are on at Mount Perry. Mount Perry is a race club that has conducted races for about 108 years. When the former Labor government was in power they took away the race meeting at Mount Perry. We returned it. We returned the races to Mount Perry. We brought the races back to Mount Perry. This Saturday when they start in the Mount Perry Cup everybody on the course at Mount Perry will remember what the former Labor government did. Everyone at Mount Perry will be wanting to know what the future is for the Mount Perry races and for country racing generally.

There has been great support for country racing from communities across Queensland—great corporate support. Evolution Mining that operates the Mount Rawdon gold mine at Mount Perry will be the major sponsors of the Mount Perry Cup this Saturday. That is a good example of what has happened across country Queensland. Corporate entities and community members have come together to boost prize money to build country racing from the devastation that was imposed upon it by the former Labor government.

What the country racing community needs now and what the Queensland Country Racing Committee needs now is some assurances from the minister. We need some assurances from the government to give some security to those people who work, mainly in a voluntary capacity, to ensure that race meetings, such as the one at Mount Perry, continue to provide the great community social focus that they have for the last 100 years for the next 100 years. Those people deserve that security. They deserve some information from the minister and some reassurance that this government is not going to cut the heart and soul out of country racing like the former Labor government did.

### Business Foreclosures

 **Mr PEARCE** (Mirani—ALP) (2.55 pm): Having been raised on the land in north-west New South Wales, I can rightly claim that I have a connection and understanding of the everyday challenges of rural families, the communities they depend on and the primary industry sector that is in the region—whether that is livestock, cropping, irrigation or any other primary production commodity. I can say in this place today that, yes, management and operational practices have changed. There is a greater reliance on technology and an improved management of the land and the farm business.


While I have been around for several decades of change, I continue to have that inner feeling of respect and care for the land. I continue to respect and admire the strength of the families who choose to live and work on the land, providing clean, green product for internal and external food supplies.

Last week I sat with the husband and wife owners of a medium size business near Mackay and heard their story about how they started off with a small service provider business to construction sites and mine sites in the Bowen Basin. I heard how they worked long hours to build their small business and double its size within a few years. Like so many similar size businesses operating in a declining economic environment, this modest couple are now experiencing foreclosure as a result of the end of the construction phase in mining.

While I am no expert in the finance sector, I want to make some comment about foreclosure. Foreclosure is on the rise as the economy falters and the devastating drought continues to take with it jobs and result in a declining cash flow. The foreclosure process allows a lender to take back ownership of a property or business regardless of its size or financial record. If a business is unable to maintain its repayments it is targeted by the bank or the other financial institution they are with.

We all understand that prolonged drought and dry spells can adversely impact on those people who choose to live and work on the land. I must say at this point that there are some businesses that just fail in the management of their businesses. This failure can be because of excessive debt, poor management, the climate or economic circumstances. Business owners understand that.

### Remembrance Day

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (2.58 pm): Yesterday we paused for Remembrance Day. I know that around the electorate of Nanango and all across the state our dedicated RSL subbranches conducted special services to commemorate this very important day. I wanted to pass on my heartfelt thanks to all of my local subbranches and RSLs for the work they do year round to support our veterans and help us remember the impact of war.

Remembrance Day marks the day in 1918 when World War I ended and it also helps us remember the loss of Australian lives from all wars and conflicts from World War I to the current conflicts. We pause to reflect on the young lives lost and pay tribute to the ultimate sacrifice that they have made in the name of peace. In regional areas like the Nanango electorate, the losses during World War I and World II had major impacts on our small towns with local war memorials bearing many names of the young men and women who never returned.

Today though I would like to pay tribute to one young man who did return from World War II and has since lived a peaceful and productive life with his wife and children residing in the small town of Yarraman. Mr Paul Tunn, who is now a lively 93 years old, fought in the skies above France and Germany in a Halifax bomber. He was part of a seven-man crew in the No. 158 Squadron, which made their first operational flight just six days after D-day to Amiens in northern France where they bombed a rail junction and marshalling yards. He flew 36 sorties between June and November in 1944, serving as a wireless operator in the Halifax crew.

Mr Tunn is a humble man and over the past few years I have come to know him better and learn more about his life and his service. In June this year, he was just one of 17 Australian World War II veterans who received the highest honour that can be awarded by the French government—the Legion of Honour medal. This medal is the premier order of the French Republic created by Napoleon Bonaparte in 1802. Men, women, French citizens and foreigners, regardless of rank, birth or religion, can be admitted to any of these classes.

While it was some 70 years later that he was presented with this honour, the French government said the honour was a way for their country to express the depth of its gratitude to the liberators of France. Mr Tunn now wears the medal with pride and we are extremely privileged to have him as a member of our community. I caught up with Mr Tunn just recently at the opening of the Military Museum at Yarraman's Heritage House. I acknowledge Helene Johnson, who is the driving force behind Heritage House and this new museum, and the wonderful work of the volunteers who put the displays together.

The Yarraman Military Museum is a remarkable display of our military mystery, particularly in the South Burnett, and it includes up to 30 guns dating back to 1856. I would like to thank all of the locals around Yarraman. I also thank Terry Reid and Tom Clarke, both active members of the local Yarraman RSL, for the work that they do in our local communities.

### Medicinal Cannabis



**Mr RYAN** (Morayfield—ALP) (3.01 pm): Whilst the Queensland government has announced its support for the commencement in 2016 of trials of pharmaceutical cannabis for children with drug-resistant epilepsy, many local people have met with me to discuss their desire to progress law reform in respect of medicinal cannabis. Those people have told me about their personal stories involving the medical conditions of family members and friends—people like Eamonn.

Eamonn has to be one of the happiest people I have ever met. He is a young man with a huge smile and an even bigger heart. I have known Eamonn's family for more than 20 years. Since before the last election, I have spoken with Eamonn's mum at length about the terrifying and sometimes daily epileptic seizures that Eamonn experiences. I cannot imagine the distress that Eamonn's mum must go through when she is holding her son in her arms and feeling helpless to prevent or control Eamonn's seizures. Surely we can do more to help Eamonn and his mum and people like them.

There are many other people with similar stories. It is hard not to be moved by the heartfelt stories from people who have debilitating conditions which may be relieved by medicinal cannabis use. I am pleased that the Premier is listening to these stories, and I commend the compassionate and courageous decision by the Queensland government to commit to supporting the trials of pharmaceutical cannabis for children with drug-resistant epilepsy. However, it is important for all members to also think about how other progress can be made. In that respect, I ask members of this House to turn their minds to how the Queensland government can progress the further trials of medicinal cannabis.

Thought should also be given to how the Queensland government can progress the recent announcement that the federal government intends to introduce a licensing scheme for the domestic supply of medicinal cannabis. As global supplies of medicinal cannabis are relatively scarce and expensive, the introduction of a national licensing scheme is essential. I encourage the Queensland government to consider how we can be a leader in relation to the rollout of this licensing scheme.


The stories about children experiencing life-threatening seizures, the stories about the nausea experienced by cancer sufferers undergoing chemotherapy, the stories about those people experiencing debilitating end-of-life pain should move us all and should call us all to act compassionately in respect of how we can act to assist them further.

## SUSTAINABLE PORTS DEVELOPMENT BILL

### Second Reading

Resumed from p. 2861, on motion of Dr Lynham—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Hon. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (3.04 pm), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions to the debate on the Sustainable Ports Development Bill. The debate before the House reinforces the previous government's lack of recognition of the scale of the problem confronting the Great Barrier Reef and its unwillingness to take the necessary action to protect it. The members opposite were prepared to defer debate on this bill—they were happy to risk international confidence in the ability of this government to protect the reef. They were also happy to leave all stakeholders in a state of uncertainty.

This bill is the product of many people who have worked hard and given of their time and expertise in delivering a bill that will achieve the right balance between protection of the reef and economic development. I think all members on this side of the House can be very proud that they have contributed to the World Heritage Committee's unanimous decision not to place the Great Barrier Reef on its World Heritage in-danger list. The former government simply did not give the international community sufficient assurance that it would better manage the impacts of port development on the Great Barrier Reef. What is disappointing is that it is still not prepared to do so.

The Palaszczuk government is taking substantial action needed to secure the reef's long-term health, and this bill is part of that action. In my opening remarks I emphasised that we are a consultative government that listens and responds. That is exactly what we have done in accepting the recommendations of the committee and taking on board the views of those who have made submissions during the committee's examination of this bill.

Through this bill, the Palaszczuk government is leading the way in setting a new national standard for port planning and sustainable port development. We have strengthened the opportunities for the public to have their say in and understand the way the priority ports of Gladstone, Abbot Point, Townsville, Hay Point and Mackay plan for future growth and development. This government is committed to supporting Cairns, its port, the industries that rely on the port and the community of Cairns. We have listened to all those concerned about the future of the port of Cairns and, through the amendments to the bill, we have established a clear direction on how the port of Cairns will be able to take up future development opportunities that will not impact on the reef. There is no better example of this government listening to stakeholders and sticking to its international commitments than this bill.

I would now like to address some of the points raised during the debate. I refer firstly to the points raised by the member for Hinchinbrook. The member referred to the LNP's bill and its requirements, particularly the time frame within which the minister had to make a master plan for a priority port. The previous bill had a three-year time frame. This government has already started work on master planning, and I can confirm today the time frames for proposed master planning for each priority port: Abbot Point and Townsville will start in 2016; Hay Point and Mackay will start in 2017; and it is anticipated that master planning for the Port of Gladstone will be completed by the end of 2016.

**Mr Cripps:** It is not in the bill though, is it?

**Dr LYNHAM:** So for the communities the timing for master planning of ports is not important? So the communities do not deserve to know when their ports are being master planned? The communities do not need to be informed as far as the member for Hinchinbrook is concerned. We take these communities much more seriously than those opposite.

The member for Hinchinbrook also claims the government is interfering in Ports North's recalibration of the Cairns Shipping Development Project. The member seems to think that the Cairns shipping development environmental impact statement could examine all options for the development of the port of Cairns—this is simply not correct.

**Mr Cripps:** It could. It used to before you got involved.

**Dr LYNHAM:** The scope of the EIS must be limited to the channel and swing basins only—the EIS cannot extend to the inner harbour of Cairns. For the benefit of the member over there who interjects on the topic, the scope of the EIS was declared a coordinated project by the Coordinator-General in September 2012 and the scope has not changed since then. All we have done is to impose a requirement that the project must be commercially viable and will require land based disposal or beneficial re-use of dredge material. Surely no-one—not even those opposite—could support a dredging project that is not economically or environmentally responsible.

The member also asked how the government could justify allowing small-scale incremental capital dredging in the port of Cairns and not in other non-priority ports. I refer to the findings of the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee on this matter. The committee ran a very thorough process and consulted widely and made a recommendation only about the port of Cairns. We have listened and responded accordingly. The member for Burleigh seems to think his committee recommended that the port of Cairns be declared a priority port. That is not correct. The committee recommended only that it be considered as a priority port, which we did. Amendments to the bill will allow small-scale capital dredging at the port of Cairns confined to the inner harbour, outside any state or Commonwealth marine park and subject to both project and total volumetric limits.

The member for Clayfield asked about the evidence behind the limits that have been decided for the Cairns inner harbour capital dredging. These limits were developed following extensive consultation with stakeholders in Cairns. Apart from a small handful of people, this approach has widespread support. Critically, it is supported by Ports North. If anyone understands the future needs for capital dredging in the port of Cairns, it is Ports North. Ports North has supplied a detailed estimate of future likely needs for capital dredging in the inner harbour. A range of small projects may be needed to upgrade port facilities for sugar, general cargo, shipyards, commercial fishing and other marine industries. As I mentioned in my opening remarks, a great example of a potential need to upgrade port facilities is the opportunity of the Pacific Patrol Boat Replacement Project currently out for tender by the Department of Defence. This project is worth \$594 million and potentially \$1.38 billion over 30 years, and fits well with Queensland's niche capacity to build and sustain navy vessels up to 2,000 tonnes.

Ports North has estimated that capital dredging of less than 50,000 cubic metres would be needed to support this expansion. This is fact. We have included a review of the inner harbour capital dredging limits within four years because no-one can perfectly predict future needs. The proposed limits are based on the best available information, but they may need to change after we have seen four years of the operation.

I would like to take the opportunity to correct the record about historical dredging proposals at Abbot Point. Even though I was not in parliament at that stage, we have reviewed the record and the members for Hinchinbrook and Callide made a claim that the previous ALP government proposed dredging of 38 million cubic metres of capital material. That is correct, but that material was intended to be used for land reclamation to create a multicargo facility. This was set out clearly in the project's initial advice statement in July 2009. The federal Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act referral used similar wording.

What about the MCF proposal? Yes, it was ambitious. However, it was a long-term expansion plan and no different in concept to port expansion projects still underway, and very successful, in our ports including Brisbane, Gladstone and Townsville. It was about more than coal. It was about multicargoes, as its name suggests. Along came the Newman government in 2012 which simply scrapped these plans. Instead, interestingly they proposed dumping three million cubic metres at sea in the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area. This was the responsibility of the former LNP government and, in particular, the member for Callide. This was right at the time that Queensland and Australia were under the international spotlight about its management of ports in the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area. In response to public pressure and international scrutiny, the Newman government did alter the plan and instead decided to dump the dredge spoil into the Caley Valley wetland. The Palaszczuk government has now restored sanity and has come up with a workable plan to pump the dredge material to land for beneficial reuse. The EIS process for the Abbot Point Growth Gateway Project is now coming to a close, and I am confident that we will receive Commonwealth approval shortly.

It saddened me to hear the appalling attack from the member for Callide on the chairman of Gladstone Ports Corporation, Mr Leo Zussino. This man has done so much to bring about the economic development of this state, the resources industry and Gladstone, and is someone who I know is very conscious of the environmental obligations the port has, given the special place it exists in. He has done more for the environment than most of those opposite. For example, when he was chair of the Australian Maritime Safety Authority it was Mr Zussino who recommended to the then prime minister of

Australia, Mr Kevin Rudd, after the *Shen Neng 1* incident that AMSA apply to the International Maritime Organization to have the 'particularly sensitive seaway' declaration for the Great Barrier Reef extended all the way to the bottom of the reef. This declaration facilitated the introduction of a reef vessel tracking system for the southern Barrier Reef. That system is now operational, with a command centre in Gladstone which controls movements of all large shipping in the declared area. As chair of AMSA, he also initiated development of the north-west and north-east shipping management plans which have facilitated increased safety of bulk shipping through pristine parts of Australia's coastline.

Both the member for Hinchinbrook and the member for Burleigh raised the key differences between the LNP bill and the government bill before the House. The purpose of the government's bill is to balance protection of the Great Barrier Reef with managing port related development responsibly. By complete contrast, the prime purpose of the LNP's lapsed bill was economic growth. One has to ask whether the LNP's bill would have satisfied UNESCO and kept the Barrier Reef off the in-danger list. I also ask what would have happened if the LNP were re-elected. Would they have sold Townsville port and then the other ports one by one? What was their plan for the port of Cairns? Would this have been sold along with the rest? This bill bans sea based disposal of port related capital dredged material in the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area. The member for Burleigh suggested that the previous LNP government was considering banning sea based disposal. However, all we know is that it was not included in their bill introduced in November last year. An additional protection for the reef in the bill before the House is that there are no time restrictions on its prohibitions on capital dredging for new port facilities and greenfield ports outside existing port limits, unlike the LNP's previous bill.

Another notable contrast between this government's bill and the LNP's bill is that this bill has the support of the two largest economic voices in the Cairns community—the Cairns Chamber of Commerce and Advance Cairns. Unlike those opposite, this government has been able to work constructively with important stakeholder groups including the World Wildlife Fund, the Environmental Defenders Office and the Australian Marine Conservation Society. We have been able to find the correct solution through respectful dialogue and achieve the right balance in terms of protection of the reef and economic development.

The member for Burleigh also raised the question that, if the government has been able to come up with this solution for Cairns, why is a similar solution not available for Port Alma? The answer is quite simple. In the Reef 2050 Plan, action EHA22 states that the government will protect the Fitzroy delta including north Curtis Island and Keppel Bay. As members are aware, the Reef 2050 Plan is a joint Commonwealth-state document.

This bill will give communities a say in the future development of their ports. Master planning will facilitate coordinated planning of land and marine areas by identifying state interests through a cooperative approach. Existing planning authorities will retain their decision-making roles by ensuring state interests are managed consistently. This government respects the independence of statutory authorities and their ability to make decisions in the state's interests. Accordingly, both the Coordinator-General and the Minister for Economic Development Queensland will retain their roles and manage land uses in their respective areas of responsibility. This bill clearly requires all the planning entities to agree on stated objectives and management measures for development of economic opportunities and key environmental values.

The outcome will bring certainty to ports, associated industries and, most importantly, the community. The measures will enable preservation of areas for future essentials that a growing port will require, such as infrastructure corridors for road, rail, gas and water pipelines and powerlines. It will protect areas that support community needs as well as sensitive environmental areas. A statutory review of these objectives will involve public consultation, giving the public and stakeholders an opportunity to have their say in how the objectives are being met and balanced for the benefit of ports and the community and the protection of the reef. Master planning will also ensure the outstanding universal value of the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area is an intrinsic consideration in future port development.

As well as being an Australian icon and a world renowned ecosystem of the utmost heritage value, the Great Barrier Reef contributes \$6 billion annually to the Queensland economy and supports over 70,000 jobs. I recognise here that the opposition have said that they will support this bill. We appreciate that but note, having heard the debate in this place over the past days, that it is grudging support. There has been an attempt to rewrite history on some issues, and I hope I have corrected that with my speech. The members opposite say that this bill is close to theirs. How close? We do not think it is, and if they thought that as well why did we have speaker after speaker attacking this government

and aspects of the bill while saying they support this bill? It is politics—LNP politics, which is more important to them than Cairns, Gladstone, Mackay and Townsville and, most importantly, the Great Barrier Reef. They are putting politics over our communities and over our reef.

I thank the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee once again for their robust examination of the Sustainable Ports Development Bill 2015 and all those who participated in the committee's examination. Again, I thank all honourable members for their contributions to the debate today. I commend this bill to the House.

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

Resolved in the affirmative under standing order 106.

Bill read a second time.

### Consideration in Detail

Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Clause 2—



**Mr CRIPPS** (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (3.27 pm): I move the following amendment—

1

#### **Clause 2 (Purpose of Act)**

Page 6, lines 8 to 26 and page 7, lines 1 to 8—

*omit, insert—*

- (1) The purpose of this Act is to provide for the sustainable development of Queensland's ports to facilitate economic growth while protecting and managing Queensland's environmental assets.
- (2) The purpose is achieved through planning for the efficient use and development of major ports in a way that—
  - (a) increases their contribution to the State's economy; and
  - (b) protects and manages environmental assets, including the Great Barrier Reef; and
  - (c) is consistent with ecologically sustainable development.
- (3) Also, the purpose is to be achieved in a way that includes the following—
  - (a) long-term planning for priority ports to provide a strategic and coordinated approach to managing economic, environmental, cultural and social values in the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area;
  - (b) concentrating port development in priority ports;
  - (c) recognising the diverse functions of the port network, including trade, tourism and defence operations;
  - (d) efficiently using port and supply chain infrastructure;
  - (e) expanding port and supply chain capacity in a staged and incremental way to meet emerging demand for imports and exports;
  - (f) identifying and protecting land and infrastructure critical to the effective operation of the port network;
  - (g) maximising the community and economic benefits of port development and minimising potential adverse impacts on social, environmental and cultural heritage values;
  - (h) avoiding unacceptable impacts on environmental values by having regard to the avoid, mitigate, offset hierarchy.
- (4) The **avoid, mitigate, offset hierarchy** is the following precepts, listed in the preferred order in which land use planning for ports should be considered—
  - (a) avoid impacts on environmental values, including on any of the following—
    - (i) a matter of national environmental significance under the Commonwealth Environment Act, chapter 2;
    - (ii) an outstanding universal value within the meaning of the World Heritage Convention (Article 11);
    - (iii) a matter of State environmental significance that is prescribed as a prescribed environmental matter under the *Environmental Offsets Act 2014*;
  - (b) mitigate impacts on environmental values;
  - (c) offset any significant residual loss of environmental values that can not be avoided or mitigated.
- (5) In this section—

**World Heritage Convention** means the Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage that has been adopted by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, a copy of which is set out in the *Wet Tropics World Heritage and Protection Management Act 1993*, schedule 2.

Consistent with the comments I made during my contribution in the second reading debate on this bill, I indicate to the House that in my opinion the purpose of this bill is narrow and does not take into consideration the important economic and social role that the ports on the east coast of Queensland adjacent to the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area play in the economic development and support of the communities in those regions of Queensland. As evidence of that, I indicate that proposed subclause 2(1) of the bill before the House, under the heading 'Purpose of Act', states—

The purpose of this Act is to provide for the protection of the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area through managing port-related development in and adjacent to the area.

That is the only area that is described as part of the purpose of the act in proposed subclause 2(1) of the bill. The amendment that I have moved acknowledges that the environment of Queensland is extremely important and should be recognised, but it also recognises in terms of the Sustainable Ports Development Bill that those pieces of infrastructure play a wider and broader role in Queensland. The purpose of the act that I have drafted and moved reads as follows—

The purpose of this Act is to provide for the sustainable development of Queensland's ports to facilitate economic growth while protecting and managing Queensland's environmental assets.

The alternative purpose of the act that I have moved goes on to nominate the Great Barrier Reef and the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area on a number of occasions throughout the text. As I indicated earlier, I think this is a more broad and appropriate purpose for this particular piece of legislation. The other feature of the alternative purpose of the act that I have moved is the inclusion of the 'avoid, mitigate, offset' hierarchy.

In my opinion this will give the legislation access to the 'avoid, mitigate, offset' hierarchy, which is not part of the purpose that is currently included in the 2015 bill before the House. It is desirable to give the sustainable ports development act framework access to the offsets hierarchy to achieve better environmental outcomes in the long term but with the maximum flexibility allowed to achieve those particular outcomes.

**Dr LYNHAM:** The proposed amendments to the purpose of the bill moved by the member for Hinchinbrook are based largely on the purpose of the 2014 bill. They are very familiar—they look familiar, they smell familiar. Honourable members will recall that the purpose of the 2014 bill was to ensure that the major ports adjacent to the reef were asset sale ready. The proposed amendments seek to fundamentally change the purpose of the bill. What we are trying to achieve is protection of the Great Barrier Reef while providing for sustainable port development.

**Mr Seeney** interjected.

**Mr Cripps:** That is a ridiculous red herring.

**Dr LYNHAM:** It is the same thing.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Members, this is not an opportunity for debate. Member for Hinchinbrook, you have spoken. The minister is speaking. Member for Callide, if you want to speak I invite you to speak at the appropriate time. I call the minister.

**Dr LYNHAM:** We are trying to protect the reef. Those on the other side are simply going back to their previous strategy and that is to package up the priority ports for asset sales. Their ports bill was designed to maximise control over port land and minimise future costs of dredging. Fundamentally, it was about getting the highest price for the ports in their assets sell-off. Why else would they want to remove from the purpose clause prohibitions on dredging and sea based disposal of capital dredging? The proposed amendments include the reintroduction of the 'avoid, mitigate, offset' hierarchy. We cannot support this as it is simply not consistent with the Reef 2050 Plan. The Queensland and Australian governments have agreed to move on from this. We have now committed to ensuring that all development provides a net benefit to the reef.

**Ms Trad** interjected.

**Mr Seeney** interjected.

**Dr LYNHAM:** The purpose clause as introduced reflects our commitment to achieving an effective balance between reef and economic development. Changing the purpose of the bill to focus on economic growth at the expense of the reef would be a disastrous outcome for the reef and for the people of Queensland. Changing the purpose clause to ratchet up the purchase price for eventual sale is a travesty. Clearly, those opposite have not abandoned their old ways. To support the proposed amendment would be to go back to the old ways of thinking, and this is simply not acceptable. The purpose clause of the member's amendment gives it away. We cannot support this amendment.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Deputy Premier, I urge you not to bait the member for Callide.



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

**AYES, 44:**

**LNP, 42**—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, Watts, Weir.

**KAP, 2**—Katter, Knuth.

**NOES, 44:**

**ALP, 43**—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, Palaszcuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Pyne, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

**INDEPENDENT, 1**—Gordon.

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

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Mr Cripps) negated.

Clause 2, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 31—



**Dr LYNHAM** (3.40 pm): I seek leave to move amendments en bloc.

Leave granted.

**Dr LYNHAM:** I move the following amendments—

**1 Clause 6 (Master planned areas)**

Page 8, lines 16 and 17, 'under the Transport Infrastructure Act'—  
*omit.*

**2 Clause 9 (Process for making or amending master plans)**

Page 10, lines 15 to 17—  
*omit.*

**3 Clause 12 (Making proposed master plan or amendment)**

Page 13, line 6, 'notice'—  
*omit, insert—*

public notice and the master plan or amendment

**4 Clause 12 (Making proposed master plan or amendment)**

Page 13, lines 11 to 13—  
*omit, insert—*

(4) Within 14 sitting days after the master plan or amendment is made, the Minister must table in the Legislative Assembly a copy of the master plan or amendment.

(5) If the Minister decides not to make the proposed master plan or amendment, the Minister must—

(a) publish the decision in a public notice; and

(b) give each entity mentioned in section 11(3) a copy of the public notice.

**5 After clause 12**

Page 13, after line 13—  
*insert—*

**12A Administrative amendments**

(1) The Minister may make an administrative amendment of a master plan without complying with sections 10 to 12.

(2) Instead, the Minister may make an administrative amendment of a master plan by publishing a public notice that states—

(a) the day the amendment was made; and

(b) where a copy of the amended master plan may be inspected and purchased.

(3) The Minister must give each entity mentioned in section 11(3) a copy of the public notice and the amended master plan.

**6 Clause 15 (Notice of review)**

Page 14, lines 20 to 28—  
*omit, insert—*

Minister must publish a public notice stating that—

(a) the Minister proposes to review the master plan; and

(b) an entity may make a written submission to the Minister about the proposal within a stated period of at least 20 business days.

- (2) The Minister must give a copy of the public notice to the following entities—
  - (a) the port authority for the priority port;
  - (b) each affected local government;
  - (c) if the master planned area is within, or includes, a priority development area—MEDQ;
  - (d) if the master planned area is within, or includes, a State development area—the Coordinator-General.

**7 Clause 17 (Action Minister must take after review)**

Page 15, line 15, after 'plan'—

*insert—*

for a priority port, including considering all submissions made in accordance with the public notice

**8 Clause 17 (Action Minister must take after review)**

Page 15, lines 22 and 23—

*omit, insert—*

must—

- (a) table in the Legislative Assembly a report stating the reasons for the decision; and
- (b) give notice of the decision to each entity mentioned in section 15(2).

**9 Before clause 22**

Page 18, after line 6—

*insert—*

**21A Preparing and notifying draft instrument**

- (1) If the Minister proposes to make or amend a port overlay for a priority port's master planned area, the Minister must prepare a draft of the proposed port overlay or amendment (the ***draft instrument***).
- (2) After preparing the draft instrument, the Minister must publish a public notice stating—
  - (a) where copies of the instrument may be inspected and purchased; and
  - (b) a phone number or email address to contact for information about the instrument; and
  - (c) that an entity may make a written submission to the Minister about any aspect of the instrument; and
  - (d) the requirements for properly making a submission; and
  - (e) the period (the ***consultation period***) within which a submission may be made, which must be at least 10 business days after the public notice is published in the gazette.
- (3) The Minister must give a copy of the public notice and the draft instrument to the following entities—
  - (a) the port authority for the priority port to which the draft instrument relates;
  - (b) each affected local government;
  - (c) if the master planned area is within, or includes, a State development area—the Coordinator-General;
  - (d) if the master planned area is within, or includes, a priority development area—MEDQ.
- (4) For all of the consultation period, the Minister must keep a copy of the draft instrument available for inspection and purchase by members of the public at the department's head office.

**10 Clause 22 (Making or amending port overlays)**

Page 18, lines 8 to 24—

*omit, insert—*

- (1) After the Minister considers all submissions made in accordance with the public notice, the Minister must decide—
  - (a) to make the proposed port overlay or amendment; or
  - (b) to make the proposed port overlay or amendment with the changes the Minister considers appropriate; or
  - (c) not to make the proposed port overlay or amendment.
- (2) If the Minister decides to make the proposed port overlay or amendment (with or without changes), the Minister must—
  - (a) publish the decision in a public notice stating—
    - (i) the day the port overlay, or amendment, (the ***instrument***) was made; and
    - (ii) where a copy of the instrument is available for inspection and purchase; and
    - (iii) for an amendment of a port overlay—a brief description of the amendment; and
  - (b) give each entity mentioned in section 21A(3) a copy of the public notice and the instrument.

**11 Clause 22 (Making or amending port overlays)**

Page 18, line 27, '(1)'—

*omit, insert—*

(2)

**12 After clause 22**

Page 19, after line 8—

*insert—***22A Administrative amendments**

- (1) The Minister may make an administrative amendment of a port overlay without complying with sections 21A and 22.
- (2) Instead, the Minister may make an administrative amendment of a port overlay by publishing a public notice that states—
  - (a) the day the amendment was made; and
  - (b) where a copy of the amended port overlay may be inspected and purchased.
- (3) The Minister must give each entity mentioned in section 21A(3) a copy of the public notice and the amended port overlay.

**13 Clause 29 (Requirement to review approved development schemes under State Development Act)**

Page 22, lines 17 to 20, from 'scheme' to 'decision.'—

*omit, insert—*

scheme—

- (a) the Coordinator-General must give the State Development Minister a report about the reasons for the decision; and
- (b) the State Development Minister must, within 14 sitting days after the decision is made, table the report in the Legislative Assembly.

**14 Clause 30 (Requirements for making or amending approved development schemes under State Development Act)**

Page 22, line 27—

*omit, insert—*

- (2) Subsections (3) and (4) apply if—

**15 Clause 30 (Requirements for making or amending approved development schemes under State Development Act)**

Page 23, lines 4 to 7—

*omit, insert—*

- (3) The Coordinator-General must give the State Development Minister a report stating the reasons for making the instrument despite the inconsistency.
- (4) The State Development Minister must, within 14 sitting days after the instrument is made, table the report in the Legislative Assembly.

Amendments agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 31, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 32—

**Dr LYNHAM** (3.40 pm): I move the following amendments—**16 Clause 32 (Particular applications for port facilities must be refused)**

Page 24, lines 13 to 15—

*omit, insert—*

- (b) the disposing, or depositing, of material generated from dredging activities.
- (3) Also, subsection (1) does not apply to development for, or relating to, a port facility for the Port of Gladstone if the development is carried out on an island—
  - (a) that, on 12 October 2015, was included in the special industry zone under the planning scheme made under the Planning Act for the Gladstone local government area; or
  - (b) that is completely or partly within the port's strategic port land, or a State development area, and the strategic port land or State development area is within, or adjacent to, the existing port limits of the Port of Gladstone.
- (4) This section applies despite the following—

**17 Clause 32 (Particular applications for port facilities must be refused)**

Page 24, line 20, '(4)'—

*omit, insert—*

- (5)



**Mr KNUTH:** I move the following amendment to the minister's amendment No. 16—

**1 Amendment to Minister's amendment No. 16**

Clause 32 (Particular applications for port facilities must be refused)—

Omit proposed subsection (2)(b) and insert—

- (b) the disposing, or depositing, of material generated from dredging activities;
- (c) development for, or relating to, a port facility for the Port of Cairns or the Port of Mourilyan.

**Mr KNUTH:** I table a copy of the amendment to the minister's amendment.

*Tabled paper:* Sustainable Ports Development Bill 2015: Amendments to the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources' amendments, to be moved in consideration in detail by the member for Dalrymple, Mr Shane Knuth [1641].

The amendments that I have circulated remove the ports of Mourilyan and Cairns from the Sustainable Ports Development Bill 2015 until the EIS has expired on 31 March 2016. Cairns interest groups have clearly stated that 50,000 cubic metres per project is insignificant and 150,000 capped over four years is completely insignificant. It will probably take 50 to 100 years for these projects, particularly when Cairns is looking to get international cruise liners, cargo ships and sugar ships. There is also a 6,000-strong petition which indicates that the Cairns community is determined to see their port become a priority port or get a better deal than they have today.

I know that of course everyone has concerns about dredging in the Great Barrier Reef, but I think they are a little bit exaggerated. When I flew over Cairns after Cyclone Yasi, the devastation was such that the amount of percolating water would be 100,000 times greater than one dredging in that port, so the effects of dredging on the Great Barrier Reef are minute compared to just one cyclone and one storm alone. Cairns has air, rail and road links but they do not have a port, and all that they are asking for is to dredge so that international cruise ships, fuel tankers, sugar ships and navy ships can enter. We are debating something that will have little impact on the Great Barrier Reef, yet it is stalling development in the fastest-growing region in this state. These amendments remove Cairns and Mourilyan from this bill so they can be debated separately to other ports like Townsville and Gladstone, and I know that I have the support of the Cairns community.

**Dr LYNHAM:** I rise to respectfully oppose the amendments moved by the member for Dalrymple. Amendment No. 1 would have very limited effect and is unnecessary. Clause 32 of the bill already allows development within the limits of all ports. The proposal, which specifically allows port related development outside the port limits of Cairns and Mourilyan, does not make sense and is contrary to the commitments made in the Reef 2050 Plan.

Amendment No. 2 seeks to remove all restrictions on capital dredging in the ports of Cairns and Mourilyan. To amend the bill in this way for Cairns and Mourilyan, when both ports are clearly within the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area, completely defeats the purpose of the bill. I am afraid it would send a very poor message to Queensland, Australia and internationally as well as those who care for our environment and the economy of this state. It would allow the ports of Cairns and Mourilyan unfettered ability to develop without any of the safeguards of master planning, including a mechanism for measuring cumulative impacts on the Great Barrier Reef. This bill and the government's amendments are vital for managing the Great Barrier Reef, and their passage intact and in a timely fashion is critical. It fulfils our government's commitments made in bond to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization's World Heritage Committee in June 2015. Moreover, the contents of, and policy behind, the bill in that committee's unanimous decision were not to place the Great Barrier Reef on its in-danger list.

We recognise that the port of Cairns is critical economic infrastructure to its city, its region, its people and its business. To make it clear, the proposed legislation does not limit the port of Cairns from undertaking the following dredging: capital dredging within the inner harbour to a maximum of 50,000 cubic metres for a single project; and up to 150,000 cubic metres over a four-year period. Additional capital dredging is allowed for the Cairns Shipping Development Project. This includes the widening and deepening of the existing shipping channel and expansion of the swing basins and berth pockets used for cruise ships and navy vessels. Do not forget that it does include dredging for small-scale marine facilities such as tourism or recreational purposes for which Cairns is a very important port. This includes things like boat ramps, boat harbours and marinas, which are excluded from the bill; they are allowed to continue. Also of vital importance is that it allows maintenance dredging to continue. Once the capital dredging has been done, either by the in-port 50,000 limit or by a successful EIS, the maintenance dredging will enable it to still function through its lifetime.

Of course all dredging works are subject to rigorous approval processes. Any capital dredging must be commercially viable, and we have stated time and time again that there must be land based disposal or beneficial reuse. The government supports the port of Cairns being able to develop in a way

that does not harm the Great Barrier Reef. That is why we argue that the bill and the amendments to the bill which have been put forward must be passed. Any diversion from this road map to reef sustainability balanced with economic prosperity would be potentially disastrous for Australia and Queensland's reputations. There is no doubt that, under our proposal, as the great city of Cairns grows the port of Cairns can grow with it. Accordingly, I argue strongly that this bill should proceed without the amendments proposed by the member for Dalrymple.

**Mr CRIPPS:** In view of the concerns raised by the local community in Cairns and Far North Queensland, the concerns raised by organisations like Advance Cairns, the Cairns Chamber of Commerce, the mayor of Cairns and indeed the community organisation Cairns Port Development Inc., the LNP did investigate a range of options with respect to the provisions of this bill with a view to formulating amendments that addressed these concerns regarding the sustainable growth of non-priority ports in Queensland adjacent to the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area. To that end, the LNP consulted with the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment to try to determine amendments for this purpose that would not offend the agreement entered into by the Queensland and Australian governments and UNESCO. The LNP has been advised by the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment and his office that no amendments to this legislation which provide for capital expansion in a non-priority port, including specifically the wording of this amendment, would not offend that particular agreement with UNESCO.

During my contribution to the second reading debate I advised the House that the LNP was concerned about Queensland's international reputation as a steward of the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area and outlined our concern about industries such as the tourism industry being negatively impacted upon if UNESCO moved to remove the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area from the World Heritage List. Without advice from the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment that this amendment will not do that, the LNP cannot support the amendment and the LNP has not received any such advice.

The only other source of advice that could clarify if this amendment in particular is consistent with that agreement with UNESCO is the other signatory to that agreement—that is, the government of Queensland. It has not done so. In fact, even with the amendment that the minister has foreshadowed, the government has not really provided any supporting evidence that his amendment is consistent with the agreement with UNESCO. Without that justification, the LNP certainly cannot support an amendment that goes beyond what one of the signatories to the agreement is prepared to put forward, which is the compromise amendments submitted by the government.

It is, however, in my opinion very unfortunate that the government has failed to provide any robust justification for the compromise amendment volumes for small incremental capital works at the port of Cairns. If it had done so, the House could support the government's amendment with some more confidence that it does not contravene the agreement between the Queensland and Australian governments and UNESCO.

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

Resolved in the negative under standing order 106.

Non-government amendment (Mr Knuth) negatived.

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 32, as amended, agreed to.



**Dr LYNHAM** (3.58 pm): I move the following amendment—

**18 Part 3, division 3 (Capital dredging and disposal of dredge material)**

Page 25, lines 4 and 5, 'and disposal of dredge material'—

*omit.*

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 33—



**Dr LYNHAM** (3.58 pm): I move the following amendment—

**19 Clause 33 (No approvals for particular capital dredging)**

Page 25, lines 7 to 13—

*omit, insert—*

- (1) An approving authority must not give an approval for development that is, or includes, capital dredging if the dredging will be carried out—
  - (a) within a restricted area; and
  - (b) for the purpose of establishing, constructing or improving a port facility.

- (2) However, subsection (1) does not apply to an approval for development that is, or includes, capital dredging carried out for the purpose of establishing, constructing or improving a port facility—
  - (a) in a priority port's master planned area; or
  - (b) for the Port of Cairns, if—
    - (i) the dredging will be carried out in the port's inner harbour; and
    - (ii) the approval does not permit the extraction or excavation of more than 50,000m<sup>3</sup> of material; and
    - (iii) the approval will not result in more than 150,000m<sup>3</sup> of material being extracted from, or excavated in, the port's inner harbour in a 4-year period.
- (3) In calculating whether an approval will result in more than 150,000m<sup>3</sup> of material being extracted or excavated in a 4-year period, only the following amounts are relevant—
  - (a) the amount of material to be extracted or excavated under the approval;
  - (b) the amount of material extracted or excavated, or to be extracted or excavated, under another approval for development that is, or includes, capital dredging unless the capital dredging was the subject of an EIS process started before the commencement.

**Mr CRIPPS:** Amendment 19, moved by the minister, amends proposed clause 33 to allow an approving authority to approve capital dredging for the purpose of establishing, constructing or improving a port facility at the port of Cairns, and it allows for the compromise amendments that have been put forward by the minister and the government in relation to an individual project in the port of Cairns being 50,000 cubic metres or a total of not more than 150,000 cubic metres of capital dredge material in a four-year period.

The reason I wanted to speak to this particular clause is that, notwithstanding the questions that I asked during the course of the second reading debate, and notwithstanding the minister's opportunity to respond to those questions during his summing-up on the bill, the government still has not addressed this nagging question of where these volumes come from, how they are justified and why this diversion from the cardinal rule of not having any capital works in a non-priority port does not offend the agreement between the government of Queensland, the Australian government and UNESCO.

The explanatory notes accompanying these amendments state quite clearly that proposed clause 33 as amended will ensure the port of Cairns can expand without presenting a threat to the Great Barrier Reef. That sentence is contained within the explanatory notes accompanying this amendment, and I touched on this issue during the course of my contribution to the second reading debate where I quoted from the ministerial media release issued by the Premier, amongst other ministers, on 4 November. In that press release the Premier defined the commitment of the Palaszczuk government as follows—

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.

As I mentioned yesterday, Minister Bailey said that the dredging plan—that is, the compromised amendments put forward by the government—meant that future development at the port could continue and not negatively impact the reef, with port material not to be disposed of at sea. Those comments relate to these compromised volumes of 50,000 in any one project and 150,000 over any four years, but what has consistently been ignored and not explained is why, if those arrangements are appropriate for the port of Cairns and will not impact on the Great Barrier Reef going forward and do not offend the agreement with UNESCO, will not those arrangements also suffice for other non-priority ports on the east coast of Queensland that are adjacent to the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area and not be in place? What is the justification for this unique arrangement for the port of Cairns and not other non-priority ports?

**Dr LYNHAM:** I am happy to address the concerns to allay the fears of the member for Hinchinbrook and those opposite. It is quite simple. I did say in my second reading speech that the volumes were determined by Ports North. Ports North is the port authority. It obviously is the arbiter of what goes on in that port and it advised us quite simply that it could meet its obligations for port expansions to grow with the city of Cairns as Cairns grows by these limits of 50,000 per project, with a maximum of 150,000 over a four-year period. We have also been in consultation with the Department of the Environment in Canberra and also the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority and there appears to be no inconsistency with UNESCO with this finding. I have also been in contact by phone with the federal Minister for the Environment—it was a brief phone call and I must admit that I would ask for him to confirm because he had to go away and find some more details himself—but on that brief phone call he could see no difficulty with that. The main issues are that the Department of the Environment in Canberra has ticked it off, the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority has it ticked off, advice from Ports North—

**Mr Cripps:** But why are they unique—Cairns? That is my question.

**Dr LYNHAM:** To address that specific interjection as to why Cairns and not other ports, it is important that we identified four priority ports. These exemptions are taken with the utmost seriousness to protect the Barrier Reef. This exemption is a one-off because we listened to the people of Cairns. We heard how vital the Pacific patrol boats project was and those other little tiny projects that the people of Cairns wanted for their port. We listened carefully. It took us a long time to reach a decision by listening to the people of Cairns that this agreement was worthwhile. This agreement bedded down with environmental groups, the people of Cairns, Advance Cairns and Ports North to simply allow the simplest concept, and I will say it simply for you: as that rich and wonderful city of Cairns grows, its port can grow with it and keep the Great Barrier Reef in its pristine state.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 33, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 34 to 65—



**Dr LYNHAM** (4.02 pm): I seek leave to move amendments en bloc.

Leave granted.

**Dr LYNHAM:** I move the following amendments—

**20 Clause 34 (Restriction on granting approvals for disposal of prescribed dredge material)**

Page 25, lines 14 to 30—

*omit, insert—*

**34 Condition for approvals for particular capital dredging**

- (1) This section applies to an approval given by an approving authority for development that is, or relates to, capital dredging if the capital dredging is carried out—
  - (a) for the purpose of establishing, constructing or improving a port facility in a priority port's master planned area; or
  - (b) in the inner harbour of the Port of Cairns for the purpose of establishing, constructing or improving a port facility for the port.
- (2) The approval is taken to include a condition that material generated from the capital dredging must not be deposited, or disposed of, in a restricted area unless the material is beneficially reused.
 

*Examples of ways in which the material may be beneficially reused—*

  - for land reclamation
  - for beach nourishment
  - for environmental restoration purposes, such as creating or restoring wetlands or nesting islands
- (3) To remove any doubt, it is declared that this section applies to an approval whether it was given before or after the commencement.

**21 After clause 35**

Page 26, after line 8—

*insert—*

**35A Review of s 33 in relation to capital dredging for Port of Cairns**

- (1) The Minister must review the operation of section 33(2)(b) and (3) within 4 years after its commencement.
- (2) The object of the review is to decide whether section 33(2)(b) and (3) is effectively achieving a balance between economic development and the protection of the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area.
- (3) Before carrying out the review, the Minister must publish a public notice stating—
  - (a) that the Minister proposes to review the operation of section 33(2)(b) and (3); and
  - (b) a phone number or email address to contact for information about the review; and
  - (c) that an entity may make a written submission to the Minister about the review; and
  - (d) the requirements for properly making a submission; and
  - (e) the period within which a submission may be made, which must be at least 20 business days after the public notice is published in the gazette.
- (4) In carrying out the review, the Minister must consider all submissions made in accordance with the public notice.
- (5) The Minister must, as soon as practicable after finishing the review, table a report about the outcome of the review in the Legislative Assembly.

**22 Part 4, division 2 (Compensation for port overlays)**

Page 27, line 23 to page 32, line 26—

*omit.*

**23 Clause 56 (Registers)**

Page 34, line 10, 'division 3.'—

*omit, insert—*

division 3;

(d) proposed port overlays, or proposed amendments of port overlays, notified under section 21A;

(e) the matters raised in any submissions made to the Minister about—

(i) a proposed master plan, or proposed amendment of a master plan, notified under section 11; or

(ii) a proposed port overlay, or proposed amendment of a port overlay, notified under section 21A; or

(iii) a review notified under section 35A.

**24 Clause 60 (Particular development exempted)**

Page 35, line 22, 'Section 33'—

*omit, insert—*

Section 33(1)

**25 Clause 60 (Particular development exempted)**

Page 35, lines 25 to 26 and page 36, lines 1 to 13—

*omit.*

Amendments agreed to.

Clauses 34 to 65, as amended, agreed to.

Schedules 1 and 2—



**Dr LYNHAM** (4.05 pm): I seek leave to move amendments en bloc.

Leave granted.

**Dr LYNHAM:** I move the following amendments—

**26 Schedule 1 (Dictionary)**

Page 39, after line 2—

*insert—*

**administrative amendment**, of a master plan or port overlay, means an amendment correcting or changing—

(a) an explanatory matter about the instrument; or

(b) the format or presentation of the instrument; or

(c) a spelling, grammatical or mapping error in the instrument; or

(d) a factual matter incorrectly stated in the instrument; or

(e) a redundant or outdated term in the instrument; or

(f) inconsistent numbering of provisions in the instrument; or

(g) a cross-reference in the instrument.

**27 Schedule 1 (Dictionary)**

Page 39, line 8—

*omit.*

**28 Schedule 1 (Dictionary)**

Page 40, lines 13 and 14—

*omit, insert—*

(b) does not include dredging carried out for the purpose of—

(i) maintaining a channel, basin, port, berth or other similar thing for its intended use; or

(ii) protecting human life or property.

**29 Schedule 1 (Dictionary)**

Page 40, line 24—

*omit.*



**30 Schedule 1 (Dictionary)**

Page 40, line 27—

*omit.***31 Schedule 1 (Dictionary)**

Page 41, after line 2—

*insert—***EIS process** means any of the following processes—

- (a) an EIS process for development within the meaning of the Planning Act;
- (b) an EIS process for a project within the meaning of the Environmental Protection Act;
- (c) the process under the State Development Act, part 4, division 3, subdivision 1 for an environmental impact statement for a coordinated project under that Act;
- (d) the process under the Commonwealth Environment Act, chapter 4, part 8, division 6 for an environmental impact statement for an action under that Act;
- (e) the process under another Commonwealth Act for preparing an environmental impact statement for a project.

**32 Schedule 1 (Dictionary)**

Page 41, after line 14—

*insert—***inner harbour**, for the Port of Cairns, means the area that is—

- (a) south of latitude 16°55'0.7" south and within the port's port limits under the Transport Infrastructure Act; but
- (b) outside the State marine park.

**33 Schedule 1 (Dictionary)**

Page 41, lines 19 and 20—

*omit.***34 Schedule 1 (Dictionary)**

Page 41, lines 23 and 24—

*omit.***35 Schedule 1 (Dictionary)**

Page 42, lines 23 to 26—

*omit, insert—*

- (ii) for a notice about another instrument or the repeal of a master plan or port overlay—circulating in the master planned area to which the instrument, or repealed master plan or port overlay, relates;
- (iii) for a notice about a proposed review under section 35A—circulating in the Cairns local government area; and

**36 Schedule 1 (Dictionary)**

Page 43, after line 2—

*insert—***State Development Minister** means the Minister responsible for administering the State Development Act.**37 Schedule 1 (Dictionary)**

Page 43, after line 4—

*insert—***strategic port land** see the Transport Infrastructure Act, section 286(5).**38 Schedule 2 (Other amendments)**


Page 44, after line 22—

*insert—***Sustainable Planning Act 2009****1 Section 255E(13), after 'part 2'—***insert—*or the *Sustainable Ports Development Act 2015*

Amendments agreed to.

Schedules 1 and 2, as amended, agreed to.

### Third Reading

 **Hon. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (4.06 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. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (4.06 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.

## PLANNING BILL

### Message from Governor

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade) (4.07 pm): I present a message from His Excellency the Governor.

**Mr SPEAKER:** The message from His Excellency recommends the Planning Bill. The contents of the message will be incorporated in the *Record of Proceedings*. I table the message for the information of members.

MESSAGE

PLANNING BILL 2015

Constitution of Queensland 2001, section 68

I, PAUL de JERSEY AC, Governor, recommend to the Legislative Assembly a Bill intituled—


A Bill for an Act providing for an efficient, effective, transparent, integrated, coordinated and accountable system of land use planning and development assessment to facilitate the achievement of ecological sustainability

GOVERNOR

12 November 2015

*Tabled paper:* Message, dated 12 November 2015, from His Excellency the Governor, recommending the Planning Bill 2015 [1642].

### Introduction

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade) (4.07 pm): I present a bill for an act providing for an efficient, effective, transparent, integrated, coordinated and accountable system of land use planning and development assessment to facilitate the achievement of ecological sustainability. I table the bill and explanatory notes. I nominate the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee to consider the bill.

*Tabled paper:* Planning Bill 2015 [1643].

*Tabled paper:* Planning Bill 2015, explanatory notes [1644].

I am pleased to introduce the Planning Bill 2015. I present a bill for an act that will establish a better planning and development assessment system for Queensland that is fair and practical for all Queenslanders. Before the election we made a commitment to continue the planning reform process. We said we would keep those elements of the former government's reform that made sense but ensure that we get the balance right between community, environment and development. Since then, we set a clear course for reform with the release of the *Better planning for Queensland* directions paper and secured funds to support local governments on this journey.

The tabling of this bill and the two subsequent bills that I will introduce are a key milestone on our journey to deliver the best planning system in Australia and one that engages and includes the broader community in the discussion. The bill will help us deliver Australia's best planning system by delivering greater transparency and certainty for the community and industry; putting sustainability back at the core of planning; and supporting jobs and investment through improved assessment processes.

The bill will repeal the Sustainable Planning Act 2009 and replace it with an improved planning and development assessment system. Planning influences the way in which we live our lives. It creates the communities, place and spaces where we live, work and play. It also helps to protect our diverse natural systems and places.

I have said on many occasions that all Queenslanders have a role to play in the planning system. To enable Queenslanders to have their say on the Planning Bill, my department undertook an intensive, six-week consultation process. Officers travelled over 200,000 kilometres to visit 18 locations across the state to talk about the bill. An exceptional effort was made to describe the draft planning bills in a way that nonplanners, which most of us are, could understand and help people with the information they needed to make a submission. This consultation effort was determined and authentic. I now table a copy of the consultation report for the benefit of the House.

*Tabled paper:* Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning: Draft Planning Bills 2015—Consultation Report November 2015 [\[1645\]](#).

In preparing the bill, we considered all submissions and made key changes based on community and key stakeholder feedback. I would like to thank all those Queenslanders who did provide us with that feedback, as it has been invaluable in crafting the current version of the bill.

Queensland will continue to have an integrated development assessment and planning system that addresses both state and local matters. I have made it clear that I want to work with the LNP state opposition on planning reform and have indicated my willingness to build on the work the previous government did in this space. In honouring our election commitments, we have reviewed the planning reform process started by the former government and retained the State Assessment and Referral Agency as part of the Queensland planning framework. I acknowledge the work of the previous government in establishing the State Assessment and Referral Agency and how this supports applicants when seeking a decision from the state.

We have also retained the State Planning Policy to comprehensively present the state's interests in one document, making it easier for local governments to reflect and balance the state's interests up-front in local planning schemes. I have directed funds to enhance the systems and processes surrounding the State Assessment and Referral Agency and the State Planning Policy so they can add more value for Queensland.

The bill retains ecological sustainability as a core purpose of the legislation as it is under the Sustainable Planning Act 2009. The purpose has also been further refined through consultation to include having regard to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander customs and traditions, housing affordability and community resilience. The bill simplifies categories of development by establishing clearer, simpler categories supported by better decision rules and, to assist the community transition, we have decided to keep the existing names of code and impact for the categories of assessable assessment. While the process supporting the categories has changed, we wanted to keep things as simple as possible for the community. We will work hard to ensure communities understand the new system that underpins development assessment in Queensland.

A reoccurring theme throughout the consultation on the bills was the need for greater transparency and accountability. We have delivered on our commitment to restore appeal rights for objectors without fear of cost orders and have made sure that third-party submission rights are retained for all impact assessable applications. In our discussion with community and representative groups, the reintroduction of provisions to give effect to this commitment has been welcomed. We received a lot of feedback from community and representative groups who have found it difficult to understand the basis of development decisions. So now, for the first time, we will require assessment managers to publish reasons for both approvals and refusals. This goes a long way towards making the system more open and transparent and aims to rebuild some of the trust that has been lost over time between communities and the planning system.

We have affirmed our commitment to communities by retaining and, in some cases, increasing consultation and notification time frames throughout the plan making and development assessment processes. To improve plan making, the bill outlines how best practice engagement can be applied at the front end of the local plan-making process so communities understand the plan and what it means for their neighbourhoods. And, knowing that not all local governments are the same, we will create real and contemporary tools and templates to help councils with this work.

While the bill is being reviewed through the parliamentary committee process, my department will work on the instruments and guidance material intended to support it. This will include extensive consultation with practitioners and the community. In addition, we will be planning for the transition journey with local governments and communities. To help smooth the transition to the new framework, I have instructed my department to work with local governments to develop a support package. The department will also be producing a range of implementation tools and guidance materials to help the community and stakeholders adapt.

The bill creates the foundation for a better planning system for Queensland which all Queenslanders can engage in, is accountable and transparent and supports investment and job creation in our great state. I commend the bill to the House.

### First Reading

**Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade) (4.14 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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

Motion agreed to.


Bill read a first time.

### Referral to the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Furner): Order! In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee.

## PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COURT BILL

### Introduction

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade) (4.15 pm): I present a bill for an act about the Planning and Environment Court. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee to consider the bill.

*Tabled paper:* Planning and Environment Court Bill 2015 [\[1646\]](#).

*Tabled paper:* Planning and Environment Court Bill 2015, explanatory notes [\[1647\]](#).

I am pleased to introduce the Planning and Environment Court Bill 2015. Together with the Planning Bill 2015, the Planning and Environment Court Bill 2015 will govern the dispute resolution framework for planning and development matters.

The bill creates stand-alone legislation for the Planning and Environment Court to govern the constitution, composition, jurisdiction and powers of the court that has to date been embodied in the Sustainable Planning Act 2009. The Planning and Environment Court has jurisdiction conferred on it under approximately 28 different acts in addition to the Sustainable Planning Act 2009. They cover topics such as planning and development, environmental protection, coastal protection and management, heritage, fisheries, marine parks, transport infrastructure and vegetation management. Provisions for the Planning and Environment Court are located in the Sustainable Planning Act 2009, primarily due to the historical establishment of the court in local government and planning legislation over time.

In the interests of delivering clear and concise legislation, it is time for the creation of the court in its own specialised courts act, where opportunities for better alignment with court matters generally can be exercised. Having a separate bill for the Planning and Environment Court will enhance the role and visibility of the court as a distinct, specialised and accountable court to hear planning and environment disputes. A stand-alone bill also ensures the ensuing act can be assigned to the most appropriate minister and administering department under the administrative arrangements order. This will assure the court's efficacy and its functions and resourcing needs can continue to be supported by the portfolio with the principal responsibility for justice services.

The bill delivers the government's election commitment to restore the rights of communities, individuals and residents to object to developments without the prospect of harsh financial penalties. We have reintroduced the provision that each party must bear its own costs for proceedings in the court

to ensure all Queenslanders can explore a case without fear of having costs awarded against them. This received broad support during public consultation on the bill. However, we have provided the court with the discretion to make an order for costs in specific circumstances, such as frivolous or vexatious proceedings and commercial competitor appeals.

The bill continues the opportunity for parties to a proceeding before the Planning and Environment Court to participate in an alternative dispute resolution process. Alternative dispute resolution processes provide alternative, efficient and lower-cost options for resolving disputes to the benefit of the parties to the proceeding. There remains considerable support for continued improvement, particularly in relation to those matters that are considered relatively simple, straightforward disputes and to enable those matters to be resolved quickly, cheaply and effectively. Feedback also provided continued support for routine procedural matters to be dealt with by an Alternative Dispute Resolution Registrar, particularly where those matters are uncontested.

These improvements will undoubtedly support the efficiency of the court, allow disputes to be resolved more quickly and affordably and, importantly, reduce judicial time spent in determining such matters. The bill is broadly supported by stakeholders with specific consultation having been undertaken with the Planning Institute of Australia, the Bar Association of Queensland, the Queensland Law Society and the Queensland Environmental Law Association.

With this bill we have also made changes to ensure the system is open and transparent and easy for Queenslanders to access. I believe the improvements made in this bill will support a fair and open system which enables everyday Queenslanders access to the support they need when it is needed. I commend the bill to the House.

### First Reading

**Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade) (4.18 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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

Motion agreed to.


Bill read a first time.

### Referral to the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Furner): Order! In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee.

## PLANNING (CONSEQUENTIAL) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

### Introduction

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade) (4.18 pm): I present a bill for an act to make consequential amendments to the legislation stated in this act for the purposes of the Planning Act 2015, and to amend other legislation stated in this act for particular purposes. I table the bill and explanatory notes. I nominate the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee to consider the bill.

*Tabled paper:* Planning (Consequential) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 [[1648](#)].

*Tabled paper:* Planning (Consequential) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015, explanatory notes [[1649](#)].

I am pleased to introduce the Planning (Consequential) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. The objective of the bill is to make consequential amendments required for the proposed enactment of the Planning Bill 2015 and the Planning and Environment Court Bill 2015 and repeal of the Sustainable Planning Act 2009.

Essentially, the bill tidies up all of the technical flow-on amendments to other acts that work in with the planning legislation. The bill makes the amendments required as a result of the reform of the planning legislation, including updating Sustainable Planning Act terminology and references in other acts and reflecting the consolidation of planning functions within the planning portfolio. I commend the bill to the House.

### First Reading

**Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade) (4.19 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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


Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.

### Referral to the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Furner): Order! In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee.

### Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade) (4.20 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—


That under the provisions of standing order 136 the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee report to the House on the Planning (Consequential) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, the Planning Bill and the Planning and Environment Court Bill by 21 March 2016.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

## HEALTH LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

### Introduction

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (4.21 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Food Act 2006, the Health Ombudsman Act 2013, the Hospital and Health Boards Act 2011, the Pest Management Act 2001, the Public Health Act 2005 and the Transplantation and Anatomy Act 1979 for particular purposes. I table the bill and explanatory notes. I nominate the Health and Ambulance Services Committee to consider the bill. To inform the committee's consideration of the Food Act amendments, I also table related amendments to the food regulation and explanatory notes.

*Tabled paper:* Health Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 [[1650](#)].

*Tabled paper:* Health Legislation Amendment Bill 2015, explanatory notes [[1651](#)].

*Tabled paper:* Food Amendment Regulation (No. ...) 2015: tabling draft [[1652](#)].

*Tabled paper:* Food Amendment Regulation (No. ...) 2015: tabling draft, explanatory notes [[1653](#)].

The Health Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 amends six Health portfolio acts to support policy initiatives of the government and to improve the effective operation of the relevant acts. Significantly, the bill amends the Food Act to implement a statewide menu labelling scheme. This scheme, and supporting consumer awareness campaign, will deliver on the Palaszczuk government's commitment to introduce kilojoule menu labelling to help Queenslanders make healthier choices when eating fast food. Population-wide weight gain causes significant health problems for individual Queenslanders, their families, their employers and the community. Around 2.5 million Queensland adults and children are overweight or obese. In 2008, the estimated financial impact of obesity on the Queensland economy was \$11.6 billion in health system costs, lost productivity and lost wellbeing. This equates to \$4,644 for each overweight or obese person in Queensland.

One of the key contributing factors for obesity and chronic diseases is consuming considerable amounts of fast food. Fast food typically contains more kilojoules, fat, sugar and salt and can often be larger in portion size than meals prepared at home. In 2014, 30 per cent of Queensland adults consumed takeaway food at least once a week. This increased to 48 per cent of adults aged 18-24 years. Studies in the United States have shown that consumers greatly underestimate the amount of energy, saturated fats, sugar and salt in unhealthy foods and that people who consider nutritional information consume fewer kilojoules, fat and sugar.

The food menu labelling scheme will help Queenslanders make healthier fast-food choices by providing easily understood nutritional information at the point of sale where purchasing decisions are made. The scheme is based on, firstly, the National Principles for Introducing Point-of-Sale Nutrition in Standard Food Outlets agreed by the former Australia and New Zealand Food Regulation Ministerial Council in 2011 and, secondly, on legislation already in place in New South Wales. Businesses with either 20 outlets in Queensland or 50 outlets nationally that sell standard food items such as burgers, chips, sandwiches, drinks and muffins, will be required to display certain nutritional information. The nutritional information to be displayed is the energy content for each standard food item, expressed in kilojoules, and the statement 'The average adult daily energy intake is 8700kJ'. The regulation will prescribe how, where and when the nutritional information must be displayed.

The scheme will not be mandatory for businesses such as service stations, convenience stores and cinemas; dine-in restaurants; catering services; not-for-profit home delivery, for example, Meals on Wheels; patient food services in health facilities; and canteens in schools, sporting clubs and workplaces. Food outlets that are not captured by the mandatory scheme, but that choose to voluntarily display nutritional information, will also be required to comply with the prescribed display requirements. This will ensure consistent display of nutritional information to consumers.

The scheme will help Queenslanders make informed and healthier fast-food choices at the point of sale, whether that is in a queue in-store, at home ordering over the phone or internet, or when on the go and ordering via a mobile application. Food outlets will have 12 months to comply with the display requirements. During this time, the Department of Health will work with businesses to assist with transitional issues and conduct consumer education activities.

The bill also amends the Food Act to allow the chief executive of the Department of Health to authorise disclosure of confidential information provided the chief executive has a reasonable belief the disclosure is necessary to prevent, reduce or mitigate a serious danger to public health. Confidential information may include, for example, the name of a food business associated with a food risk. This will enable the department to inform at-risk consumers about serious health risks associated with particular foods in circumstances where existing emergency food recall powers may be ineffective. The legislation also includes safeguards; in particular, the chief executive's power to authorise disclosure can only be delegated to the chief health officer.

The bill amends the Health Ombudsman Act 2013 to allow the minister to make temporary appointments to the public panel of assessors that assists the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal in disciplinary proceedings relating to registered health professionals. The temporary appointments can be for up to six months and can be made only on the advice of the principal registrar of the tribunal.

The bill amends the Hospital and Health Boards Act 2011 to enable the minister to make temporary appointments to hospital and health boards for up to six months, with a further extension of six months. This will allow the minister to make urgent appointments when necessary to ensure each board has the composition and skills mix required under the act. Urgent appointments may be required if, for example, current board members unexpectedly resign or take unplanned leave.

The bill amends the Pest Management Act 2001 to allow the chief executive of the Department of Health to delegate his or her powers under the act to an appropriate qualified employee of a hospital and health service. This amendment facilitates transfer of operational responsibility for functions under the act from the department to hospital and health services.

The bill also amends the Public Health Act 2005 to streamline the process for enabling registered midwives who are not also registered nurses to access the Queensland Pap Smear Register.

Finally, the bill amends the Transplantation and Anatomy Act 1979 to clarify that the definition of blood products does not include cord blood. Cord blood is blood obtained from the placenta via the umbilical cord following childbirth for the main purpose of extracting stem cells. Stem cells obtained from cord blood are used to treat a range of conditions, including leukaemia, lymphoma and anaemia, as well as immune and metabolic disorders. The Australian Bone Marrow Donor Registry is a non-profit organisation that undertakes searches for matching cord blood units. The registry is funded by the Commonwealth, state and territory governments. This amendment will ensure that the Australian Bone Marrow Donor Registry can be exempted from the general prohibitions on trading human tissue for the purpose of trading in stem cells containing cord blood under agreements with the Commonwealth and Queensland.



The bill contains important measures to improve the operation of Health portfolio legislation. It also delivers on a key election commitment aimed at improving the health of Queenslanders. The causes of obesity are complex, but it is clear that the widespread availability and consumption of unhealthy food is a key factor. This new menu labelling scheme will help Queenslanders make healthier fast-food choices, benefitting individuals, families and the community. I commend the bill to the House.

### First Reading

**Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (4.28 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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


Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.

### Referral to the Health and Ambulance Services Committee

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Furner): Order! In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Health and Ambulance Services Committee.

### Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (4.29 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—


That under the provisions of standing order 136, the Health and Ambulance Services Committee report to the House on the Health Legislation Amendment Bill by 15 February 2016.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

## TACKLING ALCOHOL-FUELLED VIOLENCE LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

### Introduction

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (4.30 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Bail Act 1980, the Fair Trading Act 1989, the Gaming Machine Act 1991, the Liquor Act 1992, the Liquor Regulation 2002, the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992 and the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000 for particular purposes. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee to consider the bill.

*Tabled paper:* Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 [[1654](#)].

*Tabled paper:* Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015, explanatory notes [[1655](#)].

The Queensland government is committed to building a safer community and a vibrant night-life by tackling alcohol fuelled violence. Despite previous liquor reforms, alcohol fuelled violence continues to be a problem that claims lives, destroys families, discourages patronage in entertainment precincts and drains valuable resources from our police and emergency services. Queensland cannot afford the human and economic costs related to the abuse and misuse of alcohol. That is why the Palaszczuk government went to the last election with a commitment to make the difficult decisions required to address this complex problem in our community. Unlike the previous LNP government, the Palaszczuk government understands that the majority of Queenslanders support the reduction of late-night liquor trading. We also acknowledge the experiences of other jurisdictions and the extensive body of internationally recognised, peer reviewed research that demonstrates reducing the supply of liquor late at night is an essential key to reducing alcohol fuelled violence. The research could not be clearer: for every hour of reduced liquor trade, there is a significant decrease in alcohol related assaults.

I am pleased to introduce the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2015, which supports the government's comprehensive, multifaceted policy framework aimed at changing the culture around drinking, promoting responsible drinking practices and ensuring a safer environment. The bill amends the Liquor Act 1992 to stop the sale and supply of alcohol at 2 am statewide, with no lockout except in certain prescribed safe-night precincts. The new liquor trading hours will commence on 1 July 2016.



The government recognises that safe-night precincts are uniquely equipped to implement high-visibility policing, late-night transport options and other initiatives for managing the elevated risk of alcohol and drug related risks associated with late-night liquor trading. Accordingly, amendments will provide for safe-night precincts to be prescribed by regulation to allow for 3 am liquor trading with a 1 am lockout, following a thorough consultation and application process. If local boards do not wish their precinct to be subject to the lockout, they may opt to remain a 2 am precinct. If a 3 am safe-night precinct is declared, licensees who currently have approval for liquor trading until 3 am or later will automatically be approved to sell or supply liquor until 3 am from 1 July 2016. However, licensees without extended liquor trading hours approval for the venue will still be required to apply individually for approval for liquor trading up to 3 am through usual late-night liquor trading application processes. The lockout provisions will apply to all post 1 am liquor traders in the precinct.

In keeping with the pledge to consult widely in delivering these reforms, the Palaszczuk government has listened to industry concerns regarding a statewide 1 am lockout. We have responded by restricting the 1 am lockout policy to areas where 3 am liquor trading, and the concentration of licensed premises, necessitates the use of this important tool to maximise patron safety. Licensees will retain their current ability to apply for up to 12 one-off permits per year to sell or supply liquor beyond their regular approved liquor trading hours.

The Palaszczuk government recognises the importance of supporting a night-time economy that includes but does not revolve solely around alcohol. Therefore, it is intended that licensees will be able to stay open beyond the hours of liquor service to provide other services, such as food, non-alcoholic beverages and entertainment. New provisions commencing on 1 July 2016 will remove the linkage of gaming hours to liquor consumption hours. Gaming applications will be able to be approved for a period of up to two hours after the cessation of the service of liquor at the licensed premises. This will allow gaming services up to 5 am in prescribed safe-night precincts and 4 am outside of prescribed safe-night precincts, upon approval. Furthermore, amendments in the bill enable licensees that offer gaming and adult entertainment to continue to provide those activities for the duration of the approved gaming and adult entertainment hours in effect immediately prior to 1 July 2016, despite the wind back of liquor trading hours on 1 July 2016.

As I indicated in my ministerial statement, to assist in managing the supply of alcohol late at night the bill amends the Liquor Act to prohibit new approvals for the sale of takeaway liquor after 10 pm. From 10 November 2015, any late-night extended trading applications for takeaway sales that were still with the commissioner for determination are void. No new applications can be accepted. These amendments do not apply to existing extended trading approvals for takeaway liquor. Licensees who currently have approval to sell or supply takeaway liquor to 12 midnight may continue to do so.

In line with the government's commitment to promote responsible drinking practices, the bill amends the Liquor Act to allow a regulation to be declared to ban the service of high-alcohol content drinks and alcoholic beverages designed to be consumed rapidly after midnight. However, the bill allows for an exemption to be granted for the operation of small bars specialising in the sale of premium spirits. The definition of premium spirits will be prescribed by regulation. I will be consulting with stakeholders on the type of liquor service that might be prescribed in the regulation as banned or exempt to ensure the responsible service of alcohol can be maintained. In recognition of the heightened controls that exist at licensed premises in airports, casinos and industrial canteens, those venues will not be subject to the new restrictions.

The government also recognises the importance of supporting the Queensland Police Service and the liquor regulator to undertake their roles and pursue prosecution where offences are alleged to have occurred. Therefore, the bill amends the Liquor Act to clarify that the results of breath tests taken in accordance with current police powers are admissible as evidence in prosecutions against a licensee. To be clear, this provision does not open the door for random breathalysing of patrons enjoying a night out. Rather, it means that when a patron has committed relevant assault offences and a blood alcohol reading is taken under existing police powers, the results of the analysis can be used as supplementary evidence in prosecutions where there is other evidence to suggest a licensee has committed an offence by serving an unduly intoxicated or disorderly patron.

To ensure more effective operation of alcohol related violence initiatives, the bill amends the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000 to bring the handling process for specimens of saliva for particular offences in line with the handling process for specimens of blood. The bill also makes a number of amendments to the Bail Act 1980 and the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992. The Bail Act amendments redefine the nature of a drug and alcohol assessment referral bail condition, otherwise

known as a DAAR condition. A DAAR condition requires a defendant to complete a two-hour counselling session that seeks to assess a defendant's drug and alcohol use and to offer information about treatment options. Completion of a DAAR condition is currently mandatory for people charged with one of eight prescribed violent offences alleged to have been committed in a public place while intoxicated. The changes under the bill will ensure that this important bail condition can apply to those most likely to benefit from the program. The bill removes the mandatory nature of the condition to significantly broaden its application by allowing the court the discretion to include the DAAR condition as part of a grant of bail for any offence to which the Bail Act applies. This means it will no longer be anchored solely to eight offences.

Further, in recognition of the therapeutic and rehabilitative nature of a DAAR, the bill no longer makes it an offence to fail to complete a DAAR condition. The bill also provides that it is no longer an offence to breach a condition that the defendant participate in a therapeutic or rehabilitative bail condition. These changes recognise the challenges associated with overcoming addiction. The changes will also support the reinstatement of specialist courts which will include access to intervention programs through a condition of bail. Additionally, the bill amends the Penalties and Sentences Act to extend the availability of a DAAR course as a condition of a recognisance order at sentence.

A number of the amendments included in the Liquor and Fair Trading Legislation (Red Tape Reduction) Amendment Bill, introduced by the member for Mansfield in May 2015, are consistent with the government's overarching policy framework. Therefore, the government has adopted reforms from the private member's bill that are considered to improve operational efficiency and provide greater clarity around the provisions of the Liquor Act.

A number of the provisions of the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill are intended to support more effective regulation of the liquor industry. Amendments to the Liquor Act formally grant all police officers the powers of an investigator under the act. This will simplify the work of police by removing the need for officers to be individually designated as such by an instrument of delegation. Amendments allow investigators to issue a person with a notice to produce documents in their possession or control that are relevant to the administration or enforcement of the Liquor Act.

In order to minimise the risk of minors obtaining liquor, amendments clarify the types of documentation that may be accepted as proof of age for the purposes of purchasing alcohol and strengthen existing requirements around when an entity can be approved to issue identification documentation.

The bill amends the Liquor Act to ensure that the commissioner gives written notice of an approved manager's suspension or cancellation to the licensee who employs the approved manager. The bill also includes amendments intended to create a safer environment in and around licensed premises. To reduce the risk of alcohol related violence in events, such as sporting carnivals and music festivals, amendments prohibit persons from taking liquor into or away from activities conducted under a community liquor permit or commercial public events permit.

The bill amends the Liquor Act to reinstate the ability for the requirements of a risk assessed management plan to be specified under a regulation, which was inadvertently removed by the previous government. Amendments to the Liquor Act ensure that licensees whose car park is designated as part of the licensed premises must seek the approval of the Commissioner for Liquor and Gaming before holding an event where alcohol is supplied or consumed in the car park. This requirement would override existing approvals or conditions on a licence.

Other provisions of the bill provide relief from unnecessary regulatory burden that may be lifted without risk of harm to the community. The bill makes amendment to the Liquor Act so that Brisbane licensees need only enter information regarding incidents into the incident register under the Liquor Act if the incident is not recorded in the crowd controller register. Amendments extend the risk assessed management plan exemption to subsidiary on-premises licensees whose principal activity is a florist or gift baskets.

The bill amends the Liquor Act to clarify that food additives or substances used as ingredients in food preparation are not subject to the act. This exclusion of food additives only applies to those substances that must be consumed as an addition to or ingredient of another substance. If a substance is labelled as a food additive or ingredient, but is palatable and generally intended to be consumed without being altered or modified, it will not be exempt, such as table wine that is packaged and labelled as cooking wine.

Other provisions of the bill boost tourism and promote Queensland's national and international profile as a destination of choice, whilst still providing for the minimisation of alcohol related harm. In recognition that Queensland is home to a vibrant and growing craft beer industry, amendments to the Liquor Act place craft beer producers on an equal footing with wine producers by allowing the sale of craft beer at promotional events, such as food and wine festivals.

Amendments allow bed and breakfast premises to cater for up to eight adult guests and remain exempt from the Liquor Act. Amendments also support community clubs by allowing these licensees to sell takeaway liquor to club guests and visitors.

Finally, the bill repeals section 96 of the Fair Trading Act to ensure that provisions around directors' liability are consistent with the broader Queensland policy and the executive officer liability provisions in other Australian jurisdictions. On 1 November 2013, the Directors' Liability Reform Amendment Act 2013 implemented the policy that state legislation should only include directors' liability provisions when appropriately justified and, generally, without onus of proof reversal clauses.

Queenslanders support the government in tackling alcohol fuelled violence to make our community safer. The reforms introduced in this bill demonstrate that the Palaszczuk government is getting on with the job and delivering on our commitment to tackle violence in Queensland. We will continue to consult and work in partnership with community groups and licensees to improve safety and amenity in and around licensed venues. Safer venues, safer entertainment precincts and safer communities are good for business, good for tourism, good for patrons and good for Queensland. I commend the bill to the House.

### First Reading

**Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (4.45 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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


Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.

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

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

### Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (4.45 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—


That under the provisions of standing order 136 the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee report to the House on the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill by 8 February 2016.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

### Further Answer to Question; Laidley Land, Ministerial Responsibility

 **Hon. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (4.46 pm): Earlier today in question time the member for Lockyer asked me a question about a parcel of land in Laidley in his electorate. I took the question on notice and I am happy to provide a response. I am advised that the member for Lockyer had originally emailed the Deputy Premier regarding the parcel of land. In the member for Lockyer's email he identified that the parcel of land was owned by the Department of State Development. Based on the advice of the member for Lockyer that the land was owned by the Department of State Development, the Deputy Premier referred the matter to my office for attention and reply.

On further investigation it became clear that the land was not owned by the Department of State Development and that it was in fact owned by Economic Development Queensland, which is in the Deputy Premier's portfolio. My office wrote to the member advising him of this fact. I am advised that the Deputy Premier will write to the member for Lockyer regarding the matter in due course.

## QUEENSLAND PRODUCTIVITY COMMISSION BILL

Resumed from 15 September (see p. 1733).

### Second Reading



**Hon. CW PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (Treasurer, Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (4.47 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I thank the Finance and Administration Committee for its report, tabled on 2 November 2015, regarding the Queensland Productivity Commission Bill. I also thank those who made submissions to the committee about the bill and those who appeared as witnesses as part of the committee's inquiry. The committee has recommended the bill be passed.

This bill establishes the Queensland Productivity Commission in its permanent form. The commission has been operating since 1 May 2015 in an interim form as a government entity under the Public Service Act 2008. This bill establishes the commission as an independent statutory body in order to formalise its independence from government and establish its full set of functions and powers. The commission will provide independent economic and policy advice to the state with the goal of increasing productivity, driving economic growth and improving living standards in Queensland.

The creation of the commission is another election commitment the government is delivering on. Productivity is the main driver of long-term economic prosperity. However, there are economic and structural pressures on future productivity growth. The economy is evolving in the direction of services industries, which historically have had lower productivity growth than more capital intensive industries. At the same time, the public sector is having to manage the economic impact of an ageing population, including growing demand on the health sector and social expenditures. Most immediately, there is the impact of lower commodity prices on the economy and government finances. Of course, the most easily reachable gains in productivity are now gone as the infrastructure and regulatory reform program of the 1990s and 2000s—the Hilmer reforms—is now largely complete.

So it is clear that governments should seek new productivity gains in order to protect economic growth and living standards. The Queensland Productivity Commission is intended to be a key mechanism in that respect. It will be unique at a state or territory level. No other state or territory has an independent authority focused on productivity matters. Some states—New South Wales and Western Australia—conduct public economic inquiries, but these inquiries are by their economic regulatory bodies rather than a stand-alone authority. This government considers an independent body focused solely on productivity related matters will yield better results.

The commission will be an independent statutory body with an advisory function only and no executive function. The government will set the questions for the commission's work. The commission will work through the issues in detail with the help of public consultation before providing an independent opinion to government. The government will then respond to the commission's findings. The government will remain the decision-maker, but it will have the benefit of rigorous, thorough and public advice from the commission.

It is important to recognise the chain of responsibilities and accountabilities involved. The commission is independent in its operations and accountable for the quality of its work, but the government sets the commission's tasks and priorities. This contrasts, for example, with the case of the Auditor-General, who cannot be directed about the priority given to audit matters. Indeed, to equate the functions and accountabilities of the commission with those of either the Ombudsman or the Auditor-General is to fundamentally misconstrue the character of those statutory offices. In the case of the commission, the government makes the final decisions and is accountable for those decisions.

Having the commission subject to direction by parliament to undertake a specific inquiry would compromise the fundamental model of the commission. The commission would have two masters and this would both confuse its operations and blur the chain of responsibility and accountabilities. Of course, the government is very open to members' suggestions about what the commission should

investigate. This is the model adopted by the Australian Productivity Commission and it has worked well, with that body driving economic reforms across many sectors, including the energy reforms of the 1990s and most recently the National Disability Insurance Scheme.

The commission will have four main lines of work. First, it will conduct public inquiries and make public reports on questions referred to it by the government. These inquiries will involve expert, rigorous analysis and will be informed by comprehensive public consultation. Second, the commission will provide advice on regulatory matters and be an independent reviewer of Queensland government agency regulatory impact assessments. Third, it will provide advice on competitive neutrality issues and policy. Finally, the commission will undertake research to assist its other functions and to inform the public about Queensland's productivity performance.

The commission will be an economic advisory body. The questions it will investigate will be economic ones: how to improve policies and regulation to get better economic outcomes; how to get better results from government expenditure; what the productivity and economic implications of new proposals are; and how existing government programs have performed in terms of their productivity and economic outcomes. While the questions will be economic, the scope of the commission's work will not be limited to traditional economic infrastructure sectors. For example, the commission may be asked to examine how to improve productivity and achieve better value for money across social sectors such as housing, health, education and Indigenous affairs. The commission will be asked by the government to go where the main economic issues are and where the productivity gains can be made.

Public involvement will be a central feature. By public involvement the government means comprehensive and systematic consultation with the public and stakeholders. This will involve measures such as public hearings and forums, regional visits, seeking comments on draft reports and issues papers and the establishment of stakeholder reference groups. It will mean the commission responding to the results of these consultations in its reports, while of course respecting the commission's ultimate independence and responsibility to make its own conclusions.

I propose now to consider some of the more important provisions of the bill and the reasons for them. Part 1 states that the purpose of this act is 'to establish the Queensland Productivity Commission to provide independent economic and policy advice to the State with the goal of increasing productivity, driving economic growth and improving living standards in Queensland.' The reason for this definition is to make clear that the Commission is an advisory body, focused on economic and policy issues and with the clear objectives concerning productivity, economic growth and living standards.

Part 2 stipulates that the commission's functions will be to facilitate and promote productivity in Queensland, to undertake inquiries as directed by the minister, to research and analyse productivity matters and to advise the government on competitive neutrality and regulatory matters. In undertaking these functions, the commission will be focused on productivity but have regard to a range of economic and policy considerations and the public interest generally. In particular, the commission may have regard to living standards, employment, real wages, industry development, environmental sustainability, fiscal sustainability and the public interest.

The board of the commission will consist of a maximum of three commissioners, including the principal commissioner. The board will be appointed under this act, holding office for a maximum of three years. They must abide by standard provisions for the management of potential conflicts of interest and cannot be insolvent or have criminal histories. Staff are to be appointed under this act, not the Public Service Act 2008.

The commission will be required to perform its functions with 'independence, rigour, responsiveness, transparency, equity, efficiency and effectiveness'. These are principles of good governance especially relevant to the commission as an independent economic advisory body. They are intended to work in a holistic way with the commission balancing and integrating the separate principles in all of its work.

Part 3 deals with the arrangements for public inquiries. Public inquiries will be the core of the commission's work. Inquiries will be commissioned by the government through a written ministerial direction notice. The notice may require a specific process for undertaking an inquiry, such as having regard to certain matters and undertaking particular types of consultation. The written notice must be published on the commission's website. The commission must then undertake public consultation. The commission must prepare a written report and provide it to the minister. The minister must then give the commission a written response within six months after receiving it. The report will then be published on the commission's website.

These provisions will ensure that the commission's work is open and transparent, with substantial public involvement. They require key documents—the ministerial direction and report—to be publicly available. They require the minister to respond to reports and give the minister a reasonable length of time to prepare a considered response before the report is published. In this regard, while the ministerial response is not formally required in the legislation to be made public, it is likely in practice that it will be, especially as the report itself will be made public. This approach follows that of the Australian Productivity Commission which usually involves simultaneous release of reports and government responses.

Part 4 deals with arrangements for the commission's research function. Part 5 deals with the commission's competitive neutrality functions. The competitive neutrality role has been transferred from the Queensland Competition Authority, the QCA. The principle of competitive neutrality is that a government agency carrying on a significant business activity should not enjoy a competitive advantage over competitors in a particular market solely because the agency's activities are not subject to certain requirements based on its government ownership. The commission will provide an independent complaints mechanism role which will allow it to receive competitive neutrality complaints, investigate those complaints and publicly report to government on whether the complaints are substantiated. Under the consequential provisions of the bill, the commission is also nominated to replace the QCA as the independent referee to investigate and report on competitive neutrality complaints against local government business activities.

Part 6 gives the minister the power to direct the commission to undertake research and analysis and make recommendations on regulatory matters. The commission has already assumed in its interim structure the work of the former Office of Best Practice Regulation in the QCA. This part makes the move permanent, with the commission now to be the government's main independent adviser on regulatory matters.

Part 7 sets out provisions for the conduct of board meetings and requires the commission to keep the minister reasonably informed of its operations. This part also deals with the commission's information management practices. The commission will have the power to require information in order to help with its investigations. However, this will be limited to government agencies, water distributor-retailers, local government and local government companies. There will be exemptions for certain types of material such as information subject to legal professional privilege or parliamentary privilege. There is also a provision for confidentiality requests to accompany the provision of commercial-in-confidence information. While these information powers exist, the commission is likely, in practice, to base its work on publicly available information. The use of publicly available information is important as it can be scrutinised and tested by stakeholders, thereby raising the transparency and rigour of reports.

Parts 8 and 9 contain evidentiary and miscellaneous definitional matters. Part 10 comprises transitional provisions concerning the transfer of competitive neutrality complaints and investigations from the QCA to the commission, and staff transfer and appointment matters.

Finally, I wish to advise the House of my intention to move amendments to the bill during consideration in detail to address some minor referencing issues. The amendments will correct cross-references to other legislation contained in clause 52, schedule 1 and schedule 2 of the bill.

The establishment of the Queensland Productivity Commission is a key economic reform. The government expects the commission's work to be of material benefit to the Queensland economy and to the living standards of Queenslanders. I commend the bill to the House.



**Mr LANGBROEK** (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (4.58 pm): At the outset I would like to say that the LNP opposition will not be opposing this bill. I would like to foreshadow, however, that I will be moving some amendments during consideration in detail.

In considering this bill, it is important to reflect on the importance of productivity and the definition of it that I think often leads to some eye glazing when politicians talk about it. Productivity means 'the effectiveness of productive effort, especially in industry, as measured in terms of the rate of output per unit of input'. So no wonder people's eyes glaze over, but it is a very important issue for our economic development. It is driven by the three Ps—that is, population, participation and productivity. It is particularly true of Queensland because the key drivers of our economic growth over the last 25 years have largely been population growth, increased workforce participation and the development of the state's vast mineral resources. It is a national debate we are having about the importance and the challenge of the Asian century, to make sure that our productivity keeps pace with those of our competitors. That is the basis of this bill that the Treasurer has brought into the House today.

When looking at ways of boosting growth and economic opportunities, it is essential that the issue of productivity is considered. It is a matter of public record that the previous LNP government sought to put productivity front and centre of the economic debate. We knew this was particularly important, considering the longer term economic trends and the challenges the ageing population would bring. To sustain our economic growth, we needed to think smarter and be more productive. The issue was put firmly on the agenda by the independent Commission of Audit. I know members opposite like to comment about the Commission of Audit—and the Treasurer has certainly made a number of comments there—but at its heart its report was about how we could better deliver government services to boost productivity.

One of the key aspects of the commission's work was 'for Queensland to lift its productivity performance to sustain the economic growth which will improve living standards for its citizens'. It is fair to say that the Commission of Audit made for some sobering reading because this is what it found, and I quote—

Apart from the deterioration in its financial position in recent years, Queensland's economic and productivity performance has also declined markedly, more sharply than the rest of Australia. Queensland's productivity is now below the level recorded a decade earlier.

That is fairly salient. In 2012 when we came to government, Queensland's productivity as recorded by the Commission of Audit was below the level recorded a decade earlier. The Commission of Audit's findings continued—

Over the longer term, Queensland faces significant economic and fiscal challenges due to demographic and social factors, such as the ageing of the population and rising demand for government services.

As part of its work, the commission also made recommendations about how the government might boost productivity and better deliver services for the people of Queensland. Again, here is what the commission found—

Strong and decisive action is necessary to restore Queensland's record of economic and productivity growth. It is necessary to take decisive action to repair state finances and prepare for the challenges posed by demographic change and other factors.

It was not just through the independent Commission of Audit that the LNP put productivity front and centre of the economic agenda. We also commissioned Queensland Treasury to undertake medium-term modelling, looking into Queensland's economic and fiscal challenges. This is what the independent officers of Queensland Treasury had to say in that report released in March last year—

... the economy faces structural challenges in the form of lower rates of working age population growth, productivity growth and labour force participation. Unless there is concerted policy action to address these challenges, economic growth ... is expected to be slower over the longer term than in the past.

When I stand here today and say that the LNP is serious about boosting productivity, I can point to our track record in putting it on the economic agenda. There is no doubt that members opposite will stand up following my speech to criticise the Commission of Audit, so I would like to remind them that it was the Commission of Audit that made recommendations regarding the Queensland Productivity Commission. Unlike those opposite, who seem to run away from any semblance of policy development, the LNP considered and responded to the Commission of Audit's recommendations. What we said was that we would not create an entirely new bureaucracy, but we would instead add further functions to the already established Queensland Competition Authority. We took that view because the expertise and experience already existed within the QCA. We believed that it would be a better use of resources to strengthen the QCA, instead of adding another bureaucracy drawing employees extensively from the QCA.

To that end, the former treasurer and member for Clayfield in November last year introduced the Revenue and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. That bill included amendments to the Queensland Competition Authority Act 1997 which would have had added productivity and competitive neutrality complaints investigation functions to the renamed Queensland independent pricing and productivity authority. However, that bill did not receive passage through the House before the 2015 election.

Of course the bill we are debating here today is different from what was proposed then. This bill will establish the Queensland Productivity Commission as an independent statutory authority charged with undertaking inquiries into particular matters of economic importance. Competitive neutrality and regulatory advice functions will be moved from the purview of the QCA to the QPC. I acknowledge that this was an election commitment from the Labor government, and I welcome the Treasurer's

commitment to enhancing Queensland's productivity. The LNP opposition also acknowledges that there is a level of support from stakeholders for this bill. With that in mind, we will not be opposing this bill; we simply want to highlight our concerns about this government's fondness for creating bureaucracies and putting everything to review.

I want to pause for a moment to commend the Finance and Administration Committee for its report No. 15 into this bill. It was very comprehensive. It referred to the stakeholders and there were a number of references to the committee's hearings. I want to commend those committee members, many of whom I know will be speaking on this bill. If anything, I think it demonstrates that the power of our committee system has led to better analysis of our bills. This is something we brought in in 2011. I think the work of the committees and the secretariats that support them is indicative of the work we can be doing and we are doing to improve our bills, especially compared to my early years in this place 11 years ago. So I commend the committee for the production of their report.

Since the government's election nine months ago, we have seen more than 70 reviews. It is well and good to put everything to a review, but at some stage this government will have to start making decisions.

**Mr Minnikin:** Don't hold your breath.

**Mr LANGBROEK:** I will take that interjection. In my contribution today, I am going to focus on a few key areas of the Queensland Productivity Commission Bill 2015. First and foremost amongst these are the provisions relating to inquiries by the commission and the reports on those inquiries. Clause 23 specifically outlines the minister's ability to direct the commission to undertake an inquiry on a matter related to productivity, economic development or industry in Queensland. Clause 23(2) outlines the types of things that can be included in the direction to the commission by the minister. Other clauses in this division relate to the commission's compliance with the direction and level of consultation undertaken in consideration of an inquiry. I note that the Treasurer and the minister responsible have already flagged matters to do with the amendment that I have moved. I will discuss that amendment at the appropriate time.

There was concern raised by some stakeholders about clause 23 regarding this section of the bill. The Queensland Resources Council highlighted its concern that the minister can amend or withdraw the direction at any time before receiving the report from the QPC. The Queensland Resources Council suggested that the committee consider recommending the development of a framework for managing changes in directions which have already been issued to the commission. The Queensland Farmers' Federation also outlined its concerns that there is no provision for the minister to release their draft report for public comment before it is finalised. I note that the Treasurer just mentioned a few moments ago that there is every chance that report would be released, but the important thing is that that is what the Farmers' Federation had to say.

The LNP opposition notes the department's response to these submissions, as highlighted in the parliamentary committee's report. We understand the need to balance openness without being overly prescriptive in the legislation. We would again highlight the importance of transparency in the minister's dealings with the commission. If the minister's directions to the commission change or are withdrawn, the reasons for this need to be adequately explained publicly to further inform debate on the issue. A significant example of this which was raised this week in the media and today in the House was the minister's dealings with the Queensland Industrial Relations Commission about some of the changes to local government industrial relations matters, where the minister had asked for some changes to be considered by the Industrial Relations Commission and it now looks like he is no longer accepting the referee's decision.

Today in the parliament in question time he was at odds with our assessment of that. It does beg the question as to whether the way this is being set up is more about making sure that the minister has control of what the Productivity Commission can look into and can change his dealings with the commission to reflect a changing circumstance, and that is not as transparent that we think it could or should be.

Stakeholders also had concern with the six-month time frame for the minister to provide his response to the commission's report before its public release, as outlined in clause 27. Again, the Queensland Resources Council raised concerns that six months was an unnecessarily long delay. I note the department's response to this submission which was, as I recall, that there could be some difficulty with the government accepting a recommendation from the Productivity Commission that is



actually at odds with the government's own agenda. That seems to be at odds with the Treasurer, who has already suggested that our amendment, which contains a provision for this parliament to make a recommendation to the Productivity Commission, would be something that he is not prepared to consider. However, he has already flagged in the legislation, in the explanatory notes or in the committee's report that there are going to be times when the Productivity Commission may make a recommendation that is not exactly what the government wants to be doing or is not part of the government's policy and to that end they are going to take six months to respond to it. That would mean that they obviously were not going to do the things that the Productivity Commission had recommended.

The LNP opposition understands the benefit of having the government properly consider its response to a QPC report before they are simultaneously released but with the caveats that I explained previously. Our only concern is that the reports are often quite detailed and hundreds of pages long. When coupled with a government response, the risk is that a large volume of information is released at the one time and some of the key parts of these reports may get lost in that process. A key example of this was the Treasurer's review of state finances. This was a key, independent economic report and election promise from the Treasurer. However, its release was delayed until the same day as the budget, thereby burying it in the rest of the day's news. The Treasurer saw fit to hide his key economic report. This is precisely why the opposition would highlight the need for continued consideration and reports back on the progress in implementing or responding to the recommendations made by the commission to the government. I believe this view is in keeping with the parliamentary committee, who provided this advice—

The Committee considers that department should actively pursue prompt resolution of any recommendations made by the QPC.

Another key aspect of the bill is detailed in clause 30, which provides the commission with the ability to initiate its own research and analysis of matters relating to productivity, economic development and industry. This is an extremely important part of the legislation because it gives the QPC the freedom to look into issues without government direction. This was strongly supported by stakeholders such as the CCIQ and the QRC—the Chamber of Commerce & Industry Queensland, the peak body for small business in Queensland, and the Queensland Resources Council. The Queensland Resources Council went so far as to suggest that a specific portion of the overall budget should be directed to this area. I believe it is important that it is not just the government that has the ability to direct the commission to undertake important work, and that goes to the heart of the amendment that I will introduce later. There may be instances where the Legislative Assembly believes there is a need to look into prevailing economic or productivity issues. This is a topic that I intend to speak to later.

I want to draw the House's attention to clause 30(2), which states—

The commission must advise the chief executive—

in this instance, the Under Treasurer—

it will publish the research or analysis before publishing the research or analysis.

What is not made entirely clear in this clause is whether the Under Treasurer can advise or even direct the commission on the release of this information. I understand the department provided correspondence to the parliamentary committee on this issue. However, that correspondence was not available online from the committee's website. I would ask for some clarification from the Treasurer as to how this works in practice. The LNP opposition would not support the chief executive having the power to direct the commission in relation to this function. So I look forward to the Treasurer's explanation.

I would also like to highlight my concern about this aspect of the department's response as detailed on page 15 of the committee's report into this bill—

... the department advised that the Commission's ability to initiate its own research and analysis of matters allows it to develop its expertise and knowledge of Queensland's productivity, economic development and industry, and make this available to the public where appropriate.

Once again, I would ask for more clarity about when it is and is not appropriate to be releasing this research. Quite clearly, if the commission has spent time and public money investigating these matters, it has to be in the public interest to be releasing this information to inform public debate.

As highlighted in sections 5 and 6 of the bill, the QPC will also take on competitive neutrality and regulatory review functions. The regulatory review functions were transferred from the Office of Best Practice Regulation to the interim commission in July. I understand the transfer of these functions was

a policy decision of the government. I would just like to take this opportunity to again highlight the importance of this function and the Office of Best Practice Regulation in measuring the burden of red tape here in Queensland. This was highlighted in the CCIQ's submission, which stated—

CCIQ strongly supports the approach to measure the existing burden of red tape and set a reduction target. This methodology is based on CCIQ's 2009 Blueprint for Fighting Queensland's Over-Regulation and the widely acclaimed British Columbia approach.

...

CCIQ believes the regulatory requirement baseline measure remains 'the' most valuable indicator of red tape reduction and any role for OBPR under the Commission must include this measurement process. In our view the baseline measure represents a massive and defining opportunity for Queensland to stand out in Australia on how to tackle red tape.

**Mr Power:** You've already got our votes.

**Mr LANGBROEK:** I take that interjection from the member for Logan. I would think that CCIQ are pretty important stakeholders in Queensland. We have already seen the response from the education minister, who is also the small business minister, and know what she thinks of their recommendations about red tape. I do not know if the member for Logan has had any experience in small business. If he had, he would know that filling out the business activity statement and all the paperwork that has to be done for licensing and regulation is actually pretty hard when you are running a small business. Given that he probably has not run a small business, he would also not have much consideration for the CCIQ. We know what they thought about the education and small business minister's recommendations on red tape. Nick Behrens from CCIQ—

**Mr Dick** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Hart): Pause the clock. Minister, the member is not taking your interjections across the chamber. Please cease.

**Mr LANGBROEK:** As I mentioned to the House this morning, we know what CCIQ thinks of this small business minister's claims that she has been trying to reduce red tape simply by supporting the energy minister's amendments that passed through the other day, which of course were the work of the member for Caloundra, and that was that high energy-using small businesses could now approach the energy ombudsman. That is her example of somehow supporting small business. However, Nick Behrens from the CCIQ has said that setting up a red-tape reduction committee that is going to meet every three months ain't going to cut it and that, when the small business minister had a chance to respond to the CCIQ recommendations about reducing red tape, all she did was blame the other mob. We know what this government thinks about red tape and small business; they dismiss them because they are really only dancing to the tune of the unions. We think that with hundreds of thousands of small businesses in Queensland CCIQ is a very important stakeholder. We think that having a target for reducing red tape is essential. We want to make sure that CCIQ, which is concerned about continuing to measure the burden of red tape, is vital. Of course we know that is something that the small business minister, who has so much on her plate she cannot even do a tourism investment paper—the education department has IT things happening within it. It is obvious that this minister is not across her brief, just as we have other ministers who are unable to deal with the issues that they face in their portfolios.


Let us turn now to the competitive neutrality aspect of the bill. Again, these are functions that we transferred from the QCA. It is another extremely important review function in that it ensures a government agency carrying on significant business activities should not enjoy competitive advantage just because they are owned or controlled by the government. The bill provides for the commission to receive and investigate complaints from a person that is or could be in competition with a government agency in a particular market and from a person who is or could be adversely affected by a competitive advantage a person alleges is enjoyed by the agency. This was another issue discussed at length during the committee's consideration of this bill and in its report.

There were a number of concerns raised, most particularly by the Waste and Recycling Industry Association of Queensland. They are discussed at length in the committee's report, but it is interesting to note their concerns because these stakeholders have mentioned it to me as well. The fact that the QCA can make a decision that is not legally binding is something that is very frustrating for groups like the Waste and Recycling Industry Association of Queensland, and in the committee's report there was a significant section about waste management at the Sunshine Coast Regional Council that has been amplified a fair bit. The Sunshine Coast Regional Council, on receiving the recommendation about competition issues, basically voted against changing what they were doing. That is very frustrating in terms of increasing competition for the members of the Waste and Recycling Industry Association of Queensland, so that is important. I am assured by the Waste and Recycling Industry Association of Queensland that if businesses were faced with more competition they would be able to benefit from

lower prices, and that would help them in not passing those increases on to their own customers. But that is something which has been addressed, and I look forward to hearing from committee members who may wish to address this in their contributions as well.

I note the committee's satisfaction that the department is working to address the issues raised by stakeholders in relation to the handling of competitive neutrality complaints. There are other aspects of the bill that I am not going to speak to. Many relate to administrative and miscellaneous functions and others relate to transitional provisions, specifically the transfer of records, complaints, investigations and employees from the QCA or the department of QPC. I do, however, note the committee's comments in relation to the minor referencing errors in its report.

As I have stated earlier, the LNP opposition will not be opposing this bill. I do believe that it was through the hard work of the previous LNP administration that the issue of productivity was put on the agenda here in Queensland. It is very important for governments of either colour to make sure that they focus on productivity and the definition that I spoke of. Whether we want to water down the definition, whether we want to make sure that we have more outputs for inputs, whether we want to have social enterprise or social factors—as I know the Nurses' Union would like to have considered—the important issue is that now in the 21st century, which everyone acknowledges is the Asian century, we are competing with economies where people are prepared to work to increase their productivity, and it is imperative for Queenslanders to make sure we are part of the game. This is a bill that, hopefully without political interference, will lead to increased productivity in Queensland and it is a bill that we will not be opposing. Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, for the opportunity to contribute.

 **Ms FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (5.22 pm): As chair of the Finance and Administration Committee, I rise to speak briefly on the Queensland Productivity Commission Bill 2015. It was very interesting to hear the contribution of the member for Surfers Paradise, who flagged that someone on this side of the chamber might criticise him for raising the Commission of Audit. I do not think we really need to do that because it speaks for itself: when you appoint one of your mates to deliver the outcomes that you want, then you are going to be criticised for it. I think Campbell Newman made that clear in his book, and certainly the Queensland electorate made it very clear what they thought about that.

I would like to thank the committee in particular. We made the unanimous recommendation that the bill be passed, and we made that decision after considerable deliberation over some issues that were raised by stakeholders. I think we all agreed that it was important to establish an independent economic advisory body, and we very quickly came to agreement on most of the elements of the Productivity Commission. I would like to thank the department for the work that they put in when we went back to them on a number of occasions to make sure that we had interrogated some of the issues raised by stakeholders.


The commission is obviously fulfilling an election commitment. As the Treasurer says, productivity is imperative for long-term economic prosperity. The Treasurer obviously already established the commission in an interim form in April of this year, and it has already been referred two public inquiries: one into electricity pricing and the other into solar feed-in pricing. It has already been flagged that other possible areas include housing affordability, clean energy, industry and consumer regulation, regional development and Indigenous economic development. I am pleased to see that there is bipartisan support for the role that it can take.

I want to very briefly go to some of the issues that were raised by stakeholders to show respect to the effort that was put in by the stakeholders who made submissions and appeared before our inquiry. One of those concerns was about the commission being funded through a combination of base funding and industry and other contributions for specific inquiries. Some submitters like the Queensland Farmers' Federation, the Queensland Council of Unions and CCIQ wondered about the transparency of that proposal. Again we went back to the department and spent quite some time interrogating that issue. But we are very comfortable in accepting the department's advice that in fact there is no power or compulsion to require the industry to contribute, and the practical evidence is that it is a longstanding practice for the Queensland Competition Authority and other independent regulators to fund parts of their operation. In fact, in the last financial year the QCA received about 60 per cent of its funding from public and private regulated entities.

Another concern was about the QPC not duplicating the work of the Australian Productivity Commission. Again, we were very happy to accept the advice of the department that, while there is potential for duplication when referring an inquiry to the QPC, the Treasurer will be able to work out what is on the Australian Productivity Commission's agenda and make a decision accordingly. Regarding the length of time for the minister to provide a written response, as usual with the LNP you

never let the facts get in the way of a good story. The member for Surfers Paradise spent several minutes referring to something in the report which stated that the reason the minister could not reply within six months was that it might not agree with some dodgy thing the government was doing. There is no part of the report which refers to that at all, and it is really quite appalling that he is using this speech about such an important bill to feed in with some story that he is trying to make up. This is based on the Victorian model, and from advice from the department it is clear that it is quite similar to the Commonwealth model as well, so let us look at the facts when we are talking about these things.

I refer to the issues that were raised by the Waste Recycling Industry Association of Queensland. We accept that they have been through a long and tortuous process, but we also accept the department's submission that in fact this has contributed to some new processes with regard to transparency of decision-making and being able to accept neutrality complaints from industry associations. We also accept that the new body is an advisory body whose function is to make recommendations, and there are other mechanisms for the implementation and enforcement of those recommendations. I would like to acknowledge that we took the concerns of those stakeholders very seriously. We thank them for their contribution, and I thank the committee.

 **Mr CRANDON** (Coomera—LNP) (5.27 pm): Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to make a very brief contribution to the Queensland Productivity Commission Bill 2015 and, more to the point, to speak a little bit to Report No. 15 of the Finance and Administration Committee as the deputy chair. I acknowledge the comments that have been made by the chair of the committee. We certainly worked in a bipartisan way in relation to reviewing this particular bill and asking questions. At the outset I need to thank all of the members of the committee for the very robust, but positive, discussion that we had at times to bring this report to the House with a unanimous recommendation. Of course the secretariat have been working very hard. As I mentioned, this is Report No. 15 and I think we have got to about Report No. 17, so it has been a very full calendar for the committee and certainly for the secretariat, particularly with the four-year-term inquiry as well that we have just tabled the report on.

I acknowledge all of the people who took time to come to committee hearings and make submissions to us. I also acknowledge the constant support we received from the department. They were able to, sometimes in very short time frames, provide us with the answers we needed in relation to various aspects of the inquiry. Various members of the public, various organisations and so on raised issues, and we were able to get answers from the department very quickly, which was very good. We had general support. As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has already mentioned, we are not opposing the bill. I note that some amendments will be moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. Some concerns were raised. I recall asking: is this a toothless tiger? Is the Productivity Commission just a name and is it able to do anything about things that might come forward? Certainly, the commission that looked at things previously seemed to be a toothless tiger.


The committee looked closely at some of the issues raised before us. One in particular—interestingly, it has been mentioned by both the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the committee chair—is the issue of competitive neutrality. It is a big issue that is alive and has been going since 2011. I refer to the Waste Recycling Industry Association complaint to the Queensland Competition Authority in relation to the Sunshine Coast Regional Council. The QCA inquiry took some 12 months—it was very extensive—and found that the Sunshine Coast Regional Council's waste and resources management business does have a competitive advantage over potential competitors. That is where the question arises as to whether or not 'toothless tiger' is the right term. Although the council was given some opportunity to make decisions that may restore competitive neutrality, it went behind closed doors and made some decisions, but those decisions were to do nothing and leave things as they were. It is now 4½ years down the track. Even though pathways were recommended by the Queensland Competition Authority, the council chose to do nothing about the situation and there was nothing the Queensland Competition Authority could do about that.

There were two particular things noted by stakeholders in relation to part 5 of the bill. One was the ability of the industry association to make competitive neutrality complaints. The other related to the enforcement of recommendations where the commission finds there has been a breach of competitive neutrality. In short, the committee investigated the issues. Although it is indeed the case, we are satisfied now, having made the inquiry of the department, that the department is working to address those concerns. We look forward to those concerns being properly addressed going forward and to perhaps some resolution for those waste management businesses on the Sunshine Coast.

In relation to competitive neutrality, in its report on the matter the QCA agreed that it did have jurisdiction. Whereas the Waste Recycling Industry Association indicated that the QCA at that point had no jurisdiction to investigate something if an association made a complaint, it was determined—and the

QCA agreed—that it did in fact have jurisdiction to investigate complaints from an industry association. So something positive has come out of this whole affair for that association and for other industry associations. Now there is capacity for it to investigate on behalf of a whole industry, as opposed to expecting one particular business in an industry to come forward. Sometimes coming forward comes with great potential cost to the business, both in financial terms and in terms of the risk of being singled out perhaps by the local authority. The committee noted the department's advice that a precedent has now been set. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has well and truly canvassed the issues covered in the report and the bill. I also note the comments made by the committee chair in relation to it. I will go no further on that topic.

I have taken the opportunity to read through the amendments to clause 23 proposed to be moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I will not speak to the amendments now, but I have had an opportunity to look through them. To be honest, I do not know why we did not consider canvassing those particular issues during our committee hearings. Perhaps in the future when we are looking at this type of bill we should look at giving consideration to things that will be canvassed by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition at a later time.


 **Mr WHITING** (Murrumba—ALP) (5.36 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Queensland Productivity Commission Bill. The establishment of this body is another important part of forging an economy that is strong, growing and diversified. It is also part of forging an economy that adds to the quality of life of working Queenslanders. The Productivity Commission will provide independent economic and policy advice to the state with the goal of increasing productivity as well as improving the living standards of Queenslanders and driving economic growth.

The Queensland Productivity Commission will go wider than the traditional economic scope that we may usually expect from such a body. It will be looking at improving living standards. The Queensland Productivity Commission will look at not just how something will improve productivity but also its impacts on living standards, employment and real wages.

Certainly, I do like the breadth of the approach of this bill. I think it recognises that the economic wellbeing of the state is not just created by the people we see on the business pages in the newspaper; it is also created by the families around the kitchen tables of Queensland homes, it is created by the mums and dads who volunteer their time helping out at the junior sports clubs and it is created by the grandparents who spend a lot of their time looking after their grandkids while the parents are at work. The Queensland Productivity Commission will help us make sure that we have productivity growth and that it is benefiting the working Queenslanders who create it.

As we know, the Queensland Productivity Commission is already at work. It has been operating since 1 May 2015 as a government entity under the Public Service Act. It has commenced an inquiry into electricity prices and is also conducting an inquiry into a fair price for solar. It is investigating the public and private benefits of rooftop solar, including the social, economic and environmental benefits. As we know, it is also undertaking a regulatory and economic impact assessment of the Sugar Industry (Real Choice in Marketing) Amendment Bill 2015, introduced by the member for Mount Isa.

Productivity is the key. It drives long-term economic prosperity. Productivity is the single most important determinant of our living standards. In Queensland about half of all per capita growth over the last 30 years has been attributable to productivity growth. We have to keep looking for productivity gains and see where they can be made, and that is why the Queensland Productivity Commission will be so important. It is another component of that broader plan to grow and diversify our economy and create jobs now and jobs into the future and it complements the other recent components of our plan—Advance Queensland, the new draft infrastructure plan and Building Queensland—which will help create that infrastructure pipeline for the future. The Palaszczuk Labor government plan and its components such as this are all designed to grow and diversify Queensland's economy to, as I said, provide jobs now and for the future.

 **Miss BARTON** (Broadwater—LNP) (5.40 pm): I rise to speak on the Queensland Productivity Commission Bill as a member of the Finance and Administration Committee. At the outset I want to acknowledge and thank my fellow members of the committee and all those who took the time to make written submissions to the bill, appear at public hearings and also thank the departmental officers for their assistance and guidance. I also want to acknowledge the secretariat for the work that it has done in helping us prepare this report. As has been flagged by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and shadow Treasurer, we will of course not be opposing this bill but the shadow Treasurer will move an amendment during the consideration in detail stage. As has been highlighted by many members in this

debate, the aim of the Queensland Productivity Commission Bill is to create an independent economic advisory body which can look at how we can lift productivity, improve living standards and drive economic growth. It is important to note that there will be formal public inquiries, reviews and investigations into complex economic and policy issues that can be referred by the Treasurer. The Treasurer himself can also request advice or research, although it does concern me that when we have a government that talks about accountability and transparency when the Treasurer requests advice or research there does not need to be a public inquiry as part of that process. It is also important to note that the Productivity Commission will also have a mandate to initiate its own research and analysis.


The other important factors in the Queensland Productivity Commission Bill are the regulatory advice and guidance and the competitive neutrality functions. Those have been taken from the Competition Authority. Just briefly with respect to regulatory advice and guidance, I am sure that all members on this side of the House would agree that it is absolutely paramount that in this space the Productivity Commission work to ensure that there are no shackles on small business and entrepreneurs in Queensland as we continue to ensure that business can grow and small business can grow so that we can create jobs and that those businesses themselves are able to grow. I want to pay tribute to the member for Nanango for the work that she did in the last term of parliament in looking to reform the regulatory framework of Queensland so that it was not a burden, particularly on small business.

I do have concerns that this is effectively just creating another government bureaucracy. As touched on by the member for Surfers Paradise and Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the establishment of a Productivity Commission was something that was mooted in the Queensland Commission of Audit and certainly the LNP when in government had started to take action toward this. Rather than establishing a separate stand-alone body and creating another bureaucracy and another authority, we were looking to ensure that these productivity functions were within the Queensland Competition Authority. It just seems to me that this is just another example of a government that is obsessed with inquiries and bureaucracy and authorities and reviews as opposed to a government that is obsessed with actually doing anything.


I am sure all members of this House but particularly members of the LNP absolutely recognise the need to boost productivity to help drive economic growth and there are things that we need to look at in terms of moving forward into the future. As I said, we need to not only look at productivity but also consider population growth and workforce participation when it comes to economic growth. As I said, this was a recommendation that came out of the Commission of Audit and I am sure that all members on this side of the House would be glad to see that Labor is following the LNP's lead when it comes to recognising the importance of productivity to economic debate.

I want to briefly touch on the member for Surfer Paradise's amendment which he has flagged, and the amendment and the explanatory notes were circulated around the House earlier. I am disappointed that the Treasurer has indicated that the government will not be supporting this amendment and when we have a government that wants to talk about openness and accountability and transparency it strikes me that it is a bit of a shame that this government does not want to give the House an opportunity to instruct the Productivity Commission towards particular investigations. The Treasurer in his response to the member for Surfers Paradise's amendment said that he did not want to confuse the Productivity Commission with respect to multiple masters, but it strikes me that this is not necessarily about who the master is but respecting the sovereignty and the democratic right of this parliament to say on behalf of the people of Queensland by a majority that we think that the Productivity Commission should look to a particular issue. As I said, economic growth is absolutely paramount and productivity is one of the massive drivers of that and I find it a little disappointing that a government that talks so much about openness, transparency and accountability is effectively seeking to gag the right of this House to have a say in those particular factors, particularly when we are talking about productivity.

As I said, in spite of those concerns, the opposition will not be opposing this bill. There were not a large number of submissions on the bill, but those who took the time to make submissions expressed their support for this bill. I note that the member for Coomera spoke particularly about competitive neutralities, so I do not intend to canvass those issues again, but it was certainly something that was raised by the waste industry association and I would certainly urge all members of this House to consider whether or not we should be gagging this House and the sovereignty of this House to make decisions and encourage open and accountable discussions about productivity and economic growth in this state.

 **Mr PEGG** (Stretton—ALP) (5.46 pm): As the House is aware, one of the first commitments made by this government was to drive productivity reform and economic growth as well as boosting innovation across Queensland. The establishment of the Queensland Productivity Commission will fulfil another election promise. This legislation will ensure that an expert independent body is established to review complex economic and regulatory issues and propose evidence based policy reforms to government, and a key point here is independent. At this point I am reminded of a quote from Sir Humphrey that applies very well to the former LNP government and explains why it never considered implementing a Productivity Commission in Queensland: 'Minister, sometimes the most open and democratic way to do something is to do it in secret.' Clearly the LNP took Sir Humphrey's advice as, unfortunately, that is exactly how it acted during its tenure. Premier Newman did not want any peer review of his policies because he thought he knew exactly what he was doing. Put simply, Premier Newman felt he knew best and independent evidence based analysis, not to mention an independent statutory body to offer suggestions to him on how to enhance the Queensland economy, would just get in the way of his master plan for Queensland.

This was a master plan with the LNP's seal of approval stamped on the cover which included a cruel and obsessive focus on cutting government spending, sacking 14,000 public servants and selling highly profitable government owned corporations in a desperate fire sale to pay down debt, no matter what independent advice was provided to the contrary. Just think how much money, public resources and jobs could have been saved, not to mention how many families could have potentially saved money on their electricity bills, if the Queensland Productivity Commission had been established just a few years earlier. In stark contrast to the secrecy of the former LNP government, the establishment of the commission under Labor will allow reviews to be undertaken by independent experts through an open and transparent process informed by widespread public consultation. Everyone will have a chance to have their say and everyone will be listened to. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr WEIR** (Condamine—LNP) (5.48 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Queensland Productivity Commission Bill 2015 as a member of the Finance and Administration Committee. The establishment of the Queensland Productivity Commission was an election commitment by the Labor Party announced during the course of the 2015 election campaign with the broad objectives of lifting productivity, improving living standards and driving economic growth. An interim commission was announced by the Treasurer on 28 April 2015, with Mr Kim Woods subsequently appointed as the principal commissioner who commenced in that role on 1 October 2015. The interim commission has since been referred two public inquiries—the first in relation to electricity prices and the second into solar feed-in pricing.

Whilst business and industry were largely supportive of the bill, there were concerns around some aspects of the commission, such as funding, duplication and the absence of enforcement provisions for competitive neutrality breaches or withholding information. The commission is to be funded by a combination of government, industry and other contributions. The state government allocated funding of \$300,000 in 2015-16 and \$2.5 million from 2016-17 in the state budget. This raised concerns with groups such as the Chamber of Commerce & Industry, the Farmers' Federation and the Queensland Council of Unions, with the CCIQ stating that any funding from industry could be perceived as compromising the neutrality of an independent objective by the commission. The QFF expressed concern as to how industry contributions would be sought.

In response, the department stated that there will be no power of compulsion to require industry to contribute. It further advised that funding arrangements are not addressed in the bill and are a matter for the commission to resolve with the government via its administering department. The department further advised that there may be circumstances where the funding may be sourced from external parties with a policy interest, but that this would be managed centrally and that the commission would be indifferent to the funding source. The Queensland Competition Authority operates in such a manner and there have been no suggestions that its independence has been compromised.

The Queensland Resources Council, whilst supporting the bill, stated—

As drafted, the purpose of the Act seems to assume that independent economic advice can drive economic growth. QRC suggests that rather than 'driving economic growth', the purpose should be to 'enable' economic growth or to 'remove impediments to' economic growth.

The Australian Mines and Metals Association and the Property Council of Australia expressed the view that the new Queensland Productivity Commission not duplicate the work of the Australian Productivity Commission. The AMMA suggested that the Queensland Treasurer and the federal Treasurer undertake consultation before issuing any written direction and take into account any current

and completed Australian Productivity Commission inquiries in the same area of regulation before instigating any Queensland inquiry and that there would need to be some clear guidelines to minimise any risk of duplication.

The board will consist of a principal commissioner and up to two other commissioners who can be appointed for a period of up to three years. The appointment and remuneration are to be decided by the Governor in Council following the usual cabinet consideration. The core business of the commission is to conduct formal public inquiries, reviews and investigations into complex economic and policy issues as referred to it by direction of the Treasurer as the minister responsible. The minister may direct the commission to undertake an inquiry on a matter related to productivity, economic development or industry in Queensland. When a direction to undertake an inquiry has been given to the commission, it must be published on the website. Public inquiries will also be advertised on the website and interested parties will be able to provide submissions to the commission. Public consultation is to be a key element of the inquiry's function.

When finalised, the commission will provide a written report to the minister and the minister must provide a written response to that report within six months. Some submitters expressed concern about the six-month time frame, considering it to be excessive. The department stated that, by allowing a maximum period of six months, the minister would have the opportunity to thoroughly review and consider the commission's report and recommendations and consult further if required before providing a response. In many cases, the government would be able to respond much sooner and reports would be published in a much shorter time frame. The department advised that the intention of the legislation is to allow the government to simultaneously release the commission's report and the whole-of-government response. The minister may, by written notice, ask the commission for advice on a matter related to productivity, economic development or industry in Queensland and will have the mandate to initiate its own general research and analysis. This aspect was supported by submitters, stating that the commission should have the ability to self refer similar to the Australian Productivity Commission.

The Queensland Resources Council suggested that the commission should be allocated a specific proportion of people and budget earmarked for the commission's self-directed work. In the absence of a dedicated research budget, there is a risk of the commission's inquiry work crowding out its important research work. At present the Queensland Competition Authority undertakes the state's competitive neutrality function. That function will be transferred to the Queensland Productivity Commission. The interim commission's website summarises competitive neutrality as follows—

Competitive neutrality requires that public sector business activities that are in competition with the private sector should not have competitive advantages or disadvantages, just because they are owned or controlled by government.

Accordingly, the bill provides for an independent mechanism that allows competitors of government business to lodge a complaint where they believe that the business enjoys a competitive advantage by virtue of its government ownership.

The Chamber of Commerce & Industry Queensland raised concerns that the commission has no statutory power to enforce the recommendations of an investigation report about competitive neutrality. The department advised that maintaining a recommendation role ensures that the ultimate decision-maker should remain the accountable minister or local government, but with the assistance of an expert investigation by an independent body. The public release of all documentation relating to the competitive neutrality complaint means that the government will ultimately be held accountable for the decision that it makes and any resulting actions, or lack thereof. The committee considers that the role of the Queensland Productivity Commission is to make recommendations and that there should be other mechanisms for the implementation and enforcement of those recommendations.

Both the Queensland Resources Council and the Local Government Association of Queensland expressed concern that the bill does not provide a penalty for failure to provide requested information to the commission in contrast to the Queensland Competition Authority Act, which provides a penalty. The department stated that the Queensland Productivity Commission is an advisory board to government and, as such, is significantly different from other people or bodies that handle information such as the Auditor-General, or the Queensland Competition Authority.

As I stated at the beginning of my address, the purpose of this bill is to lift productivity and drive economic growth. In that regard, this Labor government needs all the help and advice that it can get. To date, this government has been more concerned about pandering to its union bosses than introducing any worthwhile legislation to encourage growth and productivity. We see resource projects




delayed and tied up in the Land Court owing to the actions of this government, not to mention the industrial relations amendments that discourage employers from expanding their businesses and their workforce.

Business and industry have been waiting for some indication that this government is serious about productivity and economic growth. The establishment of the Queensland Productivity Commission would at least be a start. The committee reached agreement on this bill and recommended that the bill be passed.

Debate, on motion of Mr Weir, adjourned.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

### Member for Mudgeeraba


 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (5.56 pm): I refer to the statement made by the member for Mudgeeraba in the House this morning in relation to a letter from me dated 15 October 2015. I confirm to the House, consistent with my statement to the House yesterday, that I approved visits for the member for Mudgeeraba in a letter signed by me on 15 October 2015. This letter was sent through the usual correspondence process from my office to the Department of Health for dispatch.

I am advised that, following discussions with the Gold Coast Hospital and Health Service, an officer of the Department of Health decided not to mail the letter. I was not advised by either the Gold Coast Hospital and Health Service or by the Department of Health of this decision. My office was first advised by the director-general that this letter was not sent this morning following the member for Mudgeeraba's statement to the House. My office asked that the director-general settle his advice and provide it to me in writing. I received the written advice from the director-general at 5.18 pm this evening.

I have come into the House at the first opportunity to address this after receiving this advice. I table a copy of the written advice provided to me by the director-general.

*Tabled paper:* Document, dated 12 November 2015, titled 'Ministerial Brief for Noting' regarding correspondence from Ms Ros Bates MP and department processing [\[1656\]](#).

### Alleged Contempt of Parliament by a Minister


 **Hon. JR MILLER** (Bundamba—ALP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services) (5.58 pm), by leave: I refer to the ministerial statement I made last night when I said that I regretted any distress my actions may have caused to the member for Mount Ommaney. To make it crystal clear, I apologise to the member and the House.

## QUEENSLAND PRODUCTIVITY COMMISSION BILL

### Second Reading

Resumed, on motion of Mr Pitt—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef) (5.59 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Queensland Productivity Commission Bill. I am proud to say that this bill is the fulfilment of another of our election promises. It reflects this government's commitment to excellence in policymaking and its commitment to both public consultation and expert advice. Already, the Queensland Productivity Commission in its interim form is investigating electricity pricing to improve outcomes for consumers and solar feed-in prices with the aim of determining a fair price for solar power.

Solar energy is an important part of our commitment to renewable energy. I am passionate about renewables, not just in my capacity as minister for the environment but also as member for Mount Coot-tha. This is something my constituents raise with me often and eagerly. In 2008 there were less than 1,000 solar PV customers. In June of this year there were almost 400,000. This is just one example of how the Queensland Productivity Commission will provide a vital service for the government and the state. I commend the bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Dr Miles, adjourned.

## INFRASTRUCTURE, PLANNING AND NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

### Reporting Date



**Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (6.00 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee—

1. resume its consideration of the Planning and Development (Planning for Prosperity) Bill 2015, Planning and Development (Planning Court) Bill 2015 and Planning and Development (Planning for Prosperity—Consequential Amendments) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015; and
2. report to the House on these bills by 21 March 2016.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

## MOTION

### Trade Unions



**Mr LANGBROEK** (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (6.01 pm): I move—

That this House:

1. expresses its concern over the influence of unelected trade union officials upon this government;
2. notes particularly the interim report of the Royal Commission into Trade Union Governance and Corruption handed down on 15 December 2014;
3. notes that the CFMEU and its officials have been adversely mentioned in that report;
4. notes that Mr Michael Ravbar, Queensland State Secretary of the CFMEU, remains a member of the ALP national executive, and that the CFMEU remains affiliated with the Australian Labor Party (Queensland Branch); and
5. calls on the government to desist from meeting with any unions or trade union officials who are currently under investigation by the Royal Commission into Trade Union Governance and Corruption until its final report has been released and all investigations into alleged criminal behaviour by trade union officials have been finalised.

There can be no doubt that the trade union movement has a disproportionate level of influence over this stumbling, bumbling Palaszczuk Labor government. We have had United Voice proudly proclaiming its MPs in parliament, a clear demonstration of ownership, published in a tweet—I will table it for the House—on 25 March. It shows the member for Capalaba, the member for Springwood, the member for Mount Coot-tha, who just spoke, the member for Barron River, the member for Mundingburra, the member for Thuringowa and the member for Pine Rivers. It was all about 'our MPs'.

**Mr Pyne:** What about me? I pay my dues too.

**Mr LANGBROEK:** The member for Cairns is not in the photo. The point is that it is claiming that they are their MPs and they will basically do whatever they want them to do.

**Mr Crandon:** And they do!

**Mr LANGBROEK:** And they do. There is no doubt about that from the decisions that we see and the style in which those opposite operate. We saw it from the Minister for Health. It is the unions style to come in here and make false claims. It turns out that the claims are someone else's fault, of course, but then there is no apology. A few moments ago we saw it from the member for Bundamba, the Minister for Police: a grudging apology that she had to be dragged kicking and screaming to make to the member for Mount Ommaney for what she did the day before yesterday in the parliament. I am happy to table the United Voice team photo from Craig Crawford.

*Tabled paper:* Photograph, dated 24 March, of the member for Capalaba, Mr Don Brown MP; the member for Springwood, Mr Mick de Brenni MP; the member for Mr Coot-tha, Dr Steven Miles MP; the member for Barron River, Mr Craig Crawford MP; the member for Mundingburra, Ms Coralee O'Rourke MP; the member for Thuringowa, Mr Aaron Harper MP; and the member for Pine Rivers, Ms Nikki Boyd MP, shared on Facebook by the member for Barron River, Mr Craig Crawford MP [1657].

When I was the Minister for Education and Training, the union was out there creating concern for people who were teacher aides, cleaners and admin officials. They were scaremongering that people would be losing their jobs and that we would not be abiding by the award they had signed up to. That is what they did in staff rooms in schools across the state. In the short term they may well think they have been successful. But this side stands up for decent, honest behaviour and making sure that we communicate decently with the people of Queensland. That is what we are committed to doing.

We have seen major levels of intrusion of unions into senior ministerial offices. We have tried to expose that. That has been refused. The reason that we have not been able to expose it is that there are simply too many examples. The Information Commissioner said the police minister's office—the office of the trouble-prone member for Bundamba—handled as many as 1,000 documents relating to unions during her first four months in the role and producing them for the opposition would be unreasonable because there were so many. One can only imagine what was in the documents. Riding instructions? Advice on her portfolio? Whatever it is, it does not matter because she is not getting any better. As we have seen again this week, the member for Bundamba is in another disaster. We see the charming member for Ferny Grove opposite—another union thug. What we see is a troubling level of influence from a range of organisations that have been shown to have a questionable moral code. What we heard from the Premier a couple of sitting weeks ago is that one bad apple does not prove that there is a problem. We see from the royal commission, in Sydney at the moment and Canberra and Brisbane before that, is a style throughout the unions where hardworking union people put up their money and people like those opposite rise to the top of the tree simply because they take advantage of the contributions of hardworking trade union members. We saw the former official who acknowledged that he destroyed seven tonnes of documents requested by the royal commission. Dave Hanna confirmed he had covered a security camera and helped back a horse trailer up to the door so the details of the dirty deals could be dumped. It is outrageous. It is not only the disgraced CFMEU pulling the reins, we have the Treasurer, who is in the chamber now, beholden to the Plumbers Union. He has done things to get their support. It is not the people of Queensland who win; it is the unions.



**Hon. CW PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (Treasurer, Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (6.05 pm): I rise to speak on this motion and reject it categorically. Being lectured by those opposite about decency, about ways of dealing with people and about consultation is absolutely laughable. The position taken by the opposition really does shine a light on some of the key reasons why they are now sitting in opposition. Once again those opposite have made unions a central issue for parliament. They are not here to discuss education, infrastructure, health or any other important policy matters. No, once again they have decided to waste the time of this House obsessing over the union movement. They are obsessed by unions. They are fixated on them in a very similar way to the way that some teenage girls are obsessed with Justin Bieber. It is that sort of an approach. They are absolutely obsessed with unions. Unions are not the boogiemans. They really need to get this through their heads. They are made up of members of the community: nurses, teachers, paramedics, firefighters, shop assistants, electricians, office workers, plumbers and factory workers. These are everyday Queenslanders and every time they attack a union they are attacking everyday Queenslanders. They are working families, young people, people who care about issues, such as employment security, decent health care and quality education. I am proud to be part of a government that respects unions as genuine stakeholders, which is what they are.

I have previously informed the House in my capacity as the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations that I am required to meet with many key stakeholders, including unions, employer groups, businesses and other peak bodies. As a responsible and consultative minister I will meet with these stakeholders often. I will not be told by those opposite, who are too arrogant to consult—and this is a principal reason why they lost government—whom the government can and cannot meet with.

**Mr Crandon** interjected.

**Mr PITT:** Those opposite try to paint a picture that this government is unduly influenced by unions. They have conspiracy theories that we meet with them all the time.

**Mr Crandon** interjected.

**Mr PITT:** The real story is that at the end of October, since forming government, in my capacity as the minister, my publicly available ministerial diary extracts show that I have had over 1,100 meetings, of which only 40 were with trade unions. But, of course, these meetings do not happen in a vacuum. I meet with stakeholders to consult, to listen and to solve problems.

**Mr Crandon** interjected.

**Mrs Smith** interjected.

**Mr PITT:** This is a departure from the previous government that was out of touch. They lost touch with stakeholders, they lost touch with the public.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Minister, I do not want to disrupt your thought pattern and I apologise. Member for Coomera, you are now warned under standing order 253A. Member for Mount Ommaney, you are warned under standing order 253A.

**Mr PITT:** One thing the opposition was very good at—it was an expert even—was picking fights. It was very good at picking fights, particularly with Queensland's public servants. Since winning the election, the Palaszczuk government has been able to progress and settle a broad range of industrial matters involving public servants, because we have engaged with stakeholders. We have restored employment security for state government workers. We have restored a suite of other key workplace conditions for state and local government workers, such as their right to be consulted in situations of organisational change. We have settled protracted and outstanding enterprise negotiations with government owned corporations. We have approved a fair and reasonable public sector wages policy that has allowed us to settle protracted public sector wage disputes, providing pay rises to nurses, cleaners and teachers, amongst others.


**Mr Nicholls** interjected.

**Mr PITT:** The member for Clayfield should get out a bit more and meet some real people. This motion shows the disdain with which the LNP holds traditional process and natural justice. Those opposite want to deny due process. They are happy to brand people guilty until proven innocent. If there are questions about the political agenda of the royal commission, the right places to deal with those issues are with the police and the criminal or civil courts. On this side of the House we respect that process. One would think that it should be obvious, but clearly it is not for those opposite. Until that test is met, the Palaszczuk government will not put itself in the place of police, prosecution, defence, jury or judge. Those opposite may want to cross that line, but the Palaszczuk government certainly will not.

Of course the government welcomes inquiries investigating malfeasance in an organisation. If after the proper investigative process and any recommendations that the royal commission may make there is proven to be a wrongdoing, I am sure the members of those unions would themselves welcome the outcomes. We have always said that, if someone is acting outside the law, the unions should get back to the core business of representing their members and those acting outside the law should be punished by the law. The problem is that those on the other side treated with disdain the decisions of hundreds of thousands of working Queenslanders who elected this government to support working Queenslanders. In doing so, they marginalised most of Queensland by picking fights with them, which is why they are sitting opposite.

I will end with this: the royal commission is on now. In this state we had a commission called the Fitzgerald inquiry, which led to the standing powers of a royal commission being there for the CCC. Hang on! It was not called the CCC; it was called the CJC and then the CMC and then the CCC, because they mucked around with the powers. We on this side of the House will not do that. We respect process, and that is why we respect what is happening—

*(Time expired)*

 **Mr MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (6.12 pm): I rise in support of the motion before the House this evening. Both sides of the House might be surprised by the fact that I actually believe in the concept of unionism. I think it makes sense that workers should be looked after. I think it makes sense that there should be a representative body that speaks to the employers as one vote. I support that. However, I will tell the House what I do not support: I do not support unions having preferential treatment; I do not support unions having a bigger say than other stakeholders; I do not support unions dictating policy to the government; and I support union members, but I do not support bullying union leaders.

There can be no greater example of the unions dictating government policy than the department of education and the Minister for Education. Over the past three years, they campaigned mercilessly to remove us from government. They campaigned against some of the most successful policies that the education department has seen for years. Great Teachers = Great Results was a program that promoted mentoring teachers and master teachers to recognise excellence in schools. But, no! Let us drag everybody back to the common denominator. Let us not recognise excellence. Most principals will say that the Great Results Guarantee was the most effective policy in the history of education. Principals have told me that they received so much money through the Great Results Guarantee that they did not know what to do with it. They campaigned against that as well.


They campaigned against independent public schools. In the first round, only 26 schools picked up it up. Why? Because the unions scared the living daylights out of the school principals. In the next round, 130 schools applied and it was oversubscribed. I know that in electorates represented by members on this side of the House and that side of the House, communities and principals want more

IPSS, despite what the union has said. Under our advanced maintenance program, we provided \$300 million to get rid of the maintenance backlog, but the union would find a problem with anything that the previous government did.

The unions campaigned relentlessly and the unions have now been repaid in spades. The payback is underway. Let us look at some of the payback for the education union. The former vice-president of the union, Sam Pidgeon, who has had an entire career in teaching and education policy, now has been appointed to the board of Seqwater. She is extremely well qualified. Yesterday morning after a Remembrance Day service, I was driving back to parliament. I passed the local state school. Plastered all over the fence is union propaganda material, again politicising our school students and parents, who are subjected to that every day. It is absolutely disgraceful.

What do we see now? The unions are back on the selection panels for school principals. Can members imagine any organisation that allows unions to pick the leaders of an organisation? They are back in control. We have the president of the union, Kevin Bates, now on the selection panel for independent public schools. He campaigned against it, but he is now deciding which school should get independent public school status. However, it gets better than that. A whole school community can decide 100 per cent that they want to be an independent public school. The principal can agree with that and the parents can agree with that, but the unions have a right of veto. They can veto the wishes of the parents. If the union does not want it, the school will not be granted IPS status.

In relation to the employment of more teachers, in its monthly journal the union boasted that the QTU has been closely involved in planning the distribution of additional teachers with the department. The union is dictating the policy of the education department. The other thing that is incredible is that this union has been totally silent on the fact that the education portfolio, which covers 20 per cent of the state budget, does not have a stand-alone minister. It is mixed with four other portfolios. Can members imagine an LNP government not having education as a stand-alone portfolio? This union has the hide to say that it is not affiliated with the ALP. They are not affiliated in word, but they are definitely affiliated in action.

 **Ms GRACE** (Brisbane Central—ALP) (6.16 pm): It gives me great pleasure to stand here tonight to oppose the motion before the House. We have just witnessed some of the opposition's hysterical obsession and heard a diatribe of made-up statements in this House. I have had a long proud history with the union movement in this state that dates back to 1980. I have had a most fulfilling career that enabled me to be elected the first woman QCU general secretary in the then 115-year history of the peak union council. During many years as an official I worked with various governments, but in all those years I never encountered a more anti-union attitude, bordering on hysterical obsession, such as has been displayed almost daily by those opposite since the state election. And hasn't it been displayed tonight! They simply cannot get over the fact that they lost government. They have no policies. They now have no plans. They have no leadership. And surprise, surprise, what will they play? They will play the union card time and time again, trying to score lazy cheap political points.

In spite of what those opposite believe and whether they like it or not, unions have a legitimate role in a democracy and freedom of association is enshrined in our laws. Very well you might get up and say, 'I support unions', when in every minute and every opportunity available to those opposite they will denigrate unions. They make up stories, they make up motions about undue influence and they make up whatever they need to make up in order to give unions a hard time, because they have nothing else.


However, the clear message being sent by those opposite to workers throughout the state, which is really the concerning part as, indeed, was their actions towards the workplace during the three years of the Newman government, is that a worker's union membership and involvement right is not respected by those opposite and is at their peril. That is the message they sent QNU delegates who spoke out and they continue on their nasty path full of prejudice. Due to this unhealthy obsession against unions, fundamental principles of fairness and due process are being denied and discarded. The principles of innocence before being found guilty and that not all are guilty by association are being totally ignored by those opposite in this motion.

The trade union royal commission, the Heydon commission, which, I might add, is under a bit of a political dark cloud—there are accusations that this is a politically motivated royal commission—has handed down an interim report but has made it clear that evidence received by the royal commission is not the same as evidence in a court of law but based on the balance of probabilities. Therefore, to take any action before the final report and any outcomes of the recommendations are known is deleterious, unfair and pre-emptive.

No-one is above the law; we know that. As we have always said, everyone has a right to their day in court. It is up to the courts to decide their guilt or otherwise. Officials have rights and so do the unions to defend those rights should recommendations put them in a position where they have a right to do so. This motion is pre-emptive. It has been moved way before there is a need to do so.

It is interesting that those opposite were very happy to come in here when they were in government and appoint former BLF secretary Dave Hanna to various government boards when it suited them. I remember when we were first elected talking about 1 William and we had the member for Coomera and others yelling out across the chamber that it is a CFMEU building site. They were very happy when it suited them. When it does not, they want to discard all fairness and any sense of propriety and denigrate just for the sake of doing so.

It ain't going to wash with us on this side of the House! We will vote this motion down. Unions are democratically elected to protect all of the workers who elect them. They are there to do their job. Michael Ravbar has a right to represent his members and to have his day in court, the way any citizen of this country does. For those opposite to come in here and move motions about desisting meeting with union officials is unfair. It wrecks of arrogance and is totally unacceptable to this side of the House. This obsession must stop.

 **Mr WALKER** (Mansfield—LNP) (6.21 pm): The member for Brisbane Central certainly exhibited the hysterical approach that she criticised this side of the House for. Let us try to be a bit more measured about this. I am glad that the member mentioned Mr Ravbar. We have been told by the previous speaker and the Treasurer that we had been entering into diatribe, that we had made things up and that we had made people out to be boogiemens. Let us have a look at one of these boogiemens. Let us have a look at Mr Ravbar.

Mr Ravbar has certainly had a bit of trouble with the trade union royal commission. Let us look at what the trade union royal commission said about Mr Ravbar—Mr Ravbar who is and remains the Queensland state secretary of the CFMEU and a member for the ALP national executive. Here is how he has gone at the trade union royal commission.

The interim report of the trade union royal commission says that the Australian Securities and Investment Commission should look at whether consideration should be given as to whether—

Michael Ravbar should be charged with and prosecuted for breaches of his duty as an officer contrary to s 184 of the *Corporations Act* 2001 (Cth), and whether a civil penalty proceeding should be commenced and carried on against Michael Ravbar for contraventions of ss 180, 181 and 182 of the *Corporations Act* ...

Then the interim report refers to the Fair Work Building Inspectorate in order that consideration may be given as to whether proceedings should be commenced and carried on against—

... each of Michael Ravbar and Peter Close for coercion to the existence, exercise or refusal to exercise a workplace right ... Michael Ravbar ... for taking adverse action against another person as a result of the existence, exercise or refusal to exercise a workplace right ...

This is great leadership from this man. Then the report refers to the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission in order that consideration may be given as to whether proceedings should be instituted against—

... each of Michael Ravbar, Peter Close, Andrew Sutherland, Ben Loakes ... for a secondary boycott for the purpose of causing substantial loss or damage contrary to s 45D of the *Competition and Consumer Act* ...

Then to round out things the report refers to the Queensland Director of Public Prosecutions in order that consideration may be given to whether—

... each of Michael Ravbar and Peter Close be charged with and prosecuted for extortion contrary to s 415 of the *Criminal Code* ... each of Michael Ravbar and Peter Close be charged with and prosecuted for threats to cause detriment to another person ...

That is blackmail. To me, that does not wreak of a made-up view or a boogiemans. Mr Ravbar is here in black and white and in a fair bit of trouble. What happened on 1 September this year? None other than the Attorney-General notes in her diary that she has had a meeting with Mr Ravbar. Mr Ravbar is the person I have just been talking about. He is under investigation by the Director of Public Prosecutions in Queensland—an entity that answers to the Attorney-General, as the first law officer of this state—and she is meeting with Mr Ravbar who has the rap sheet that we have just heard.

That is a totally unacceptable position for the Attorney-General of this state to be in. The Attorney-General of this state should not meet with a person who is currently under investigation by the Director of Public Prosecutions for blackmail and extortion. It is a simple matter. It shows that the unions and people like Mr Ravbar still have a degree of influence which is totally unacceptable in a system like ours.

I want to move to another item showing exactly the same thing. It was mentioned in question time this morning. I am glad the Treasurer is here to hear it. There have been some comings and goings in the Queensland Industrial Relations Commission involving unions and local governments. On 29 October the Treasurer came into this House and said in relation to a current matter before that commission—

The tribunal is an important independent umpire which enhances a Westminster government.

That was the throwaway nice line. Then he stated—

As I have indicated to the unions—and I say this to all local workers in Queensland—if the requirements of my ministerial request—

which we heard about this morning in relation to the QIRC—

have not been satisfied, the government will immediately take steps to address this, including appealing the award ...

Why did the Treasurer have to say that in this parliament in relation to a pending matter before the commission? He was heavying the commission and he was heavying it at the insistence of the union. It is an improper use of his place in this House and improper interference in the commission as an entity.



**Mr POWER** (Logan—ALP) (6.27 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution to the debate on the disappointing motion moved by the member for Surfers Paradise and speak in opposition to it. I start by borrowing a few words from a colleague about the role of the union movement. Remember that these are not my words but the words of another member in *Hansard*. The member stated—

The union movement has an important role. The union movement has had an extremely important role in this state and in this nation for more than a century.

The member continues—

I recognise that, and I commend those people who have worked in the union movement ... That is why the union movement will always, and should always, have an important and respected role in this nation and in this state.

It may surprise members to hear that these words do not originate from a member on this side of the House. Indeed, these words can be found in *Hansard* on 9 November 2000 and they are the words of the member for Southern Downs. I will continue with a few more words of support from the member for Southern Downs. He stated—

Employee unions in this country have done vital work for over 100 years. Frankly, if we had not had them, the rights of workers which we have today would not be enshrined and guaranteed as they are. They deserve commendation for that.

I do not know if I would be as eloquent and as fulsome as the member for Southern Down. However, I agree with these sentiments. We know the member for Southern Downs is the father of the House, held in esteem by all—sorry, I correct that; held in esteem by almost 40 per cent of the members of the opposition benches. I further note today that the member for Burleigh in the debate about our ports—

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Members, I cannot hear the member for Logan's speech.

**Mr POWER:** I further note today that the member for Burleigh in the debate about our ports, as a dutiful MP, put great weight into reading into the parliamentary record the statements of the Maritime Union of Australia, arguing that this House should listen more to the MUA. He praised the opinions of the MUA. Indeed, this morning the member said, 'We need a member from Burleigh to stand up for the people,' such as the MUA.

As members may be aware, recent media reports have informed us, and indeed they have informed the member for Burleigh—and I have them here; I can table them, if the member for Burleigh wants me to—that the MUA has plans to merge with the CFMEU to create a new single union. The member for Burleigh this very morning urged members to listen more—

**Mr HART:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member is reading from a document, and I would like you to ask him to table it, please.

**Mr SPEAKER:** That is not a point of order.

**Mr POWER:** As I said, I am very happy to table this document that says, 'CFMEU and MUA enter merger talks to create "Australia's most powerful union".'

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Logan, have you tabled that now?

**Mr POWER:** I am happy to table it now. I am not actually reading from it. I table it for the member's benefit.

*Tabled paper:* News article from ABC Online, titled 'CFMEU and MUA enter merger talks to create "Australia's most powerful union"' [1658].

The member for Burleigh this very morning urged members to listen more to this future part of the CFMEU, even though he would, totally hypocritically, argue the opposite this afternoon. I guess the member wrote that speech before the tactics committee dreamed up this silly motion and thinks so little of it that he could not even be bothered rewriting it.

I note that this motion is not really about current members of the House. Instead, I read it as a thinly veiled attack on the former premier Campbell Newman. We all know that he approvingly quoted the former CFMEU official Mr David Hanna in this place in 2012. Let us not forget the Newman LNP government appointed Mr Hanna to government boards. No doubt those opposite cheered, 'Hear, hear,' just as they hypocritically howl this evening.

Mr Speaker, I may be new to this House. However, my understanding of the role of a member of parliament is to represent, to meet with and to stand up for the community. Earlier in this place I told members how I spoke with a rank-and-file delegate from the firefighters union while doorknocking and also the state secretary of the Queensland United Firefighters Union. Speaking with both rank-and-file members and officials deepened my understanding of the issue of higher cancer rates that firefighters face and the difficulty of proving causation to WorkCover. I am happy to speak to anyone to get a wider idea of what people are thinking, and this motion fundamentally directs members not to speak with people to understand their point of view. One member suggested that we should not speak to the Catholic Church or to the Salvation Army because they face a different inquiry. We need to listen to as many Queenslanders as possible to get a wider view.

Those opposite continue a bizarre obsession with the trade union movement. It is all we have heard from them this year. My suggestion is that they give up on their fixation and work on ideas that would make Queensland an even better place. In stark contrast, members on this side of the House are getting on with the job of our \$1.6 billion Working Queensland package, including the Advance Queensland initiative, which is helping to build jobs now and jobs for the future.

My community of Logan, where there are great workers, great businessmen and great community members and students, expect members in this House to be focusing on growing our economy and creating jobs, and that is what this Palaszczuk Labor government is doing. This motion attempts to prevent members like the member for Burleigh or any other member from being the kind of representative who stands up for the interests of their workers.

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

**AYES, 42:**

**LNP, 42—**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, Watts, Weir.

**NOES, 46:**

**ALP, 43—**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, Pitt, Power, Pyne, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

**KAP, 2—**Katter, Knuth.

**INDEPENDENT, 1—**Gordon.

Resolved in the negative.

## SPEAKER'S RULING

### Same Question Rule



**Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, the Leader of the House rose on a point of order under standing order 87 during the introduction of the Electoral (Improving Representation) and Another Act Amendment Bill this morning. I have circulated a ruling on this matter. I have found it very difficult to come to a final conclusion on the matter. This is because the bill seeks to achieve similar ends to the last bill via a different mechanism. In the end I have decided to allow the bill to proceed. I have ultimately



taken the view that standing orders should not be interpreted in a manner that does not affect the rights of members to introduce bills that seek genuinely alternative propositions rather than simply attempting to rearrange matters. I seek leave to incorporate the ruling.

Leave granted.

On 28 October 2015 the Member for Mansfield's private members' bill titled the Electoral (Redistribution Commission) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2015 failed to pass the second reading stage.

In summary that bill made three proposals:

- (a) That the number of electoral districts be determined by the Redistribution Commission) subject to a maximum increase of up to 5 additional electoral districts, ie the total seats in the Assembly would at the commission's discretion be between 89 and 94.
- (b) That the number of commissioners on the Redistribution Commission increase from three to five so as to comprise the Chairperson, the Electoral Commissioner, a Chief Executive of a Department (or equivalent) and two experts in demographics or statistics or regional or town planning.  
Further, that all appointments (excluding the Electoral Commissioner), to be made after the relevant Minister consulted with the parliamentary committee and the appointments were supported by each member recognised as the leader of a political party represented in the Assembly.
- (c) That representation in the Legislative Assembly change by legislating for the redistribution commission to have the capacity, at its discretion, to amend the additional large district number currently set at 2% up to 4%.

Today the Member for Mt Isa introduced the Electoral (Improving Representation) and Another Act Amendment Bill. The question I need to determine is whether the bill introduced today by the Member for Mt Isa is different in substance to the bill previously introduced by the Member for Mansfield.

Standing Order 87(1) provides:

"Unless these Standing Orders otherwise provide, a question or amendment shall not be proposed which is the same as any question which, during the same session, has been resolved in the affirmative or negative."

Likewise, Standing Order 150 provides:

"No amendment, new clause or schedule to a Bill shall be at any time moved which is substantially the same as one already negatived by the House, or which is inconsistent with one that has already been agreed to by the House, unless there has been an order of the House to reconsider the Bill."

At the outset I note that this is not a situation where a bill is the same as another bill that has passed the second reading stage, and the two bills are not both able to progress as they deal with the same matters. [See Speaker Simpson, 31 October 2013, PD p3777]

This is also not a situation where a bill seeks to reverse a bill passed earlier in the same session. That is, it does not seek to reverse the effects of a bill passed previously in the same session. [See Speaker Simpson, 02 May 2013, PD p1512]

In order to be out of order under SO 87 a bill does not have to be identical to another bill, merely the same in substance as the previous bill. In other words, it is a question of substance, not form.

In a ruling by Speaker Simpson on 6 August 2014 (PD p2496) a bill that dealt with entry of a reportable offender's residence in a different way was held not to offend the rule.

I also stress that the past practice has involved a consideration of the detail of the Bill, clause by clause, as in the past Bills have been allowed to progress to the second reading, but various clauses have been ruled out of order. (Speaker Reynolds 09 September 2008 PD p2559).

The Leader of the House has submitted to me that by rejecting the Member for Mansfield's bill the House has determined that the number of members of the Legislative Assembly was not to be increased. This is strictly not correct. The effect of the Legislative Assembly's decision to not pass the Member for Mansfield's bill was that the number of seats would not increase. But what the Assembly actually determined, in part, in rejecting that bill was that the power to delegate the power to increase the number of members to the Redistribution should not be granted.

The Leader of the House has also stated that the Member for Mt Isa could have moved amendments to the Member for Mansfield's bill in consideration in detail of that bill to reflect the current bill. This is not correct, as that bill was defeated at the second reading and did not progress to consideration in detail. There was no opportunity for amendments to be moved.

A detailed (clause by clause) comparison of the Member for Mt Isa's bill and the failed Member for Mansfield's bill has been undertaken to identify where the bills are amending the same clauses in either the Constitution of Queensland 2001 or the Electoral Act 1992 and how the bills are the same or different.

The Member for Mt Isa's bill is setting the number of members in the Assembly and electoral districts at 93 (see clauses 4, 7, 10 and 11 of bill). The Member for Mansfield's bill did not specify a set number, instead it provided for the number of members to be the same as the number of electoral districts, but limited any increase in numbers to a maximum of five additional electoral districts after the redistribution.

Both Bills seek to amend s 6 of the Electoral Act. Section 6 of the Act as it currently stands does three things.

Firstly, the section establishes three Redistribution Commissioners. The Member for Mt Isa's bill is not changing the number of Commissioners (see clause 8 of bill). The Member for Mansfield's bill on the other hand, sought to increase the Commission from three to 5 (see clause 7 of the bill).

Secondly, the section establishes qualifications or criteria for the non judicial commissioner. The Member for Mt Isa's bill is seeking to have the third commissioner to be a 'person with qualifications and experience in applied demography relevant to contemporary electoral redistributions.' The Member for Mansfield's bill sought to have one commissioner as a chief executive of a department or equivalent and the two additional commissioners to be experts in demography.

Thirdly, the section establishes how the commissioners are appointed. The Member for Mt Isa's bill proposes that the appointment of the chairperson or non judicial appointee be made only with the bipartisan support of the parliamentary committee. This is different to the Member for Mansfield's bill. The Member for Mansfield's bill required ministerial consultation with the parliamentary committee on the selection process and the appointment and went further by requiring support of all leaders of a political party in the Assembly.

Clause 15 of the Member for Mansfield's bill sought to amend s 45 of the Electoral Act. That is, it sought to allow the Redistribution Commission to vary the weighting applied to large electoral districts. There is no such amendment proposed to the Member for Mt Isa's bill.

Both bills do seek to amend s 52 of the Electoral Act. Both bills are inserting a new subsection dealing with when new electoral districts take effect. Although worded slightly differently, the effect of the amendment to s 52 in both bills is that the number of members in the Assembly does not change until the next election under the new electoral districts. However, this one clause being almost the same in both bills does not result in the bills being the same in substance.

Both bills seek to impact upon the number of members in the Assembly and the composition and appointment of the Redistribution Commission. However, the Bills are attempting to affect these matters in substantially different ways. The Member for Mt Isa's bill is different and narrower to the failed Member for Mansfield's bill and is, in substance very different. The proposition being put to the Assembly is, in the final analysis, a different proposition to that last proposed. The Member for Mt Isa's Bill, does not, therefore, offend the same question rule.

## QUEENSLAND PRODUCTIVITY COMMISSION BILL

### Second Reading

Resumed from p. 2905, on motion of Mr Pitt—

That the bill be now read a second time.



**Mr PERRETT** (Gympie—LNP) (6.39 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Queensland Productivity Commission Bill 2015. Productivity growth is one of the most significant factors for the long-term economic prosperity of this state. It is also a central and crucial factor in determining our standard of living. Increased productivity can lead to higher wages, reducing unemployment levels and improved standard of living.

I welcome the introduction of the Productivity Commission here in Queensland. Its core business will be 'to conduct formal public inquiries, reviews and investigations into complex economic and policy issues as referred to it by direction of the Treasurer, as the responsible minister'. Its success will be dependent on the government allowing it to provide fully independent advice that is properly resourced, that the government does not fall back into its preference for appointments of board members based on union affiliation and that the government provides a timely response to its recommendations. This cannot and must not be yet another body set up to conduct reviews and inquiries for them to be put back on the shelf or to be another excuse for inaction.

The membership of the board is important because it truly identifies whether the government intends this commission to be truly independent and to provide the best possible advice. It cannot be another excuse for the government to make even more dubious appointments of Labor Party and union mates, as it has been currently doing. To date, the record has been appalling, and I will watch keenly how this commission will run and be established. It is important that the board will not be beholden to various arbitrary quotas and conditions set by the government. Queensland is a decentralised state and much of this government's focus is on the huge population centres. Opportunities for further productivity growth can be and must be identified in other areas of the state.

In my own electorate of Gympie, we have a diverse range of industries which need to identify increased opportunities for further productivity. Gympie has the opportunity to develop more in the education, agricultural, manufacturing, tourism and creative industries. Gympie is a major contributor to the Queensland economy, with an estimated gross regional product in the 2013-14 financial year of \$2 billion. Manufacturing is the largest contributor, representing 10.5 per cent of Gympie's total gross regional product, followed by construction at 10.4 per cent and the agricultural, forestry and fishing industries at 9.1 per cent. Some of Australia's market leaders in manufacturing industries are in Gympie, employing 1,706 people or 12.1 per cent of employed people.

Multinational companies, major exporters and locally owned and established manufacturers produce goods and services, including heavy equipment for the mining, agricultural and transport industries, foodstuffs and major timber processing and value-added products. The wide range of

products grown and produced throughout the electorate include some of Queensland's outstanding food processors who provide valuable employment and industry development opportunities. There are: growers of export quality beef; dairy farms; seafood; timber and forestry products; citrus, ginger, avocado, olive and small crop growers; and growers of organic fruit and vegetables. Companies such as Nestle, Nolan Meats, Carter Holt Harvey, Laminex, Performax and Page Furnishers are found in Gympie.

Gympie has more than 4,200 small businesses, making it the largest employer group in the region. As a small business operator, I am acutely aware of how quickly pointless bureaucratic and legislative decisions can have a detrimental effect on the operation of a business. Small business has nowhere to go when fixed costs rise and regulations and rules become more burdensome. Communities such as mine suffer because businesses have to close their doors or lay off workers. Last week the chairman of the Australian Productivity Commission said that it was one of the three areas he had identified as needing reform to improve productivity. He said—

... it's been a perennial problem for business investment and therefore for employment growth in this country that businesses run up against planning rules continuously.

And so in this particular case it's far more a responsibility of the states than the Commonwealth.

A lot of faith is being invested in this commission—a lot is riding on this commission. The Treasurer said—

The new QPC will develop policy solutions to lift our State's productivity, improve living standards and drive growth.

We need to keep that sentiment in perspective. We will not see anything before next year from the commission, and the government has given itself up to six months to respond to any report. That time span is a real concern to many stakeholders who made submissions on the legislation. Let me put that time frame in perspective. If the commission delivered a report before Christmas, the government would not have to reply until the middle of next year—that is 18 months since the election and the midway point in this government's term of office. So much can happen—or in the case of Queensland not happen—in six months.

This commission is not the end of the job. This cannot be a substitute for action now. To date, Labor is holding Queensland back. In the latest CommSec State of the States report, Queensland has dropped from fourth to sixth place in economic growth, from third to last place in construction work, from third to fifth place in equipment investment and from third to fourth place in population growth. We have heard a lot of talk over the last 10 months. We have seen a lot of reviewing and not much doing and, as a result, Queensland still has the second highest unemployment rate in the country. Queenslanders deserve a government that is prepared to do whatever it takes to take the state forward and create jobs and opportunities for our kids into the future. It needs a government that has a real economic plan to create jobs, grow the economy and unleash Queensland's potential. I support the establishment of the Queensland Productivity Commission and look forward to its part in the direction of the Queensland economy over coming generations.



**Hon. CW PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (Treasurer, Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (6.44 pm), in reply: The member for Surfers Paradise mentioned his intentions to beef up the productivity review functions of the QCA which came out of the Commission of Audit. The former government had plenty of time to implement a range of measures coming out of the Commission of Audit, but they did not want to prioritise those aspects. They intended to establish a Queensland Independent Pricing and Productivity Authority but they ran out of time, with the Revenue and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014 not getting through the parliament before the last election.

In relation to clause 23, which we will no doubt go through in the consideration in detail stage, the member for Surfers Paradise raised concerns that a direction could be changed by a minister without anyone knowing about it once the direction had been made to the commission. I can inform the House that, upon receipt of a direction, the commission must publish the ministerial direction on its website. This also extends to a change of direction. I am happy to inform the member for Surfers Paradise that, if the government for whatever reason wished to vary or amend its original direction, this will have to be published on the website for all to see as soon as practicable. So there are no secrets; there is no cloak-and-dagger conspiracy here. There will be reasons for a change of direction given to the commission—due to changing economic conditions or policy developments in other jurisdictions, for example.

The member also asked for some clarification on clause 30(2), which I am happy to provide. Clause 30 states that the commission can undertake self-initiated research and analysis relating to productivity, economic development or industry in Queensland. This clause allows the commission to develop its expertise and knowledge of Queensland productivity, economic development and industry and make this available to the public where appropriate. This could take the form of short research papers, fact sheets or statistical analysis. The commission must advise the chief executive—that is, the Under Treasurer—before publishing any work undertaken under this part. This is a notification requirement only and government approval of the material prepared by the commission is not required. This is a way of ensuring the government is informed of the commission's operations and has access to any research and analysis that may be useful in developing its policy settings.

In relation to the opposition wanting a requirement to publish a draft report for an inquiry, I would refer them to the two directions to the Productivity Commission already—the review into electricity pricing and the review into solar feed-in tariffs. We have required the commission to publish draft reports in early 2016 as part of those directions. The practical reality of this is that it is expected that we will ask the commission to publish draft reports where it is in the public interest to do so, consistent with the overarching objectives of broad consultation by the commission.

The member wants to implement a new target for measuring red tape. We remember the days not so long ago when the former government considered the number of pages of the legislation to be a key measure of productivity. On the one hand, opposition members say they do not want to establish yet another bureaucracy, in their words, but in the same discussion they want to regulate every minor detail and decision of a new one.

The government does not support the proposed amendments put forward by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, which would give the Legislative Assembly, through a resolution, the power to direct a commission to undertake an inquiry on a matter relating to productivity, economic development or industry in Queensland. The minister responsible for overseeing the commission—myself as Treasurer—should have ultimate responsibility for the referral of inquiry matters as currently drafted in the bill. This does not preclude wide consultation in the lead-up to the referrals, including with the commission, key stakeholders and the public where appropriate. Referrals to the commission need to be carefully considered by the Treasurer on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the resourcing of the commission, given its relatively small staffing and budget profile, and the ability of the commission to add value when undertaking an inquiry. The government is not aware of any other similar bodies that have a referral power from the Legislative Assembly. The examples referred by the opposition are very different bodies from the QPC and have a clear public sector oversight function. I thank all members for their contribution to the debate on this bill, and I urge all members to support it, including the government's amendments.

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 26, as read, agreed to.

Clause 27—

 **Mr LANGBROEK** (6.50 pm): I raised this in the second reading debate. This clause is about a report on an inquiry. The clause says that the minister must give the commission a written response to the report within six months of receiving it. I think the members for Coomera, Gympie and Broadwater mentioned similar concerns. It is a protracted period in which to have a report from the government that was going to be released simultaneously with the response of the QPC. I mentioned that I was concerned that one of the reasons for the delay might be that the government did not want to respond to something that was not a policy of their own choosing. The member for Bulimba, who is the chair of this committee, sought to represent my statements as being not reflected in the committee's report and did not know where I was getting it from. I would like to read from the committee report itself for which the member for Bulimba is the chair. At page 13 of the report at part 3, division 3—'Report on inquiry', clauses 26 to 28, it states—

In its response to the Committee, the department advised the six month timeframe for the Minister's response to an inquiry report was to ensure the government could carefully consider the results of the Commission's analysis even where controversial or at odds with government policy.

On page 14 it actually states—

... this approach is intended to bring discipline and coordination to the report and response process and aims to ensure the response to the QPC reports, which will usually involve up to 12 months of intensive analysis and consultation, is of equal quality as the report itself.

My point to the Treasurer is that it could be interpreted that one of the reasons that there is a six-month delay is because, in the committee's own words—and the member for Bulimba is condemned by her lack of knowledge of her own report—the commission's analysis may be controversial or at odds with government policy. I would ask the Treasurer to respond.

**Mr PITT:** My earlier comments stand.

Clause 27, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 28 to 69—



**Mr LANGBROEK** (6.52 pm): I seek leave to move amendments en bloc.

Leave granted.

**Mr LANGBROEK:** I move the following amendments—

**1 Clause 9 (Functions)**

Page 8, line 7, after 'by'—

*insert—*

the Legislative Assembly or

**2 Before clause 23**

Page 13, before line 3—

*insert—*

**22A Legislative Assembly may direct commission to undertake inquiry**

(1) The Legislative Assembly may pass a resolution directing the commission to undertake an inquiry on a matter relating to productivity, economic development or industry in Queensland.

(2) The commission must comply with the direction.

**3 Clause 23 (Minister may direct commission to undertake inquiry)**

Page 13, lines 8 to 20—

*omit.*

**4 Clause 23 (Minister may direct commission to undertake inquiry)**

Page 13, line 21, '(3)'—

*omit, insert—*

(2)

**5 After clause 23**

Page 13, after line 21—

*insert—*

**23A Direction to undertake inquiry may direct process**

A direction under section 22A or 23 to undertake an inquiry may state the process the commission must adopt in undertaking the inquiry, including, for example, by requiring the commission to—

- (a) have regard to particular matters in undertaking the inquiry; or
- (b) undertake a particular type of public consultation as part of the process; or
- (c) publish a preliminary report on the inquiry at a particular stage of the process; or
- (d) give a report about the inquiry to a stated person within a stated period; or
- (e) include recommendations by the commission in a report about the inquiry.

**6 Clause 24 (Notice of inquiry)**

Page 13, line 25, 'the direction'—

*omit, insert—*

a direction under section 22A or 23

**7 Clause 25 (Public consultation)**

Page 14, lines 5 and 6—

*omit, insert—*

The direction to undertake the inquiry may require a particular type of public consultation to be undertaken. See section 23A(b).

**8 Clause 26 (Commission to prepare report)**

Page 14, line 9, before 'After'—

*insert—*

(1)

**9 Clause 26 (Commission to prepare report)**

Page 14, after line 10—

*insert—*

(2) If the Legislative Assembly directed the commission to undertake the inquiry, the Minister must table a copy of the report in the Legislative Assembly on its next sitting day.

**10 Clause 28 (Public availability of report)**

Page 14, lines 15 to 17—

*omit, insert—*

The commission must publish the report on its website as soon as practicable after—

- (a) if the Legislative Assembly directed the commission to undertake the inquiry—the report is tabled in the Legislative Assembly; or
- (b) if the Minister directed the commission to undertake the inquiry—receiving the Minister's response to the report.

I table the explanatory notes to my amendments.

*Tabled paper:* Queensland Productivity Commission Bill, explanatory notes to Mr John-Paul Langbroek's amendments [\[1659\]](#).

These are a number of amendments which I am introducing en bloc. It is about giving, through a resolution, the Legislative Assembly the power to direct the QPC, the Productivity Commission, to undertake an inquiry on a matter relating to productivity, economic development or industry in Queensland. I note that the Treasurer has already indicated in his summing-up that the government is not going to accept these amendments.

We are looking to enhance this bill. It is about recognising the primacy of parliament. I know the member for Broadwater mentioned this in her contribution. It is very important that every member who forms a part of the Legislative Assembly can properly participate in the functions of this important body. Members who will be voting against this will be voting against the legitimacy of the Legislative Assembly. It is an important body that is going to be preparing for the economic challenges that Queensland faces. It is not just the government that sees these challenges on the horizon, the honourable Treasurer has mentioned inquiries that are currently with the interim QPC about the solar feed-in tariff or electricity pricing. We have had debate recently about biofuels. If there is enough discussion about it, why could we not say that that is something that could go to the Productivity Commission?

I do not think any members in this place could profess to be the font of all knowledge about productivity, economic development or industry. This week we debated a motion about the establishment of a select inquiry on rural debt and drought. The member for Mount Isa has done a lot of work in putting this issue on the agenda and advocating for people in the bush. That is the point: we all come from different backgrounds; we have different perspectives and experiences. That is why we are putting these amendments forward. I hope I receive the support of those opposite, although they have already indicated otherwise. This is a government that says it is committed to transparency and reflecting the wishes of the parliament. That is what the Governor said in the opening address to the 55th Parliament. The Premier said—

My government has pledged to be more consultative, and to listen to Queenslanders before acting on their concerns.

It has pledged to be a government of consensus, but one that also is unafraid to take decisive action when necessary.

We have not seen much of that. She also concluded—

This recognises the fact that Queenslanders always work better when they work together.

The Legislative Assembly reflects the views of Queenslanders—or it should. We would like to see that the powers that the Auditor-General and the Ombudsman have—and I know the Treasurer has already said it is different. However, we think that the Legislative Assembly should be able to direct a body to undertake an inquiry. If we were to provide this function to the Legislative Assembly it must be done in the enabling legislation of the Productivity Commission. Many of the stakeholders indicated that they would like to see the kinds of inquiries the QPC should be undertaking, whether it is the QFF or the CCIQ; it is important. I think that we should seek the confidence of the parliament in this matter.

**Mr PITT:** My comments from my summing-up stand.

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

**AYES, 42:**

**LNP, 42**—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, Watts, Weir.

**NOES, 44:**

**ALP, 43**—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, Pitt, Power, Pyne, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

**INDEPENDENT, 1**—Gordon.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendments (Mr Langbroek) negatived.



**Mr PITT** (6.58 pm): I move the following amendment—

**1 Clause 52 (Definitions for pt 10)**

Page 26, line 12, 'section 6'—

*omit, insert—*

section 7

I table the explanatory notes to my amendment.

*Tabled paper:* Queensland Productivity Commission Bill, explanatory notes to Hon. Curtis Pitt's amendments [1660].

Amendment agreed to.

Clauses 28 to 69, as amended, agreed to.

Schedules 1 and 2—



**Mr PITT** (7.00 pm): I seek leave to move amendments en bloc.

Leave granted.

**Mr PITT** (7.00 pm): I move the following amendments—

**2 Schedule 1 (Dictionary)**

Page 35, line 29, 'section 3'—

*omit, insert—*

section 2

**3 Schedule 2 (Amendment of regulations)**

Page 39, line 17, 'Schedule 4'—

*omit, insert—*

Schedule 8

Amendments agreed to.

Schedules 1 and 2, as amended, agreed to.

### Third Reading

**Hon. CW PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (Treasurer, Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (7.02 pm): I move—

That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Question put—That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

### Long Title

**Hon. CW PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (Treasurer, Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (7.02 pm): I move—

That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

Question put—That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

## SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT



**Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (7.02 pm): I move—

That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until 9.30 am on Tuesday, 1 December 2015.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

## ADJOURNMENT



**Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (7.03 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

## Mount Lindesay Highway Safety Review



**Mr KRAUSE** (Beaudesert—LNP) (7.03 pm): We have heard a lot today about the Productivity Commission, and since being elected the government has made a lot of noise about creating jobs and promoting industry. They have also undertaken more than 70 reviews since the commencement of the government, and one of those reviews was the Mount Lindesay Highway Safety Review. It was announced shortly after the government changed in about March or April this year, public consultation took place which closed in September and we expected to see that review released around the end of September.

I am calling on the government here tonight to release the results of the Mount Lindesay Highway Safety Review. The residents of my electorate in Beaudesert, Jimboomba and all of the surrounding areas know that it is a busy road and it has a number of issues, not the least of which is the growth in a number of priority development areas around the Mount Lindesay Highway at Flagstone and Yarrabilba which are resulting—in Yarrabilba at least—in about 100 people moving into that area every month.

These are PDAs which were put in place by the former Labor government in 2010 and which are seeing an explosion in the number of people using the highway. We need to see that review released so there is a pathway forward for improvement to that highway. Slower traffic along that corridor stagnates the economy and affects the safety of motorists and people who use it for work, to get to school or even just for leisure. We need to see those results released, and I call on the minister, who is here tonight, to see to it that the government releases that review.

I also call on the minister to set out a vision for how the improvements to the Mount Lindesay Highway will be funded, because a lot of potential development can take place in my electorate of Beaudesert and surrounding electorates as well, but poor road infrastructure is holding back a lot of this development. That has come about because of a lack of planning over the last two decades where there has been a lot of residential growth—some would say unbridled residential growth in some parts, especially around Jimboomba and those parts of Logan City—but there has not been enough investment in road infrastructure, particularly the Mount Lindesay Highway and Waterford-Tamborine Road.

The people who live at Tamborine Mountain, Tamborine, Jimboomba and Beaudesert know the potential of the area. The Scenic Rim Regional Council knows the potential of the area. The Bromelton State Development Area has been slated as a future high-growth industrial park, but we need better road infrastructure.

I again call on the government to release the safety review and put the funds on the table or a plan for funding improvements to that highway. At the end of this term the Labor Party will have been in power for 17 out of the last 20 years, and it is time that they do something about the Mount Lindesay Highway.

## Skilling Queenslanders for Work, Graduation



**Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (7.06 pm): Before the election I promised to boost employment and invest in training and education in Woodridge, and I am delivering on that promise. As a government we have reinstated the Skilling Queenslanders for Work initiative. Within my electorate of Woodridge, 18 projects delivered through eight organisations received funding to the tune of \$2.6 million in the first funding round. This is slated



to create approximately 660 jobs for our local region. In October I had the pleasure of attending the first graduation of skilling Queenslanders participants at IKEA in Slacks Creek in the electorate of Woodridge.

**Mr Hinchliffe:** Does that make you the member for IKEA?

**Mr DICK:** Thank you, Leader of the House. No, it does not make me the member for IKEA, but I am very proud to support a large employer in my electorate. Twelve people successfully completed the Hospitality Certificate 2 course thanks to the partnership between the Palaszczuk government, Access Community Services Ltd, Icon Hospitality Training and IKEA.


I am proud to say that the graduates included: Troy Visser, Sam Sangtea, Odira Uwizesimana, Yvette Nshimirimana, Yvonne Mukashema, Ian Roberts, Mohsen Abdollahi, Zakaria Zakaria, Abdul Salam, Vung Huai, San Ariff and Yar Mohammad. I want to recognise these graduates for the hard work, dedication and long hours they have invested in completing this course. I understand there was a 100 per cent attendance rate by participants during the course. I congratulate them on their diligence—something that will stand them in good stead, as I said at the graduation—during their careers in the workforce.

I also want to acknowledge the mentors, trainers, program coordinators and managers who have made this possible for these young people. This includes Icon Hospitality Trainers Neil Caldwell and Peter Mills; Shane Wilson, D'Neale Prosser, Samantha Milburn and Jason Osborn from IKEA, who supervised, supported and worked directly with the participants; Tania Pilkinton, Shane Thompson and Peter Hodges from the Department of Education and Training; and Pauline Streten, Diana Bryson and Mitch Ryan from Access, who engaged the individuals to participate in the program. I also want to recognise the CEO of Access Community Services, Gail Kerr—

**Mr Power:** Hear, hear!

**Mr DICK:** I take the interjection of the member for Logan—whose organisation is instrumental in, amongst other things, providing training and employment opportunities for residents of the Woodridge electorate and the City of Logan and helping those citizens secure better futures. I look forward to continuing to promote job opportunities for the people of Woodridge through job creation programs such as Skilling Queenslanders for Work.

### Bald Hills Memorial Hall

 **Ms DAVIS** (Aspley—LNP) (7.09 pm): The suburb of Bald Hills in the Aspley electorate is home to a wonderful community. It is the northernmost suburb in Brisbane, and the origins of Bald Hills can claim a significant place in the history of our city. European settlement came as early as the 1850s. Local lore tells us that it all started with a group of Scots who had met in the 1840s travelling to Australia from England on a ship called the *Anne Milne*. It still has many of its original buildings including Bald Hills State School, which was Queensland's fourth school, the hotel and the memorial hall. Cobb & Co used to pass through Bald Hills, delivering mail to the local store on its way through to Gympie.

Sadly, though, the memorial hall was extensively damaged by fire in the early hours of Sunday morning. The School of Arts and Memorial Hall was officially opened in August 1920 to commemorate those who served in World War I. The arch gate at the entrance is dedicated to those who served in World War II. I understand that the hall may have originally been a church on the grounds of Bald Hills State School and relocated to its current site. Anzac services are held every year on the grounds of the hall, and over the years the number of local residents who attend the services has grown significantly.


The memorial hall is 100 per cent community owned and run. It is one of the few community halls that has not been bought and administered by either local government or state government. That, I am sure, is why the memorial hall holds a very special place in the heart of the Bald Hills community. The hall is utilised by many community groups, including our senior citizens for indoor bowls and younger generations for various classes including yoga and martial arts, and, of course, is hired for private functions. The full income received from the hire of the hall contributes to the ongoing upkeep of the building and allows for this historic hall to remain in the hands of the community. It is also home to the Northern Suburbs Country Music Club. I am told that Queensland's own Keith Urban has performed on the stage at the memorial hall.

The rebuilding and restoration of this historical building is going to be a long and expensive process. I am going to work with local councillors and community groups to assist the hall committee to get this historic building back to her very best. The loss of this building has been devastating for the

community. I would like to thank the QFRS officers from the Pine Rivers, Taigum and Chermside stations for their exemplary efforts in containing the fire and the officers from Carseldine Police Station who also attended.

The Bald Hills Memorial Hall was insured, but, in the event that the insurance does not allow for the full restoration, I am calling on the state government to assist the local community to rebuild this icon of the local area. It would be for the benefit of not only the community of Bald Hills to preserve a piece of Brisbane's rich history but also generations to come.

### Relay for Life

 **Mr FURNER** (Ferny Grove—ALP) (7.12 pm): I rise this evening to speak on the important matter of raising funds for cancer. For nine years now I have been involved in a team with a variety of names. We started calling ourselves the 'Senate Stars'. After I came to state parliament we came up with a different name. This year we decided to call ourselves the 'Ferny Groovers'. We joined other teams such as the member for Kallangur's 'King's Crew' and the member for Redcliffe's 'Peninsula Possums'. It is about having a bit of fun, but the important side of it is raising money for the Cancer Council Queensland.


The relay starts at three o'clock on a Saturday afternoon and team members, in relay form, do laps around a track—on this occasion the Moreton Bay regional relay was held at Lawnton Showgrounds—until around 8.30 on the Sunday morning. It is a bit of an arduous task but it is well worth it in terms of raising money for the Cancer Council. This year I joined the Attorney-General as co-patron of the Moreton Bay Relay for Life. The relay actually raised \$75,652.43. Our team raised \$6,345, coming third. Once again, it is all about that commitment and about raising funds that hopefully one day will result in finding a cure for all forms of cancer.

I would like to recognise the sponsors I have had for the last nine years—organisations like Super Retail Group and Australia Zoo. Super Retail Group and Terri Irwin have been fantastic for our team over the years, tipping in enormous amounts of money to go towards one day finding that cure for cancer.

I would like to acknowledge the members of my team: Laurence, Judi and Will Brown, Cam and Ali Gibbs, Mark Orreal, Christine and Eva Doolan, Petrina Zaphir, Ross and Linda Williams, and Simone and Steven Flemming. During the night they had various shifts on the relay, walking around the track. In fact, Mark Orreal is still raising money as a result of the number of laps he completed on the night. It is such a credit to him to have that commitment. He was a first-time relayer, as were many of the team members. This year I enjoyed seeing new people coming on to the team and, as a result, raising thousands of dollars for Cancer Council Queensland.

We will be involved again next year, most likely on the north side. I thank the members for Kallangur and Redcliffe for their commitment and that of their team members and for their contribution on the night.

### Domestic and Family Violence

 **Mr POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (7.15 pm): The glaring spotlight that has been placed on domestic and family violence over the past 12 months is long overdue and very necessary. It has generated so much government and community discussion and action on the matter—discussion and action that needed to occur. I recently met with Rob Clark from Maleny, who wants us to consider tackling domestic and family violence in a slightly different way. This evening I would like to read into *Hansard* a speech provided by Rob. It states—

We ask that your attention be drawn to the Say Yes to Family Peace Initiative born through the Maleny Men's Forum during DV awareness week earlier this year. Four of our men walked at the head of the local march. They carried a banner clearly stating men's call for "Respect and Peace in our Homes".

This is indicative of what really matters to the majority of men. That our partners and children are provided for, happy and feeling safe. These are the men who do all they can to create peace in their families. They, the majority, seem to be forgotten in the midst of this tragedy.

We also acknowledge that there are some men who go right off the rails and we express sorrow for them and the harm they bring. Say No to DV and Not Now, Not Ever are important messages here and we recognize their importance.

However, we ask whether this constant barrage of negativity directed at men in general is helpful to encouraging healthy men and boys? Is it any wonder some men and boys act out in destructive ways when all they see of manhood is unhealthy and demeaning?

There is a need to change the way men see themselves, to change the way society sees men and to actively encourage men to be the best they can be.

This is where Government and Non Government Organisations like Men's Wellbeing, Powerhouse Programs, Mankind Project and Pathways play a pivotal role in working with men and boys, to catch them before they lose it. To break the cycle of violence or even prevent it from occurring in the first place. Good work is being done on the solutions to violence.

There are a good number of men who will reach out for help when it is all getting too much for them but only if that help is visible and accessible. What can we do to meet these men before their issues escalate?

Say Yes calls on the government to place more recognition and importance on changing the perceptions of men, to focus more on the solutions and to make them more visible and accessible. We call on the government to give more support to these individuals, organizations and programs that have proven themselves to work in supporting men and boys with the tools that build healthy young men and heal broken older men.

Clearly what we have been doing is not working, the stats prove this beyond doubt.

Funds and efforts allocated to dealing with the damage are important, we know this, but we call on you to match these funds at least dollar for dollar by investing in the preventative programs that are well proven to work on the solutions.

We put it to you that this is the shift this Government says it is looking for and willing to make.

This is the way we can say a big pro-active Yes to Family Peace and mean it.

### Justices Association



**Mr WILLIAMS** (Pumicestone—ALP) (7.18 pm): I take great pleasure in rising tonight to speak about an event that occurred in Pumicestone last weekend: the 22nd conference of the Queensland Justices Association, an organisation that was founded in 1918. The event was held at St Columban's College in Pumicestone. A record number of attendees attended that conference and it was inspiring to listen to the high-profile attendees who came to speak—our Attorney-General, Yvette D'Ath, as the keynote speaker; our new Chief Justice, Catherine Holmes; Mark Ryan; and me.

**Mr Powell:** And me.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Sorry, mate; returning the favour. Pumicestone has about 900 JPs or commissioners for declarations out of the state's 6,500, so Pumicestone is well represented amongst justices of the peace. The Caboolture branch started about three or four years ago with three members. It has now grown to have 136 members.

The origins of justices of the peace was back in 1195, some 820 years ago, when King Richard—Richard the Lionheart—of England appointed knights to be keepers of the peace and later in 1732 the role changed where keepers of the king's peace would have to have an annual income of £100 in order to be a keeper. They were granted powers such as being able to lock up a drunk overnight and being able to put a gambler in jail with hard labour for 30 days.

I have served as a justice of the peace since 1996 up until my election. I am happy that justices of the peace now and into the future will not be appointed on stature or wealth but are volunteers who provide due diligence in certifying documents for the community. This leads me to mention to the House the integral role that JPs and commissioners for declarations do on behalf of the government. The work they do saves the government thousands of dollars. Magistrates and judges have confidence that those documents have been scrutinised by JPs or commissioners for declarations before they come to their court. I am sure that other members in this House would join me in thanking justices of the peace and commissioners for declarations for their service.

### Recognise Redlands Sponsorship Program



**Mr McEACHAN** (Redlands—LNP) (7.21 pm): Tonight I rise to speak about some inspirational constituents in the electorate of Redlands. Next week I will be announcing the second round of my Recognise Redlands sponsorship program. Four inspirational Redlanders and two community groups have been selected to receive bursaries. I want to speak briefly about why each of these recipients has been nominated by their community.

Jamie Howell is a year 12 student at Faith Lutheran College Redlands. Jamie is an outstanding athlete, bringing home awards in local, state, national and international athletics competitions. Her teachers inform me that she is also a model student and serves as senior school sports captain.

Another young Redlander Luke Harvey has also been nominated for his outstanding talent in sports. Luke is so dedicated to his triathlon training that he gets up at 4.30 am every morning before school and completes a two-hour training session of swimming or cycling. He then does it all again after

school with another two-hour training session. Luke has been Athlete of the Year two years in a row at Victoria Point State High School and continues to prove that all of his training is worth the effort, bringing home innumerable medals and awards.


Shekinah Friske was nominated multiple times by community members impressed by her talent in the Australian futsal team. Shekinah is currently in Barcelona with her team representing her country and Redlands on the international stage. Shekinah also represented her district in basketball and athletics. What amazing sporting talent we have in Redlands.

Sandy Dixon is an inspirational, compassionate and dedicated volunteer at the Cage Youth Foundation. She volunteers her time as a qualified counsellor as part of the Cage community initiative. Sandy goes above and beyond in her volunteer work and puts in countless hours. This is made all the more inspirational as Sandy is already a very busy mother of four children. I want to thank Sandy for her work in our community.

Two groups were also nominated to receive bursaries. The First Responders of Russell Island donate their time and skills to the community of Russell Island. In a small and isolated community, the work of volunteers such as First Responders is vital and I thank them for their efforts.

Finally, the Macleay Island Inspirational Writers' Group has been nominated for their work in providing a social outlet, workshops and support for island residents with an interest in writing. Congratulations to the group and I thank them for their work in furthering the vibrant Redlands arts community. Congratulations to all of the nominees and I look forward to celebrating their achievements with them at morning tea next week.

### Domestic and Family Violence

 **Ms DONALDSON** (Bundaberg—ALP) (7.24 pm): As everyone here knows, the Palaszczuk government has accepted all 140 recommendations of the *Not now, not ever* report and is fast-tracking key recommendations to help victims and to hold perpetrators to account. The domestic violence court at Southport is now in its second month and now a second magistrate is working there. We have increased funding for support services and during the last sittings we passed tougher penalties for offenders who breach domestic violence orders and brought in special victim status for women in courts. The government recently introduced amendments to the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act to ensure it is mandatory for magistrates to consider ouster orders. We are also improving the system of cross-orders as well as considering how we ensure victims' views and wishes are considered as part of the court process.


The committee which I chair—the Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee—took advice from various experts this week regarding the best way to achieve some of these things. Sometimes it is easy to fall into the trap of thinking about all of this as overwhelming and all about legislation and programs and government activity, but we know that behind all of this are real women and children, men and families hurt and broken by violence. We know that domestic and family violence currently has a very high profile in the community, and this continues to grow.

Sadly, this is largely due to the appalling reality that this year alone one and sometimes two women have been killed each and every week by a man who was their current or former partner or a member of their close community, and nowhere has this been felt more acutely recently than on the Gold Coast. Two women—Mel and Dani—from the Gold Coast are stand-out examples of victims who have said enough is enough, and not just for them but for so many others. They are the brave face of change. I seek leave to table Mel and Dani's petition which has collected over 88,000 signatures, including approximately 100 people from my own part of Queensland, calling for change.

*Tabled paper:* Non-conforming petition regarding domestic violence legislation [1661].

The Minister for Communities, Women and Youth, Shannon Fentiman, has agreed that she will respond to this petition as we continue to work through the 140 recommendations of the *Not now, not ever* report. I am proudly playing my part in this implementation through my role as the chair of the committee and I proudly join with all members of this House as we work against this terrible scourge.

### Queensland Country Women's Association

 **Mr PERRETT** (Gympie—LNP) (7.27 pm): Late last month Gympie hosted the 93rd annual conference of the Queensland Country Women's Association, with more than 400 delegates descending on the city. I was impressed with their enthusiasm and eagerness to advocate on behalf of

others with an estimate of more than 500,000 volunteer hours of work members had undertaken in the last year. With more than 250 branches and 20 divisions, QCWA is one of the most accurately representative organisations that represents the diversity of Queensland.

I have had a long association with the QCWA in my own region and have been the returning officer for the Gympie and South Burnett division for the past 10 years. The drought and financial hardship and the increasing demands on women in supporting their families has had an impact on many members and their branches. Just like many other community organisations, QCWA is conscious of the need to attract newer and young members. It has been doing this with a very successful Young Leaders program which has almost 100 members.

In my own electorate there are four branches at Cedar Pocket, Gympie, Imbil and Tin Can Bay. Like many throughout the state, circumstances have meant that the Glastonbury branch is currently in recess. I was encouraged to hear that branches at Mount Colliery and Collinsville were reopened, the Bayside Belles at Wynnum was opened and Brisbane City Night and Centenary groups became subbranches.

The importance of the QCWA as an advocacy group on rural issues cannot be underestimated. Its networks and ability to have people on the ground has been recognised and appreciated by numerous governments which have sought it out to quickly disseminate information and gain feedback on major issues. During the last year it has played an important role in distributing DVConnect packs and distributing applications for rural crisis funding. It has advocated with the state government on issues such as assistance in drought stricken areas, rural hardship and crisis funding, cattle in national parks, Queensland Rail removing passenger services in remote areas, the removal of bush nurses in two areas and the red tape involved in the baiting procedure with the wild dog problem.

At this year's conference, a Country Kitchens program was launched, which is a \$2.5 million program to be delivered over three years in rural and remote communities. With the support of three nutritionists working with local branches, it will reach at least 80 communities to promote healthier eating and support local community members to develop hands-on cooking skills to eventually be able to cook healthier meals. The Country Kitchens program will also develop some practical tools and resources to support sustainable healthier eating, including the QCWA Healthy Catering Guidelines and the QCWA *Healthy Cookbook*. I congratulate the QCWA on yet another successful year.

### SolairForce



**Hon. CJ O'ROURKE** (Mundingburra—ALP) (Minister for Disability Services, Minister for Seniors and Minister Assisting the Premier on North Queensland) (7.30 pm): It gives me great pleasure to rise in the House to speak about an innovative entrepreneur in my electorate of Mundingburra. Last week I met with this entrepreneur and owner of SolairForce, Trent Small, who has created a completely portable solar product that will help save lives and provide much needed support during difficult times.

In the wake of Tropical Cyclone Pam in Vanuatu, cities were destroyed and a lot of people were in desperate need of medical assistance. Members from the Defence Force based in Townsville had flown over generators to help the Vanuatu community to only be faced with the issue of no access to fuel as ships could not dock owing to the rough seas. It was more than a week before generators could be operated so that the hospitals and medical facilities could be back up and running. During a natural disaster assistance is needed immediately, not in a couple of weeks.

A solar power supply unit would have been able to provide assistance straightaway, allowing people who are critically injured to receive treatment instantly. This is where SolairForce would have been able to provide much needed help. The SolairForce power supply is a solar charged battery system that is portable and able to be used in a variety of applications. It is charged via solar or on a mains battery charger and has a deep-cycle battery storage component. It can run freshwater pumps to provide water, run medical and communication devices and even support a small village or school in remote and Third World countries.

After tropical Cyclone Yasi hit Townsville, like many thousands of others, I was left without power for quite some days, with people in some more remote towns left without power for weeks. Only a small handful had access to generators to help keep their appliances running. Generators require fuel, maintenance, servicing and produce noise and fumes, which is why they cannot be used in confined spaces or indoors. Unfortunately, during Cyclone Yasi the people of Townsville lost a member of their community because of a generator.

Generators are becoming antiquated. The way of the future is green and renewable energy. A lot more homes are using solar panels to generate electricity and their hot-water supply. This invention takes renewable energy to the next stage and replaces diesel-guzzling generators.

Relief aid organisations, the Defence Force and representatives from Papua New Guinea, Indonesia, the Solomon Islands, Vanuatu and various other countries have shown great interest and can see the potential of this product. I am proud to be part of a community where locally manufactured, innovative products are being supported and created—products that will be used to help save lives and provide much needed support during vulnerable and tumultuous times.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 7.33 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, Pitt, Powell, Power, Pyne, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Seeney, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Trad, Walker, Watts, Weir, Wellington, Whiting, Williams