



RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

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

FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT

Thursday, 21 April 2016

Subject	Page
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	1313
Heart Week	1313
PRIVILEGE	1313
Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by a Minister	1313
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 16 February 2016, from the member for Burleigh, Mr Michael Hart MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding alleged misleading of the House by the Minister for Housing and Public Works, Hon. Mick de Brenni.	1314
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 29 March 2016, from the Minister for Housing and Public Works, Hon. Mick de Brenni, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding allegations of misleading the House.	1314
Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by a Minister	1314
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 12 November 2015, from the member for Mudgeeraba, Ms Ros Bates MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an alleged deliberate misleading of the House by the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services, Hon. Cameron Dick.	1315
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 30 November 2015, from the member for Mudgeeraba, Ms Ros Bates MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an alleged deliberate misleading of the House by the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services, Hon. Cameron Dick.	1315
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 30 November 2015, from the member for Mudgeeraba, Ms Ros Bates MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an alleged deliberate misleading of the House by the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services, Hon. Cameron Dick.	1315
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 3 December 2015, from the member for Mudgeeraba, Ms Ros Bates MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an alleged deliberate misleading of the House by the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services, Hon. Cameron Dick.	1315

Table of Contents – Thursday, 21 April 2016

<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 19 January 2016, from the member for Mudgeeraba, Ms Ros Bates MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an alleged deliberate misleading of the House by the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services, Hon. Cameron Dick. ...	1315
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 18 March 2016, from the member for Mudgeeraba, Ms Ros Bates MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an alleged deliberate misleading of the House by the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services, Hon. Cameron Dick. ...	1315
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 19 April 2016, from the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services, Hon. Cameron Dick, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding allegations of misleading the House.	1315
TABLED PAPER	1315
PETITIONS	1315
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	1315
Queen's Birthday.....	1315
Northern Australia Roads Program.....	1316
Anzac Day; George, Mr D.....	1317
Local Government Elections	1318
Rio Olympic Games; Queensland Rugby League, Country Week.....	1318
Tourism Industry	1319
Veterans, Bond Loans and Rental Grants	1320
Great Barrier Reef.....	1320
Defence Industry Services.....	1321
Northern Australia Roads Program.....	1321
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, undated, titled 'Table 1—Queensland's Northern Australia Roads Programme'.	1322
MOTION	1322
Order of Business	1322
COMMITTEES	1322
Estimates Hearings	1322
TRANSPORTATION AND UTILITIES COMMITTEE	1324
Report	1324
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Transportation and Utilities Committee: Report No. 14—Subordinate legislation tabled between 14 October 2015 and 16 February 2016.....	1324
NOTICE OF MOTION	1324
Royalties for Regions.....	1324
PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS	1324
CFMEU	1324
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Extract, undated, from the Royal Commission into Trade Union Governance and Corruption website, titled 'State letters patent'.....	1324
Road Infrastructure	1325
Palaszczuk Labor Government, Economic Management	1325
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, dated June quarter 2016, titled 'ANZ/Property Council Survey—Chart Book'.....	1325
Advance Queensland, Innovation	1326
Member for Toowoomba South; Privatisation.....	1327
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	1327
Infrastructure	1327
Sale of Public Assets	1328
Tourism.....	1328
Sale of Public Assets	1328
Tourism.....	1329
Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance	1329
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, undated, titled 'Government performance index, June QTR 2015'.....	1329
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, undated, titled 'Government performance index, June QTR 2016'.....	1329
South East Queensland Regional Plan	1330
Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance	1331
Social Benefit Bonds.....	1331
Member for Springwood	1332
Health Services, Federal Funding	1332
CFMEU	1333
Tourism.....	1333
Regional Queensland, Domestic Violence.....	1334
Cooperative Research Centre for Developing Northern Australia	1335
Government Owned Corporations	1335
Murri Court.....	1335
Mackenzie, Mr T.....	1336
Passenger Transport Services	1337
Gold Coast Commonwealth Games, Traffic and Transportation Plan	1337
Road Projects	1338

Table of Contents – Thursday, 21 April 2016

YOUTH JUSTICE AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	1339
Introduction	1339
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Youth Justice and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016.....	1339
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Youth Justice and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016, explanatory notes	1339
First Reading	1340
Referral to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee.....	1340
Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date	1341
CONSTITUTION OF QUEENSLAND AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL.....	1341
Introduction	1341
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Constitution of Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016.	1341
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Constitution of Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016, explanatory notes.	1341
First Reading	1343
Referral to the Committee of the Legislative Assembly	1343
Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date	1343
RACING INTEGRITY BILL	1343
Second Reading	1343
PRIVILEGE	1355
Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Contempt of Parliament.....	1355
Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by a Minister.....	1355
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 22 February 2016, from the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Lawrence Springborg MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an alleged misleading of the House by the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services, Hon. Cameron Dick.	1356
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 24 February 2016, from the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services, Hon. Cameron Dick, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an allegation of misleading the House made by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Lawrence Springborg MP.	1356
PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS	1356
Martin, Mr R	1356
Queensland Cricket.....	1356
Cyberbullying	1357
Jobs	1357
Queensland Nickel	1358
Cycling Laws	1359
Southern Oil Refining	1359
Miller, Mr B.....	1360
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 4 March 2016, from the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services, Hon. Cameron Dick, to the member for Mudgeeraba, Ms Ros Bates MP, regarding Mr Barry Miller.	1360
South Sea Islanders, Apology.....	1360
Rural Debt and Drought Taskforce; Hann Highway.....	1361
ELECTORAL (IMPROVING REPRESENTATION) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	1361
Second Reading	1361
Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a second time.	1372
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1372
Consideration in Detail	1373
Clauses 1 to 5, as read, agreed to.	1373
Clause 6—	1373
Division: Question put—That leave be granted.	1373
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1373
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Electoral (Improving Representation) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016, explanatory notes to Hon. Yvette D'Ath's amendments.....	1373
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, undated, titled 'Vote 1 Anna Bligh'.....	1386
Division: Question put—That the debate be now adjourned.	1394
Resolved in the negative.	1394
Division: Question put—That the amendments be agreed to.	1395
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1395
Clause 6, as amended, agreed to.	1395
Clause 7, as read, agreed to.....	1395
Clause 8—	1396
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Electoral (Improving Representation) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016, explanatory notes to Mr Ian Walker's amendments.....	1396
Division: Question put—That the amendments be agreed to.	1398
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1398
Non-government amendments (Mr Walker) agreed to.....	1398
Division: Question put—That clause 8, as amended, be agreed to.	1398
Resolved in the negative.	1399
Clause 8, as amended, negatived.....	1399

Table of Contents – Thursday, 21 April 2016

Clauses 9 and 10—	1399
Division: Question put—That clauses 9 and 10 stand part of the bill.	1399
Resolved in the negative.....	1399
Clauses 9 and 10 negatived.....	1399
Clauses 11 and 12, as read, agreed to.	1399
Clause 13—.....	1399
Clause 13, as amended, agreed to.	1400
Clauses 14 to 20, as read, agreed to.	1400
Third Reading	1400
Long Title	1400
MOTION	1400
Suspension of Sessional Orders	1400
PRIVATE MEMBER'S STATEMENT	1401
Valedictory	1401
RACING INTEGRITY BILL	1402
Second Reading	1402
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Extract of transcript of Radio 4TAB interview on 29 February 2016.	1409
Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a second time.	1429
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1429
Consideration in Detail	1429
Clauses 1 to 9—	1429
Clauses 1 to 9, as amended, agreed to.....	1429
Clause 10—.....	1429
Clause 10, as amended, agreed to.....	1430
Clauses 11 and 12, as read, agreed to.	1430
Clause 13—.....	1430
Clause 13, as amended, agreed to.....	1430
Clause 14, as read, negatived.....	1430
Clause 15, as read, negatived.....	1430
Clause 16, as read, agreed to.	1430
Clause 17—.....	1430
Clause 17, as amended, agreed to.	1431
Clauses 18 to 55—	1431
Clauses 18 to 55, as amended, agreed to.....	1431
Clause 56—.....	1431
Division: Question put—That clause 56 stand part of the bill.....	1432
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1432
Division: Question put—That clause 56 stand part of the bill.....	1432
Resolved in the negative.....	1432
Clause 56, as read, negatived.....	1433
Clauses 57 to 70—	1433
Clauses 57 to 70, as amended, agreed to.....	1434
Clause 71, as read, negatived.....	1434
Clause 72, as read, negatived.....	1434
Clause 73, as read, negatived.....	1434
Clause 74, as read, negatived.....	1434
Clause 75, as read, negatived.....	1434
Clause 76, as read, negatived.....	1434
Clause 77, as read, negatived.....	1434
Omission of heading—.....	1434
Amendment agreed to.....	1434
Clause 78, as read, negatived.....	1434
Clause 79, as read, negatived.....	1434
Clauses 80 to 87, as read, agreed to.	1434
Clause 88—.....	1435
Clause 88, as amended, agreed to.	1435
Clause 89—.....	1435
Clause 89, as amended, agreed to.	1435
Insertion of new clause—.....	1435
Amendment agreed to.....	1442
Omission of heading—.....	1442
Amendment agreed to.....	1442

Table of Contents – Thursday, 21 April 2016

Omission of heading—	1442
Amendment agreed to	1442
Clause 90, as read, negatived	1442
Clause 91, as read, negatived	1442
Clause 92, as read, negatived	1442
Omission of heading—	1442
Amendment agreed to	1442
Clause 93, as read, negatived	1442
Clause 94, as read, negatived	1442
Clause 95, as read, negatived	1442
Clause 96, as read, negatived	1442
Clause 97, as read, negatived	1442
Clause 98, as read, negatived	1442
Clause 99, as read, negatived	1442
Clause 100, as read, negatived	1442
Clause 101, as read, negatived	1442
Clause 102, as read, negatived	1442
Clause 103, as read, negatived	1442
Clause 104, as read, negatived	1442
Clause 105, as read, negatived	1442
Clause 106, as read, negatived	1442
Clause 107, as read, negatived	1442
Clause 108, as read, negatived	1442
Clause 109, as read, negatived	1442
Omission of heading—	1443
Amendment agreed to	1443
Clause 110, as read, negatived	1443
Clause 111, as read, negatived	1443
Clause 112, as read, negatived	1443
Clause 113, as read, negatived	1443
Clause 114, as read, negatived	1443
Clause 115, as read, negatived	1443
Clause 116, as read, negatived	1443
Omission of heading—	1443
Amendment agreed to	1443
Clause 117, as read, negatived	1443
Clause 118, as read, negatived	1443
Clause 119, as read, negatived	1443
Clause 120, as read, negatived	1443
Clause 121, as read, negatived	1443
Clause 122, as read, negatived	1443
Clause 123, as read, negatived	1443
Clause 124, as read, negatived	1443
Clause 125, as read, negatived	1443
Clause 126, as read, negatived	1443
Clause 127, as read, negatived	1443
Omission of heading—	1443
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to	1443
Resolved in the affirmative	1443
Clause 128, as read, negatived	1444
Clause 129, as read, negatived	1444
Insertion of new heading—	1444
Amendment agreed to	1444
Clause 130—	1444
Clause 130, as amended, agreed to	1444
Clause 131—	1444
Clause 131, as amended, agreed to	1444
Clause 132—	1444
Clause 132, as amended, agreed to	1444
Clauses 133 to 147, as read, agreed to	1444
Clause 148—	1445
Clause 148, as amended, agreed to	1445

Table of Contents – Thursday, 21 April 2016

Clauses 149 to 158, as read, agreed to.	1445
Clause 159—.....	1445
Clause 159, as amended, agreed to.	1445
Clause 160, as read, negated.....	1445
Clause 161, as read, negated.....	1445
Clause 162, as read, negated.....	1445
Clause 163, as read, negated.....	1445
Clauses 164 to 318—	1445
Clauses 164 to 318, as amended, agreed to.....	1449
Clause 319—.....	1449
Division: Question put—That the amendments be agreed to.....	1450
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1450
Clause 319, as amended, agreed to.	1450
Clauses 320 to 390, as amended, agreed to.....	1458
Schedule 1—.....	1459
Schedule 1, as amended, agreed to.....	1460
Schedule 2—	1460
Schedule 2, as amended, agreed to.....	1461
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Racing Integrity Bill 2015, explanatory notes to Hon. Grace Grace's amendments...	1461
MOTIONS	1461
Suspension of Sessional Orders.....	1461
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to.	1461
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1461
Reconsideration of Clause	1461
Division: Question put—That clause 56 of the bill be reconsidered.	1461
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1461
RACING INTEGRITY BILL	1462
Consideration in Detail.....	1462
Clause 56—.....	1462
Division: Question put—That clause 56 stand part of the bill.....	1462
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1462
Clause 56, as read, agreed to.	1462
Third Reading	1462
Division: Question put—That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time.....	1462
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1462
Long Title.....	1463
TRANSPORT LEGISLATION (TAXI SERVICES) AMENDMENT BILL	1463
Reconsideration	1463
Consideration in Detail.....	1464
Clauses 1A, 1B, 2A and 2B—	1464
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to.	1464
Resolved in the negative under standing order 106.	1464
Omission of clauses—	1464
Amendment agreed to.	1464
Third Reading	1464
Long Title.....	1465
Amendment agreed to.....	1465
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (CHAIN OF RESPONSIBILITY) AMENDMENT BILL.....	1465
Second Reading	1465
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Agriculture and Environment Committee: Report No. 16—Environmental Protection (Chain of Responsibility) Amendment Bill 2016, government response.	1465
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, dated 11 April 2016, titled 'Report by Administrators, Queensland Nickel Pty Ltd (Administrators Appointed) ACN009 842 068'	1477
Consideration in Detail.....	1482
Clauses 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.	1482
Clause 3—.....	1482
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Environmental Protection (Chain of Responsibility) Amendment Bill 2016, explanatory notes to Hon. Steven Miles's amendments.	1483
Clause 3, as amended, agreed to.	1483
Clause 4, as read, agreed to.....	1483
Clauses 5 and 6, as read, agreed to.	1483
Clause 7—.....	1483
Clause 7, as amended, agreed to.	1486
Clauses 8 to 12, as read, agreed to.	1486

Table of Contents – Thursday, 21 April 2016

Clause 13—	1486
Clause 13, as amended, agreed to.	1486
Clause 14, as read, agreed to.	1486
Clause 15—	1487
Clause 15, as amended, agreed to.	1487
Insertion of new clause—	1487
Amendment agreed to.	1488
Clause 16—	1488
Clause 16, as amended, agreed to.	1488
Clause 17, as read, agreed to.	1488
Clause 18, as amended, agreed to.	1488
Third Reading	1489
Long Title	1489
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	1489
Parliamentary Service Email System	1489
PRIVILEGE	1489
Deputy Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by a Member	1489
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 23 February 2016, from the Deputy Premier, Hon. Jackie Trad, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an alleged deliberate misleading of the House.	1489
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 24 February 2016, from the member for Callide, Mr Jeff Seeney MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an allegation of deliberately misleading the House.	1489
SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT	1490
ADJOURNMENT	1490
Pacific Women's Parliamentary Partnerships Forum	1490
Heart of Australia	1490
Mount Gravatt Electorate, TAFE Campus	1491
Vietnam Veterans	1492
Patterson, Dr R; Oatley, Mr R	1492
Logan Community Hubs	1493
Dickfos, Mr K; Cricket	1493
Northern Australian Infrastructure Facility	1494
Pacific Pines, Police Resources	1495
Bundamba Electorate, Tree Clearing	1495
ATTENDANCE	1496

THURSDAY, 21 APRIL 2016



The Legislative Assembly met at 9.30 am.

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

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Heart Week



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I advise that Heart Week will commence nationally on Sunday, 1 May and will continue until 7 May. Heart Week is a key event for the Heart Foundation to raise awareness about heart disease, which remains the single biggest killer of Queenslanders.

In 2016 the focus is on the importance of cardiac rehabilitation after a heart attack. Currently less than one-third of heart attack survivors attend cardiac rehabilitation. The benefits of attending cardiac rehabilitation are enormous for individuals, their communities and the health system. Accordingly, I encourage members to actively promote cardiac rehabilitation to their constituents and health professionals in their region.

I encourage all members to also see Heart Week as an opportunity to consider their own heart health. The heart is an amazing engine but it needs care, so remember to be physically active, make healthy choices with what you eat and drink and ask your GP for an integrated heart health check to find out your risk of having a heart attack or stroke.

PRIVILEGE

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



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on 16 February 2016 the member for Burleigh wrote to me alleging that the Minister for Housing and Public Works and member for Springwood deliberately misled parliament in his private member's statement on 3 December 2015 when he stated that the member was not concerned about congestion on the M1. I have circulated a ruling on this matter. I have decided that the matter does not warrant the further attention of the House via the Ethics Committee and I will not be referring the matter. I seek leave to have the ruling incorporated.

Leave granted.

ALLEGED DELIBERATE MISLEADING THE HOUSE

On 16 February 2016, the Member for Burleigh wrote to me alleging that the Minister for Housing and Public Works and Member for Springwood deliberately misled Parliament in his Private Member's Statement on 3 December 2015 when he stated—

Recently, I wrote to all Gold Coast members of this House asking them to take action to help Queensland get a fair share for infrastructure funding. In just a moment I will table letters that I wrote to the members for Surfers Paradise, Southport, Mudgeeraba, Mermaid Beach, Gaven, Coomera, Albert and Broadwater—from whom I have received no responses—and a letter to the member for Currumbin, who ignored that letter and instead sought funding for commuters from New South Wales. I also table a letter to the member for Burleigh. His response indicated that he was not concerned about congestion on the M1, which thousands of Gold Coast residents face when travelling to Brisbane each day. The members of the opposition are failing Queenslanders. They are ignoring reality, fairness and, unfortunately, their own communities.

In his letter to me, the Member for Burleigh contended that the Member for Springwood's statement was deliberately misleading because the Member for Springwood was aware of the Member for Burleigh's concern about the M1 at the time he made the statement.

The Member for Burleigh identified the Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports' response to the Member for Springwood's question on notice on the subject, which advised that the Member for Burleigh had written to the Minister seeking an upgrade of the M1 from the New South Wales border to Robina, as evidence that the Member for Springwood was aware of his concerns.

I sought further information from the Minister about the allegations made against him, in accordance with Standing Order 269(5). The Minister explained that it was his intention to contrast the position of the Member for Burleigh and his colleagues with the government's position on the appropriate next part of the M1 upgrade by showing that Gold Coast LNP members were concerned with upgrading the most southern part of the M1, rather than resolving congestion between the Gold Coast and Brisbane.

Standing Order 269(4) requires—

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

On the evidence before me, I am satisfied with the Minister's explanation that his statement was intended to demonstrate the contrast between government and opposition members in their views as to the M1 upgrade, and was qualified by referring to commuters travelling between the Gold Coast and Brisbane, and on that basis was not factually or apparently incorrect.

Accordingly, I have decided that the matter does not warrant the further attention of the House via the Ethics Committee and I will not be referring the matter.

I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 16 February 2016, from the member for Burleigh, Mr Michael Hart MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding alleged misleading of the House by the Minister for Housing and Public Works, Hon. Mick de Brenni [547].

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 29 March 2016, from the Minister for Housing and Public Works, Hon. Mick de Brenni, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding allegations of misleading the House [548].

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



Mr SPEAKER: On 12 November, 30 November and 3 December 2015, the member for Mudgeeraba wrote to me alleging that the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services had deliberately misled the House in a number of statements he made on 11 November 2015 and in a follow-up statement on 1 December 2015. On 19 January 2016, the member for Mudgeeraba wrote to me attaching documentation received from the Office of the Health Ombudsman.

Three distinct statements of purported fact by the minister the subject of the member's allegation that the minister deliberately misled the House were able to be drawn from the member's complaints: (1) that the minister received a letter dated 9 July 2015 from the member for Mudgeeraba requesting a 'visit' to Robina Hospital and Gold Coast University Hospital and in response on 15 October 2015 the minister approved the member's request, granting authority to attend the hospitals for 30 minutes as an observer on 24 October 2015; (2) that the member for Mudgeeraba either misled the parliament or breached her registration obligations as a registered health professional or both; and (3) the minister wrote to the Queensland Health Ombudsman in relation to those matters raised by the conduct of the member for Mudgeeraba to seek a full independent investigation of those matters.

The Minister for Health's ministerial statement on 11 November 2015 made a number of statements that, as they were being made, needed to be withdrawn as they caused offence to the member for Mudgeeraba. The minister has also written to me regarding these matters on 25 November 2015 and, more recently, on 19 April 2016. The minister also made a ministerial statement on 17 March 2016 in which some explanations were made and an apology was tendered.

On the material available to me, I believe that the minister's statement on 11 November 2015 was neither measured nor correctly informed and the member for Mudgeeraba was rightly aggrieved at the minister's comments. As I have stressed in the past, all members should be careful when making serious allegations and imputations against other members. There was insufficient care taken by the minister about the member's actions and reputation. The minister made a ministerial statement on 12 November 2015 correcting the record in respect of the matter of correspondence from the Minister for Health to the member for Mudgeeraba. I accept the minister's explanation on that matter; however, I note that had the minister taken the opportunity for a more fulsome apology to the member at that time it may have brought this matter to an early close.

Mr Crandon: Exactly!

Mr SPEAKER: I do not need your assistance. On the matter of the statements that the member for Mudgeeraba had either misled the House or breached her registration, I note that on 17 March 2016 the minister provided both an explanation and an apology in the House.

On the matter of the statements relating to the Minister for Health seeking a full independent investigation from the Office of the Health Ombudsman, there is no information before me to indicate that the Minister for Health's statements were factually incorrect. On the matter of a statement by the minister wherein he expressed concern about the extent to which the member may have disrupted hospital operations resulting in higher clinical risks for patients, I find that the minister did not make a factual statement but merely expressed concerns, although I can understand the member's offence.

In summary, I have decided that the minister has made reasonable attempts to set the record straight and apologise to the member and for these reasons I believe that the matters do not warrant the further attention of the House via the Ethics Committee and I will not be referring the matters. I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 12 November 2015, from the member for Mudgeeraba, Ms Ros Bates MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an alleged deliberate misleading of the House by the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services, Hon. Cameron Dick [\[549\]](#).

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 30 November 2015, from the member for Mudgeeraba, Ms Ros Bates MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an alleged deliberate misleading of the House by the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services, Hon. Cameron Dick [\[550\]](#).

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 30 November 2015, from the member for Mudgeeraba, Ms Ros Bates MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an alleged deliberate misleading of the House by the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services, Hon. Cameron Dick [\[551\]](#).

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 3 December 2015, from the member for Mudgeeraba, Ms Ros Bates MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an alleged deliberate misleading of the House by the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services, Hon. Cameron Dick [\[552\]](#).

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 19 January 2016, from the member for Mudgeeraba, Ms Ros Bates MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an alleged deliberate misleading of the House by the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services, Hon. Cameron Dick [\[553\]](#).

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 18 March 2016, from the member for Mudgeeraba, Ms Ros Bates MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an alleged deliberate misleading of the House by the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services, Hon. Cameron Dick [\[554\]](#).

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 19 April 2016, from the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services, Hon. Cameron Dick, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding allegations of misleading the House [\[555\]](#).

TABLED PAPER

OTHER PAPER

The following paper pursuant to Schedule 2, Section 1 of the Standing Rules and Orders of the Legislative Assembly was tabled by the Clerk—

[556](#) Appendix A—Published Indexed Thresholds to amounts contained in Schedule 2—Registers of Interests

PETITIONS

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

Queensland Police Service Administration Act 1990

From 113 petitioners, requesting the House to amend the Queensland Police Service Administration Act 1990 to reflect best practice and cultural competency by appointing a second Commissioner of Police with the requirement that person must be an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander [\[557\]](#).


Queensland Nuclear Facilities Prohibition Act 2007

From 465 petitioners, requesting the House to uphold the Queensland Nuclear Facilities Prohibition Act 2007 and request that the Commonwealth withdraws the proposal to site the National Nuclear Waste Facility at “Bennett’s Gully”, Omanama, Queensland [\[558\]](#).

Petitions received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Queen’s Birthday

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (9.38 am): On behalf of members of parliament I pay tribute today to Her Majesty the Queen, who has reached another milestone—her 90th birthday. On behalf of all Queenslanders I wish the Queen many happy returns and our very best wishes for her special day and celebrations.

Over successive generations the Queen has been an inspiration for many Australians who admire and hold her in such high regard. Her Majesty has been a regular and welcomed visitor to our great state—the state of Queensland.

Her Majesty has been a part of some of the most significant moments in our history: the Commonwealth Games in Brisbane in 1982, Expo 88 in Brisbane and the Australian Stockman’s Hall of Fame in Longreach, CHOGM at Coolumb, the opening of the Roma Street Parklands and, of course, her heartfelt visit in 2011 in the aftermath of our devastating floods. What an honour it would be for Queensland if Her Majesty were to open our next Commonwealth Games on the Gold Coast in 2018.

Her Majesty continues to devote her life to public duty and service. In that regard, she is a dignified example to all of us. Throughout her remarkable reign, she had made an extraordinary contribution to the peoples of the United Kingdom and the Commonwealth during times of enormous social change and, dare I say, some political change. Her Majesty has ruled longer than any other monarch in British history. There have been 13 premiers of Queensland under her reign.

I confirm that, following a request from the Governor, His Excellency the Hon. Paul de Jersey, the life-size statue of Her Majesty will move from Queen's Place to a new permanent home at Government House. The statue's relocation next month comes ahead of the \$3 billion Queen's Wharf project. The bronze statue, which is acknowledged as a remarkable likeness of the Queen aged in her 50s, will be in place at Government House in time for public Queensland Day celebrations in early June.

I wish Her Majesty a wonderful birthday that hopefully will be spent with family and friends. I move—

That the House take note of the statement.



Mr SPRINGBORG (Southern Downs—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (9.40 am): I too rise in this place to pay tribute to and congratulate Queen Elizabeth II on a remarkable achievement. This day 90 years ago, a little after 3 am, Their Majesties King George V and Queen Mary were awoken to be told of the birth of their first granddaughter. Princess Elizabeth was the daughter of the Duke and Duchess of York, who would later become the much loved King George VI and Queen Elizabeth the Queen Mother. The Queen was born at 2.40 am on 21 April 1926. It is appropriate that, as we pass on our congratulations for this remarkable achievement to Queen Elizabeth II, we also reflect on the fact that our state is named for her great grandmother, Queen Victoria, who was also an extraordinary and much loved monarch. In 1954, Queen Elizabeth was the first reigning monarch to visit Australia and, therefore, the first reigning monarch to visit our state of Queensland. Prior to that time, as Princess Elizabeth she learned of her father's death in Kenya, en route to Australia.

It is appropriate that we reflect upon a remarkable historical twist. Neither Queen Elizabeth II, her father or her grandfather were directly in line to the throne, but they went on to become not just ruling monarchs but also extraordinarily great monarchs at amazing times in our history. King George V led the Commonwealth through the extraordinary times of World War I. King George VI led us through the extremely difficult times of World War II. Queen Elizabeth II has reigned for a remarkable 64-plus years as the Queen of our Commonwealth, making her our longest serving monarch.

We can be justifiably proud and feel very privileged to have been led in such an outstanding way by Queen Elizabeth II. Her conduct, her care, her faith, her values, her grace and her dignity are a model for past, current and future generations. Her ability to understand, unify, empathise and offer hope and compassion is a model for all public leaders today.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Northern Australia Roads Program



Hon. A PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (9.44 am): Tomorrow I will be taking the Working Queensland Cabinet Committee to Charters Towers. Already this year the Working Queensland Cabinet Committee has met in Townsville, Mackay, Mount Isa and Rockhampton. The full cabinet has also met in Gladstone and before the end of May I will be taking the Working Queensland Cabinet Committee to Cairns. Those meetings have been critical to discuss local opportunities and initiatives ahead of our budget in June.

My government knows the importance of our regions. My government also knows the importance of a safe and reliable transport network across the state. The 2015-16 to 2018-19 Queensland Transport and Roads Investment Program, known as QTRIP, provides for \$18.8 billion in investment. QTRIP will support an average of approximately 15,000 direct jobs over the life of the program, not only delivering improved roads but also providing jobs and boosting our regional economies.


My government is working with all levels of government to improve our roads. Almost a year ago, the then Abbott government released the *White paper on developing northern Australia*, committing to a five-year \$600 million Northern Australia Roads Program. In September, the government finally called for submissions. In response, in November last year the Minister for Main Roads wrote to the then deputy prime minister, Warren Truss, outlining Queensland's submission. I repeat: our submission of priority projects for northern Queensland was lodged in November last year. During the many months that have elapsed since we made our submission, Warren Truss retired, Andrew Robb bowed out and Tony Abbott lost his job.

Our priorities remain and the need of our communities and this great state remains. What we need is for the Turnbull government to respond without further delay. In all, Queensland has put forward 25 projects, seeking federal contributions of around \$590 million on the appropriate 80-20 funding split. My government's submission focused on key freight routes such as the Flinders, Landsborough, Gregory, Peak Downs and Capricorn highways and the Gregory Developmental Road. We also included projects and packages in and around regional centres—Cairns, Townsville, Rockhampton, Emerald and Mount Isa—as well as regional roads connecting communities across northern Queensland. Importantly, this will include the progressive sealing of sections of the Hann Highway over the next five years. Those projects will improve our transport networks for the movement of people and goods, particularly for exports and tourism. Last year, Queensland exports increased by more than \$5 billion to \$49 billion.

We need the Turnbull government to actually do something for infrastructure in regional Australia. We should not have to wait until the federal budget. We certainly should not have to wait for the federal election. My government is committed to the north. The Pacific patrol boats are being built in the Indian Ocean, not at Cairns. The Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility legislation remains stuck in the Senate and the funding, despite being pledged last year, cannot be accessed. Other key Northern Australia white paper funding programs, including Beef Roads and water infrastructure, need to be prioritised.

The Turnbull government has just called for nominations for its Beef Roads program. The nominations are due on 6 May, which is three days after the budget. The CRC announcement and the promise that the NAIF legislation will pass in the budget sittings are welcomed, but those are concessions that my ministers and Labor members have had to fight for. Severe cuts to federal health and education will impact on regional hospitals and schools. We need the Turnbull government to get its priorities straight. We need the Turnbull government to focus on regional Queensland.

Anzac Day; George, Mr D

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (9.47 am): Monday, 25 April, Anzac Day 2016, marks the 100th anniversary of the inaugural Anzac Day services held in Queensland. Across our vast state, Queenslanders will gather at local memorials to pay tribute to the service and sacrifice of men and women of the Australian Defence Force, both past and present. Last year, we commemorated the 100th anniversary of the Gallipoli landing. On behalf of Queensland, I wish to express my gratitude to all involved in delivering Anzac Day this year. I look forward to seeing the ongoing community spirit at services around Queensland and I encourage all Queenslanders to find their own way to commemorate our role in the First World War and the century of service that followed.

Recently the State Library of Queensland digitised the first minute book of the Anzac Day Commemoration Committee, which records the origins of the committee and its earliest meetings in 1916. The committee was formed on 10 January 1916 at a public meeting when local land agent Thomas Augustine Ryan put forward a recommendation to form a committee to explore ways of honouring the fallen soldiers of the Gallipoli campaign. The committee quickly devised a ceremonial day, to be held on 25 April 1916, which was the anniversary of the Gallipoli landing.

Queensland has a proud history of supporting our Defence Force. This year we also pay tribute to those Queenslanders who led the way in commemorating the sacrifices our diggers made. Every year since, Queenslanders have come together in towns and cities across our state to pay their respects. I commend the State Library for the efforts to ensure this rich part of Queensland's history has been protected and will be shared with all Queenslanders for generations to come.

I would also like to make special mention of veteran Dave George, who has joined us in the gallery today. Dave is here today as a guest of the member for Springwood, the Minister for Housing and Public Works, Mick de Brenni. Minister de Brenni met Dave earlier this year. When Dave sat down and spoke with the minister he had a message from him. He said, 'Mick, you need to do something for homeless veterans.'

Dave brought to the minister's attention that Queenslanders on two specific veterans disability pensions are narrowly ineligible for Queensland government housing schemes like bond loans and rental grants. Minister de Brenni was so concerned about Dave's story that he went straight to his department to look at ways to change the eligibility threshold for these veterans.

This is an important reform that allows us to deliver real outcomes for Queenslanders and honour our veterans at the same time. I take this opportunity to congratulate the minister for his efforts in this space and look forward to him speaking more about the reforms in the House this morning. I am proud to lead a government that recognises the contribution our veterans have made to our great state and our country. Lest we forget.

Local Government Elections



Hon. JA TRAD (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade and Investment) (9.51 am): On 19 March, 76 local government areas went to the polls, electing 76 mayors and 496 councillors. The 77th local government area, Lockyer Valley, conducted a postal ballot last Saturday for mayor and six councillors, following the sad and untimely passing of Mayor Steve Jones in February. On behalf of the government, I would like to congratulate all of the first-time mayors and councillors on their election and welcome them to public service.

To support councillors in their important role, my department has been getting out across the state conducting induction seminars for newly elected local government representatives on their roles and responsibilities. These seminars are designed to give a clearer understanding of their responsibilities as well as the expected ethical behaviour of our elected representatives.

Following on from the Crime and Corruption Commission report into transparency and accountability in local government late last year, the induction program has a strong focus on reporting gifts and benefits as well as other obligations under the legislation. I take this opportunity to acknowledge all of the hard work of my assistant minister, the honourable member for Ipswich, Jennifer Howard, in this particular area. I acknowledge all of the kilometres she has clocked up trekking the state engaging with local councils.

These induction seminars will help equip new councillors to meet the high standards of ethical and legal behaviour expected by the community. Where legitimate complaints are made, it is incumbent on the government to ensure they are dealt with promptly by the appropriate body in accordance with the rules of procedural fairness and natural justice.

Today I am announcing a review of the councillor conduct and complaints policy and process. These procedures have not been comprehensively reviewed since they were introduced in 2009. This review is timely to ensure there is a modern, fair, transparent and accountable system in place to manage complaints. This review follows a request from Local Government Managers Australia, which wrote to me recently to express concerns about the role of local governments' chief executive officers in the preliminary assessment and general management of complaints. The Local Government Association of Queensland has also sought changes to the way in which complaints are dealt with under the Local Government Act 2009, including the current inability to seek a review of those decisions and the need to better ensure natural justice is afforded to all parties.

This review will be conducted by an independent panel led by former integrity commissioner Mr David Solomon. The review will examine the statutory provisions relating to complaints to assess the effectiveness of the current legislative and policy framework and make recommendations about policy, legislative and operational changes required to improve the system of dealing with complaints about councillors' conduct.

I expect the panel's recommendations to be completed within six months. I look forward to reporting back to the parliament on the outcomes of the review, which will continue this government's commitment to strengthen the transparency and accountability of local government in Queensland.

Rio Olympic Games; Queensland Rugby League, Country Week



Hon. CW PITT (Mulgrave—ALP) (Treasurer, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships and Minister for Sport) (9.54 am): As Minister for Sport, I would like to bring to the attention of the House the outstanding achievements being accomplished by Queensland's elite athletes. Supported by the Queensland Academy of Sport, our elite athletes have been excelling on both a national and an international level in the lead-up to the 2016 Rio Olympic Games and Paralympic Games. Our athletes have been training and competing for four years waiting for this very moment, showing incredible courage and determination to achieve their goals.

As it stands, I am pleased to announce that Queensland currently has 41 athletes, including eight track and field athletes, six sprint canoeists, two sailors, two shooters, and 23 swimmers confirmed for the Australian Olympic team. Additionally, 11 swimmers have been selected on to the Paralympic team following outstanding performances at the national championships.

With just less than four and five months to go to the Olympic Games and the Paralympic Games respectively, I am confident that our great state will be well represented on the big stage in Rio. I would like to congratulate our athletes and the support team which has assisted them to reach this momentous achievement.

I am also delighted to confirm the Palaszczuk government's support of the 2016 Queensland Rugby League Country Week. The Get in the Game Country Week matches will be played on 23 and 24 July in Charleville, Barcaldine, Mount Isa, Ravenshoe and Moranbah, with the commercially televised match to be held on 24 July in Gympie. As a government, we want to help support sport and active recreation at every level and hopefully inspire the next generation of champions.

An honourable member interjected.

Mr PITT: Hear, hear! Grassroots sport is the lifeblood of nearly every country town and we are committed to getting behind our local communities. I thank the QRL for working with the respective Intrust Super Cup clubs to bring games like these to the regions.

Many of our State of Origin stars began their careers in this competition, including the captain of the Queensland State of Origin team, Cameron Smith. This is a testament to the quality of the competition and the fact that it is the best breeding ground for Rugby League players in Australia.

Mr Hinchliffe: He was a great Devils player.

Mr PITT: He was great. I encourage people to get out there and have a look at some fantastic Rugby League coming to a town near them.

Since becoming Minister for Sport, I have been meeting regularly with clubs and organisations across Queensland. Most recently, on 7 April I held a Cairns sports round table where I met with representatives from 28 separate regional sporting bodies responsible for servicing Far North Queensland communities. The purpose of the Cairns sports round table was to create an opportunity to meet and engage with representatives of these organisations and to hear firsthand of their current experiences in managing their specific sports across the region.

The round table was also an opportunity for me to reaffirm the Queensland government's strong and ongoing commitment to sport and recreation clubs, organisations and individuals across the state. The meetings also provided the organisations present with the opportunity to network with each other and the staff of the Far North Queensland regional office of Sport and Recreation Services in the Department of National Parks, Sport and Racing. I would like to thank all involved for their participation and the Sport and Recreation Services' Far North Queensland regional office for their efforts in organising the Cairns sports round table.

The Get in the Game initiative continues to support Queenslanders across the state in leading a healthier and more active lifestyle. Applications close on 29 April 2016 for Get Playing Plus, which provides up to \$1.5 million for new and improved places and spaces, with \$40 million available in this round, after I boosted funding by \$17 million in March. Additionally, the next rounds of Get Going Clubs and Get Playing Places and Spaces open for applications on 1 July 2016 and close on 1 September 2016. Of course, the successful Get Started vouchers open again on 13 July 2016. Do not miss out. Further information on these programs is available on the Queensland government website.

Tourism Industry




Hon. KJ JONES (Ashgrove—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism and Major Events) (9.57 am): Every day tourism generates \$65 million for Queensland and our economy. I am determined to see this grow. We know that the low dollar, the growing Chinese market and our close proximity to Asia mean a great opportunity for us to grow our market share. In 2015 more Australian and international tourists came to Queensland than ever before. We saw a record 2.3 million international visitors who spent almost \$5 billion here in Queensland—that was up 20 per cent on the previous year.

The Palaszczuk government is positioning Queensland to grow tourism in this state and the 230,000 jobs that tourism supports. There is no doubt Asia will play a big role in the future of Queensland tourism. That is why we are developing with industry an Asia strategy to ensure we capture this opportunity for growth. We will see hundreds of millions of new middle class Chinese travellers

seeking out tourism destinations like Queensland. If we grow our share of total outbound Chinese tourism to 0.5 per cent, we will see up to an additional \$500 million for Queensland and up to 5,000 additional jobs.

Our strategy will focus on not only China but also other growing markets like Taiwan, India and a resurgent Japan. We know that tourism will increasingly support economic growth in Queensland, supporting thousands more jobs right across Queensland and particularly in our regional economies. I am determined to ensure that we grab our fair market share with both hands.


Veterans, Bond Loans and Rental Grants

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works) (9.59 am): As the Premier indicated this morning, on Monday morning in community parks, at memorials and on battlefields that stretch from the Coral Sea to Anzac Cove and on to the western front, Australians and New Zealanders will stop and contemplate the horror of war and the brave men and women who have fought on our behalf in those wars. They will pause and contemplate the phrase 'at the going down of the sun and in the morning, we will remember them—lest we forget'. Unfortunately too often we do forget. When I think about those words 'at the going down of the sun and in the morning' I think of Dave George. I met Dave at his home in New Farm. I was visiting some of the impressive homes built by the Brisbane Housing Company for some of Brisbane's most vulnerable people—good homes, safe homes, affordable homes.

Dave served in the Royal Australian Navy as a quartermaster gunner on HMAS *Yarra* and HMAS *Supply*. After he left the Navy Dave struggled, as many veterans do. At one point Dave spent 18 months sleeping rough on the streets. I am very pleased that Dave has been able to join us in the gallery today. Dave had a forceful message for me when I arrived on his doorstep. He said he needed us to do something for homeless veterans in Queensland. He pointed out that there are a small number of recipients of Veterans' Affairs total and permanent impairment disability pensions and Military Rehabilitation and Compensation Act special payments who could be helped by a bond loan or rental grant but currently cannot due to the income limits for these services. I am pleased to inform the House that this changes as of today. Today we announce that we are including these two payments in the eligibility criteria for bond loans and rental grants.

I want to be clear. I do not believe that this announcement that we make today is a matter of ideology—it is not. I fundamentally believe that reforms like this are what good government is all about. When those opposite complain too much about too much consultation, too much talking and not enough doing, I hope they reflect on the value of my conversation with Dave. When you listen to people, you hear things. As a result, a bloke named Dave just changed government policy and has helped improve veterans' lives. On Monday, as we are remembering the fallen, I encourage all of us to take a moment to spare a thought for all the vets doing it tough this Anzac Day, some of whom at the going down of the sun will find a place to sleep in a park or by a river. Let's remember them.

Great Barrier Reef

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef) (10.02 am): Yesterday I informed the House that I had called on federal environment minister Greg Hunt to convene an urgent meeting with state and territory environment ministers in Cairns so that ministers could witness firsthand the coral bleaching caused by climate change and discuss together Australia's policy response. I am pleased to report that at 10 to five last night, Minister Hunt called a national teleconference of state, territory and Commonwealth environment ministers which we held at 10.30 last night.


While it was not the face-to-face meeting I envisaged and despite the short notice, it was attended by all state and territory ministers except the ACT, whose minister was already attending another engagement. All ministers agreed that what is currently happening on the Great Barrier Reef is alarming and is an issue of concern not just to Queenslanders but to all Australians. All ministers agreed that strong and urgent action is needed on climate change. We did not agree on what that action should be, but Minister Hunt has agreed to hold further weekly talks—an unprecedented acknowledgement of the urgency with which we need the federal government to deliver a coherent and effective climate change policy for Australia.

What was interesting about last night's meeting was that the one thing Minister Hunt did not want to talk about was his government's policies to reduce carbon pollution. I cannot say I blame him—he does not have any. We also talked about funding for local Great Barrier Reef actions—funding for reef

water quality improvement and for increased monitoring to learn about the extent and severity of the current bleaching event, all of which is important work but does not address the fundamental issue causing the coral bleaching which is climate change. It is true that the Palaszczuk government is working hard to reduce those local pressures. We have set new ambitious run-off pollution targets. We have allocated \$100 million more for water quality improvement and we have tasked the Great Barrier Reef Water Science Taskforce, which will report next month, to advise us scientifically on what the best investment will be.

We already know though that the money currently on the table from the Commonwealth will not be enough to achieve the water quality improvements committed to at UNESCO. The federal government needs to do more. I was gratified to hear last night Minister Hunt say that he would be making further funding commitments to reef water quality improvements. The call by the Palaszczuk Labor government for an emergency meeting of environment ministers to discuss coral bleaching has led to a commitment by the Commonwealth to new funds for water quality and a commitment to weekly talks to address climate change. I want to thank Minister Hunt and my ministerial colleagues for responding so quickly to our call. We now have an opportunity to work together to make sure that Aussie kids, our kids, have the clean energy jobs of the future.

Defence Industry Services


 **Hon. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (10.05 am): The defence industry services sector presents vast opportunities to Queensland businesses. In 2014-15, \$3.6 billion in Defence contracts were awarded to Queensland based companies, supporting thousands of jobs through the supply chain. The disappointment in Far North Queensland will resonate strongly in Canberra due to the Turnbull government awarding the \$594 million Pacific patrol boat replacement construction program to Western Australia and South Australia. The bid by the Cairns consortium would have meant high-quality patrol boats constructed in North Queensland. The Palaszczuk government will continue to work with the Queensland defence industry to maximise benefits that may arise still from these patrol boats.

My Department of State Development will be working hard to ensure local Queensland businesses can capitalise on these future opportunities. The LAND 400 project is the next big procurement opportunity for Queensland's defence industry services, and Queensland is well placed to be the home of this project. Queensland already has a well-established heavy vehicle capability, and my department continues to work extensively with companies in this sector.

Over the past month local businesses across the state from Beenleigh to Townsville have had the opportunity to attend Defence Business 101 seminars run by my department in conjunction with the Industry Capability Network. These seminars advise manufacturers how to engage with large Defence contractors and how they can develop their business capabilities to work in Defence. There will be more of these Defence related seminars held across Queensland this year, and I would urge people to register online.

This month I was also pleased to visit some other prime examples of innovative Queensland businesses successfully tendering for the defence supply chain. I attended the Gallipoli Barracks at Enoggera, where I was pleased to see the work of two Queensland companies who have won support contracts for the Australian Defence Force. Rocklea based Haulmark Trailers will manufacture 1,700 truck trailers and Logan's Holmwood Highgate will produce 250 fuel and water modules for these trucks. These contracts are expected to create about 115 valuable new jobs. We will also be releasing a defence industries action plan to help grow the sector. Under a Palaszczuk Labor government, Queensland will continue to be on the front line of supporting industry and Defence and providing regional economic development and growth.

Northern Australia Roads Program

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Yeerongpilly—ALP) (Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply) (10.08 am): Queensland is a vast state with a decentralised population that is served by our extensive road network. The Palaszczuk government is continually working to improve and invest in our statewide road network, including through the recent State Infrastructure Plan, which included announcements benefiting Gladstone along the Dawson Highway from Biloela, the duplication of Riverway Drive in Townsville, the upgrades along Kawana Way and more direct access to the meatworks from Gracemere through Rockhampton in the electorate of the Minister for Police.

We have a range of other projects across the state such as the \$12½ million upgrade of the critical intersection of Urraween Road and Maryborough-Hervey Bay Road that I mentioned yesterday. As the Premier has said, to do this work it is essential that local councils and the federal government work in partnership with the state government to maximise outcomes for Queenslanders. That is why it is important that the Turnbull government announces the successful projects from the Northern Australia Roads Program. We have sought funding for a range of projects that are critical for regional Queensland. Queensland put forward 25 North Queensland projects seeking a federal contribution of around \$590 million on the appropriate 80-20 funding split. For the benefit of the House, I table a summary of our submission. We have been expecting the federal government to announce the successful projects for quite some time.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Table 1—Queensland's Northern Australia Roads Programme' [559].

Key benefits of the Northern Australia Roads Program include boosting economic productivity by decreasing delays and improving travel time on tourism routes and supply chains; reducing social and economic costs of fatal and serious injury crashes; enhancing remote, rural, regional and urban liveability through improved accessibility; and boosting overall economic confidence and support.

Our submission on behalf of North Queenslanders includes upgrades to the Flinders Highway between Charters Towers and Townsville, Hughenden and Cloncurry; the Barkly Highway, upgrading intersections in Mount Isa; Landsborough Highway between Longreach and Winton; and the Capricorn Highway duplication between Rockhampton and Gracemere, the upgrade of the Valentine Creek Bridge as well as overtaking lanes between Rockhampton and Emerald. We have also included the Gregory Developmental Road, widening between Charters Towers and Belyando, and an upgrade of the Cape River Bridge. In Cairns it includes the duplication of the Bill Fulton Bridge and an upgrade of the Cairns Airport access.

We are already facing one of the longest federal election campaigns in history. I call on the Turnbull government to support North Queenslanders and end their wait for this funding which they certainly need sooner rather than later.

MOTION

Order of Business



Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (10.11 am): I move—

That general business notice of motion—House to take note of committee reports—be postponed.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEES

Estimates Hearings



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

That—

1. notwithstanding anything contained in the standing orders, for the 2016 estimates committee process:
 - (a) all standing orders in relation to the Committee of the Legislative Assembly's examination of the Appropriation (Parliament) Bill be suspended;
 - (b) the Finance and Administration Committee will examine the Appropriation (Parliament) Bill with the examination being conducted in accordance with the procedures in part 6 of the standing orders; and
 - (i) the portfolio committee's area of responsibility applying to the Legislative Assembly;
 - (ii) the responsibility of a minister applying to the Speaker; and
 - (iii) the responsibility of a director-general applying to the Clerk.
2. in accordance with standing order 177(4), the dates for each portfolio committee's estimates hearing and the dates by which each committee is to report to the House as set out in the order circulated in my name be agreed to.
3. standing order 189(4) be suspended for the consideration in detail of the 2016 appropriation bills.

2016 ESTIMATES COMMITTEES—ORDER SETTING DATES FOR HEARING AND REPORTING

(1) The dates for each portfolio committee's hearings and report dates are as follows—


Portfolio Committee	Speaker	Date of hearings	Date of Report
Finance and Administration Committee	Speaker	Tuesday 19 July 2016	Friday 12 August 2016
Portfolio Committee	Ministers	Date of hearings	Date of Report
Finance and Administration Committee	Premier and Minister for the Arts Treasurer, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships and Minister for Sport Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs	Tuesday 19 July 2016	Friday 12 August 2016
Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee	Deputy Premier, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade and Investment Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines Minister for Housing and Public Works	Wednesday 20 July 2016	Friday 12 August 2016
Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee	Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services	Thursday 21 July 2016	Friday 12 August 2016
Agriculture and Environment Committee	Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef	Friday 22 July 2016	Friday 12 August 2016
Education, Tourism, Innovation and Small Business Committee	Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism and Major Events Minister for Innovation, Science and the Digital Economy and Minister for Small Business	Tuesday 26 July 2016	Friday 12 August 2016
Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee	Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services Minister for Communities, Women and Youth, Minister for Child Safety and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence Minister for Disability Services, Minister for Seniors and Minister Assisting the Premier on North Queensland	Wednesday 27 July 2016	Friday 12 August 2016
Transportation and Utilities Committee	Minister for Transport and the Commonwealth Games Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply	Thursday 28 July 2016	Friday 12 August 2016

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

TRANSPORTATION AND UTILITIES COMMITTEE

Report


 **Mr KING** (Kallangur—ALP) (10.13 am): I lay upon the table of the House report No. 14 of the Transport and Utilities Committee titled *Subordinate legislation tabled between 14 October 2015 and 16 February 2014*.

Tabled paper: Transportation and Utilities Committee: Report No. 14—Subordinate legislation tabled between 14 October 2015 and 16 February 2016 [560].

This report covers the portfolio subordinate legislation tabled on 16 February 2016 with a disallowance date of 12 May 2016. The committee did not identify any significant issues in relation to policy or regarding the lawfulness of the subordinate legislation. I commend the report to the House.

NOTICE OF MOTION


Royalties for Regions

 **Mr LANGBROEK** (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (10.14 am): I give notice that I will move—

That this House endorses the LNP's policy to reinstate the Royalties for Regions program in Queensland.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

CFMEU

 **Mr WALKER** (Mansfield—LNP) (10.14 am): Earlier this week in Canberra the Labor senators for the state of Queensland and the Independent senator, Senator Lazarus, let down the people of Queensland by failing to support the introduction of the ABCC, an institution that is meant to deal with lawlessness on building sites—something that has been shown to us quite clearly by the findings of the trade union royal commission. Those Labor senators and Senator Lazarus let the people of Queensland down, because we know from Commissioner Heydon's report that Queensland is one of the states most badly affected by lawlessness on building sites.

Yesterday we saw hundreds of members of the CFMEU leave building sites, march through the streets of this city and come down here to parliament in an unlawful activity. It was unprotected industrial action, leaving their sites. The pubs did all right. The workers had a day off. Some of them came in here courtesy of some of the members for a cup of coffee, but the Queensland economy suffered by a reported \$6 million. We had members of this House greeting those members. The member for Bundamba and the Minister for Agriculture went out and encouraged this unlawful activity. It is a disgrace that any member of this House should be encouraging such activity. They may be concerned about black lung, but like everyone else they have to obey the law.

We have given the government a chance to do something about this. The scary thing about yesterday is that the union officials are quoted as saying, 'This is just the beginning.' If it is just the beginning, we will continue to lose money from our economy. We will continue to have lawless activity and this government will continue to do nothing about it.

On 16 February we moved to introduce a bill in this House to take seriously the recommendation of Mr Heydon's commission to introduce a 24-hours-notice right of entry. The government used its numbers to vote it down. On 18 February we introduced a motion asking the government to respond to the Heydon royal commission report. They voted that down. Yesterday in this House I asked the Premier what she was going to do about it. She avoided the issue by saying it was a federal issue, not our issue. It is a state issue. There are state letters patent issued by the Governor of Queensland, Governor Wensley, on 24 March and by Governor de Jersey on 18 December 2014. I table the website information from the trade union royal commission.

Tabled paper: Extract, undated, from the Royal Commission into Trade Union Governance and Corruption website, titled 'State letters patent' [561].

There are state letters patent setting up this commission. The state has the ability—indeed, it has the responsibility—to respond to that report and yet this government does nothing. It has no plan for anything else in Queensland, and it has no plan to deal with lawless activity which is costing our economy very dearly.

Road Infrastructure



Hon. MC BAILEY (Yeerongpilly—ALP) (Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply) (10.17 am): Roads are absolutely critical to Queensland's economy. Yet when we look at the record of the Newman government it slashed \$200 million from our road budget every single year it was in power. They have the front to get up here and start talking about infrastructure and bringing back funding for Royalties for Regions when they were the big slashers and burners. As we move around Queensland we see that on our road system every single day.

The member for Indooroopilly spent \$30 million on a secret branch, on privatisation and contestability at a time when they said they would not sell assets. That is their shameful record when it comes to road infrastructure funding in this state. Compare that with Labor's record over 12 months. The State Infrastructure Plan is delivering infrastructure on the Dawson Highway near Gladstone; in Rockhampton; on Riverway Drive in Townsville; on Kawana Way in the Sunshine Coast—the forgotten about Sunshine Coast where the dithering half dozen on the other side of this chamber did nothing for three years—the Urraween Road intersection; the Pialba-Burrum Heads and Wide Bay Drive intersection, again ignored for three years under those opposite; Hervey Range Road done by the Palaszczuk government; exit 54 on the M1; the Peak Downs Highway bridges; doubling of TIDS funding with the local government to get better value on our roads system; and \$40 million for the western roads package—neglected under the LNP. There is also the accelerated works package to get more work out the door. There is so much going on. We have also put money on the table for the Ipswich Motorway and the M1 merge. We ask the federal government to partner with us to get those critical pieces of infrastructure going here in Queensland.

It is in that light that I welcome the endorsement by a couple of members of the LNP of our infrastructure spending in Queensland. In the *Jimboomba Times* on 13 April, the member for Beaudesert was complaining that there were too many roadworks going on. The paper reported him as saying that 'the many roadworks underway at the same time would add further frustration for motorists'. He thinks we are doing too much down there. I thank the member for Beaudesert for his endorsement of infrastructure funding by the Palaszczuk government.

It would be remiss of me not to mention the endorsement of the member for Glass House for our decision to reduce speed through Wamuran—something that he is 'thrilled' about, according to the *Kilcoy Sentinel* of 10 March. He said it is 'just brilliant'. I thank the member for Glass House for his endorsement of something he could not get through under the Newman government in three years. He sat around the cabinet table for three years trying to get this done and he failed, and the Palaszczuk government has delivered for his community. Thank you for the endorsement. Thank you for being thrilled. Thank you for calling us brilliant.

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Economic Management



Mr LANGBROEK (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (10.20 am): This morning we have had another report that is a condemnation of the Treasurer's and the Premier's economic management. The ANZ/Property Council survey has shown a dramatic decline in confidence in Queensland's property industry in the last quarter, and I table a copy of that.

Tabled paper. Document, dated June quarter 2016, titled 'ANZ/Property Council Survey—Chart Book' [562].

The latest survey shows that confidence in Queensland has dropped nine points over the last quarter. In announcing the results, Property Council Queensland's Executive Director, Chris Mountford, pleaded with the government to provide a better economic framework. He said—

With the Queensland industry confidence dipping below the national average, it is clear that the southern States have made themselves more attractive destinations for investment.

The results show that the correct policy settings need to be applied to turn Queensland into a magnet for investment.

When looking at the survey, it is abundantly clear that Queensland's property industry professionals have absolutely no confidence in the Palaszczuk Labor government. We have gone from having the most positive view of state government policies under the LNP to having amongst the worst in the country under this do-nothing Palaszczuk Labor government. It is all in the survey. Only South Australia ranks worse than Queensland. Not since this government's election has there been a positive view of state government policies among professionals in this vital industry. It is a direct indictment on the Treasurer and the Premier and the fact they are still searching for an economic plan after more than a year in government.

It is not just the Property Council survey that shows the negative view Queensland's business community has of this do-nothing, be-nothing government. The Sensis Business Index released earlier this month showed business confidence in Queensland is also on the slide. This is a survey of 1,000 small and medium sized businesses nationwide, with 171 of those based in Queensland, and there was almost an even split between metropolitan and regional parts of the state. Consistent with the Property Council survey, the Sensis survey shows that ever since the election of the Palaszczuk Labor government there has been a negative view towards state government policies. At negative 17 points, current attitudes towards the Palaszczuk Labor government are the second worst of any state government—again, better only than South Australia.

Prior to the last state election, attitudes to the LNP government's policies were the most positive in the country. Not once since the change of government have the attitudes towards Labor gone into positive territory. These two surveys are just the latest economic reports to indicate that the Labor government's lack of vision is hurting the economy. Queensland's business community is pleading with the Palaszczuk government to admit there is a problem with confidence and to outline a plan to address it. It is time for the Treasurer and the Premier to step up and deliver. The Property Council report proves that the Palaszczuk government is frozen at the wheel. The 'head in the sand' attitude from the Treasurer proves that the Palaszczuk government does not care. Misrepresenting survey after survey about business confidence, retail sales and jobs data proves that the Palaszczuk government continues to mislead Queenslanders. That is why we have reinstated Royalties for Regions—a plan for all of Queensland, for the metropolitan areas and the regional areas.

Advance Queensland, Innovation




Hon. LM ENOCH (Algeria—ALP) (Minister for Innovation, Science and the Digital Economy and Minister for Small Business) (10.23 am): We are at an exciting but critical juncture in our state's economy and our state's history. We know that the world is changing at an ever-increasing pace, and we know that new industries and economies are emerging and that our existing ones are changing. Only an innovative approach will create the spark for employment now, while preparing our state for the jobs and industries of the future. That is precisely what the Palaszczuk government's Advance Queensland innovation and jobs plan is delivering. It was our Premier who had the vision to put Advance Queensland at the heart of the government's agenda to embrace and foster the innovation movement in our state. It was our government that saw the coming crossroads for our economy and set about putting together a plan to put Queensland at the forefront of that movement—unlike those opposite, who continue to be fixated on bashing unions and holding a death grip on their four-pillar plan.

As a result of the hard work of the Palaszczuk government and the great foundation that our state has inherited from previous Smart State investment, we are in a great position to take advantage of the shift towards a knowledge economy. This is important because the knowledge economy is not just on the horizon anymore; it has arrived and our state is primed to make the most of the opportunities before us. The Palaszczuk government is shifting the focus for researchers, industry, small business and entrepreneurs. Our programs are bringing these amazing minds together to take great ideas and turn them into products and services, unlocking their potential to make an impact on global markets.

If we are truly to be global leaders within this innovation movement, we need everyone to get involved. Our state needs to be united in its focus to drive innovation in every aspect of our lives. Universities and researchers need to work closely with industry to create the next big global idea. Those working in our traditional industries need to continue to embrace innovation and look at new ways to stand on the global market. Our investors have to be prepared to take risks, to back our start-ups and entrepreneurs who may fail on the journey to striking the idea that could change people's lives forever. As a community, we have to shift the conversations we have with our young people to help them prepare for and embrace all the possibilities of the future.

That is why next week's Advance Queensland Innovation and Investment Summit is a crucial pivot point in our conversations about the direction we are headed as a state. The Palaszczuk government is seizing these opportunities, understanding the impact of changes globally and understanding that we are at this special time in the world's history and our state's history. I am proud to be part of a government which is not focused on the past and which is not dredging up old policies while holding that death grip on the four pillars. We are embracing innovation. I encourage everyone in this House from all parties and all sides to be part of the innovation movement.

Member for Toowoomba South; Privatisation

 **Mr SPRINGBORG** (Southern Downs—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (10.26 am): Today is the last day in this parliament for the member for Toowoomba South. I take the opportunity to congratulate the member for Toowoomba South on his outstanding contribution as a member of parliament, as a minister in the government and also more recently as a shadow minister. I also acknowledge the contribution of the member for Toowoomba South in his time as a great councillor for the Toowoomba Regional Council. He has been a resident of the Darling Downs with his family for many generations—a much respected family. I believe he has all of the acumen, all of the ability, all of the grace and all of the commitment to go on to become a very, very excellent member for Groom, depending upon the outcome of the federal election. On behalf of my colleagues, I would like to take this opportunity to wish the member for Toowoomba South all the very best as he seeks to serve his community in an exemplary way at another level of parliamentary jurisdiction. Honourable member, you depart this place with our very best wishes, our great admiration and our great friendship.

We have seen another demonstration of a government of broken promises today. This is a government that is not only frozen at the wheel; this is a government that has broken the covenant with the people of Queensland. We have seen many broken promises, including increasing the number of ministers from 14 to 17. We have seen a government that did not level with the people of Queensland when it came to talking about raiding the public servants' long service leave. When this government went to the people of Queensland, it did not level with them with regard to not paying superannuation contributions. This is a government which now is about embarking upon a program of privatisation by stealth. Let us look at what the Treasurer said in this place in 2014. He said—

... selling the profits of a business, selling the management of a business and selling the debt of a business is divestment—just another word for privatisation.


What do we have today? We have a clear plan from the Palaszczuk government to go down the path of privatisation by stealth. This government did not level with the people of Queensland. Sitting on that side we have the member for Ashgrove, the member for Woodridge, the Premier, the member for Mulgrave and the member for Sandgate: five members of parliament who actually sat there and privatised by stealth in 2009. They did not level with the people of Queensland then and they did not level with the people of Queensland in 2015. At least we levelled with the people of Queensland.

This plan by this government today is privatisation by stealth. The Treasurer said it in 2014 and 2013 and nothing has changed.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr SPEAKER: Question time will finish at 11.29 am.

Infrastructure

 **Mr SPRINGBORG** (10.29 am): My question without notice is to the Premier. I refer to today's report in the *Australian* about the government's increasingly desperate attempts to find finance for infrastructure. Can the Premier explain to this House the detail of how this proposal is meant to work?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the Leader of the Opposition very much for the question. As we saw from the Leader of the Opposition's three-minute speech just moments ago, the LNP is clearly stuck in the past. There is only one side of this House that wants to privatise assets of this state and that is the LNP. We have Mr 'Strong Choices', the member for Clayfield, still sitting there. They clearly went down a path of selling our state's assets. The people of Queensland made their decision very clearly at the most recent state election when they rejected the asset sales. Let me make it very clear: my government will not be selling the assets that the people of Queensland put their faith in us to uphold. That is the clear distinction between this side of the House and that side of the House.

What we see very clearly is a proposal that is being discussed by the LNP that was revealed by Michael McKenna about more asset sales. They are the only ones that are looking at asset sales, not this side of the House. When the Treasurer brings down the budget he will be outlining very clearly our plan to continue growing this state's economy. There is nothing more important than growing our state's economy in terms of diversification and making sure that Queenslanders have jobs right across this state. That is what my government's plan will deliver for the people of Queensland.

We will not forget the regions. We will continue to focus on the regions. We will continue to fund Health, to fund Education and to also look at attracting more investment into this state. That is why next week the very first Advance Queensland Innovation and Investment Summit will be held right here in this state. That is what my government is doing. We are working hard. We are fighting hard to get investment in this state. We are focused on delivering. We are focused on growing infrastructure and, most fundamentally, we are focused on growing jobs in this state of ours.

Sale of Public Assets

Mr SPRINGBORG: My second question without notice is to the Premier. On 5 June 2014 the Treasurer said—

... selling the profits of a business, selling the management of a business and selling the debt of a business is divestment—just another word for privatisation.

Will the Premier admit that the government's plan to sell government owned corporations' future profits to foreign pension funds is nothing more than privatisation by stealth?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. That is simply not the case.

Tourism

Mr CRAWFORD: My question is of the Premier. Will the Premier outline any opportunities for Queensland tourism following the recent trade mission to Asia?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Barron River for that question. In fact, I was very delighted to see on the front page of the *Cairns Post* today the great news about the fact that the number of tourists coming into Cairns is growing from strength to strength. The numbers from Japan are up, the numbers from the UK are up but, most importantly, the numbers from China are up. I know that Cairns is going to be a great gateway into the future. It was very clear to me when I was meeting with members and governors and airlines in China that they have three clear cities on their map of Queensland: Cairns, Brisbane and the Gold Coast. Unlike New South Wales and Victoria which have only one city each, Queensland tops the list and we have three.

As I have said in this House this week, we know that there is going to be a boom in the middle class of China. Eight hundred million people are expected to join the middle class. With the increase in the number of people from China having passports into the future, we need to be ready. I can report that on my trade delegation to Chengdu I had the opportunity to meet with Sichuan Airlines. The Governor said to me that he would like to see the first flights from Chengdu to Queensland as soon as possible. My government is going to do everything we can to fight to get those flights into this state.

When I met with Sichuan Airlines, once again they sat down with me, showed me their map of Queensland and highlighted to me that they believe in the first instance they can pursue flights from Chengdu to Cairns. That is a huge win for the Cairns region; it is a huge win for the Cairns economy. Like Queensland, where we are very much focused on conservation and our Great Barrier Reef, the people of Chengdu and the Sichuan province are also very much focused on conservation. Many people in this House may not be aware that the panda conservation park is located in Chengdu. There are enormous opportunities for families to come here and view our Great Barrier Reef and experience our great culture, our food and our wine; and, vice versa, there are opportunities for families from here to travel to the Sichuan province to look at panda conservation. This is a great two-way exchange that we can see into the future.

We will be preparing Queensland for the boom in tourism that we will be seeing over the next five to 10 years. I have tasked my Minister for Tourism and the Deputy Premier as Minister for Trade to develop an Asian tourism attraction package. We are going to be at the front and centre of these reforms.

Sale of Public Assets

Mr LANGBROEK: My question without notice is to the Premier. Will the Premier advise the House where in the government's pre-election commitments and costings document did she say that she would sell the future income-producing opportunities of state assets to foreign pension funds?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for the question. As I have stated very clearly, we are not.

Tourism

Mr POWER: My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier advise the House of any important regional tourism events in the coming weeks?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Logan very much for that question. As members of this House will undoubtedly be aware, we are coming up to a very significant regional event across our state, and that event is Labour Day. Labour Day has returned to May. Shortly, I know the member for Logan will be travelling out west to the birthplace of the Labor Party, to Barcaldine, where we will celebrate the 125th anniversary of the Shearers' Strike and we will be joining with thousands of other people. In fact, I am actually told that Barcaldine is fully booked out. I understand the member for Gregory may be attending. I hope to see him there celebrating this great event for Queensland. We might even get to see the former member for Gregory as well. Of course, it would be an absolute pleasure to see both of them at the celebrations.

In terms of getting everything ready, I understand the council is working very hard and they are going into overtime. There will be a re-enactment and there will be festivities located around the Tree of Knowledge memorial. The Australian Workers Heritage Centre will be getting ready. I understand the Minister for Racing has also confirmed that a race day is happening out there. What a great event for tourism in the outback. The advice from the Minister for Tourism is that the capacity of Barcaldine is around 1,000. I think it is booked out and we now have 3,000 people who will be descending into Barcaldine, so people will have to look outside the region.

When the LNP were in government they were very divisive: they moved Labour Day. They turned their backs on the great history and culture of Queensland that has served our great state for many years. I look forward to joining my ministers who will be attending and some members of the backbench. The member for Logan is taking his family out there. It is going to be a great weekend of celebration. Labour Day has been returned to its rightful place in May!

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance

Mr NICHOLLS: My question is of the Treasurer.

Mr Pitt interjected.

Mr NICHOLLS: That is all right, mate. I have asked more of you than you asked of me. Prior to the 2015 state election—

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I rise to a point of order. I think that may have been the question. I am sure the Treasurer would like to answer.

Mr SPEAKER: Resume your seat, Leader of the House. Member for Clayfield, your question, please.

Mr NICHOLLS: My question is of the Treasurer. Prior to the 2015 state election, Queensland's property industry had the most positive attitude towards state government performance in the country. I table the chart produced by the Property Council.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Government performance index, June QTR 2015' [563].

Following the election of the Labor government the attitude of the Queensland property industry has consistently been among the most negative of any state, and I table the chart.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Government performance index, June QTR 2016' [564].

Treasurer, is this not a vote of no confidence in the government's economic stewardship?

Mr PITT: I thank the honourable member for the question. This is from the guy who supported the former premier's crane index, which was apparently the very scientific metric they used to make sure they could understand what was happening in property and development around the Brisbane CBD.

When we look at confidence surveys, as we have said on a number of occasions there are many indicators and multiple surveys that you need to take into consideration. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition today had a go about business confidence and cited Sensis. In fact, when you look at what the improvement has been in Queensland since we saw the change of government, we have had a long way to claw back because the LNP put us into the doldrums in the Sensis survey. Then we had nine months of business confidence in a row under the NAB confidence survey. When it comes to those opposite trying to use surveys for political gain, I think they need to be very careful. This is from the chief cherrypicker from Clayfield, and we have heard this on a number of occasions. Last night during

the debate the member for Clayfield said that unemployment is on the rise in Queensland. I have no idea what figures he used in that regard, because it was at 6.6 per cent when we took office and it is now down to six per cent on a trend basis, so it concerns me greatly when we hear this.

With regard to the member's question concerning the Property Council survey, we are constantly engaging with the Property Council. We know that the Property Council has great confidence in the fact that we have the first statewide infrastructure plan that we have seen in this state in three years. They can continue to crow as much as they like about what they apparently did during their time in government, but there was no plan. I remember those meetings prior to the election. Every time we met we were told it was of great concern that there was no plan under the former government. That was of great concern to us then and it is of great concern to us now, which is why the Deputy Premier has come forward with our plan to create some certainty. We made a very strong commitment around Building Queensland to ensure that, whatever public infrastructure we were delivering, it was going to be very important to have a robust business case. We all know how well the member for Clayfield does when it comes to business cases. Look at what he did with the back-of-the-envelope job on 1 William Street. We are very keen to see—

Mr Nicholls: Release your cabinet documents. Why did you hide them all under an RTI?

Mr PITT: I take that interjection from the member for Clayfield. He asked us to release cabinet documents. We have asked for some very simple cabinet documents to be released by the Leader of the Opposition regarding the ultimate performance of Strong Choices—all work that could help us with the merger of electricity businesses—but it has not been forthcoming. If he wishes to go on, he should start talking to the member for Southern Downs and get him to release their cabinet documents and live up to the commitment that he made in public in the media before he starts asking us to do anything further.

Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Murrumba, I am pleased to advise members that we have students in the House from the St Bernard's school, Upper Mount Gravatt in the electorate of Mansfield observing the proceedings.

South East Queensland Regional Plan

Mr WHITING: My question is of the Deputy Premier. Will the Deputy Premier update the House on the review of the South East Queensland Regional Plan?

Ms TRAD: I thank the member for Murrumba for his question. I know that as a former councillor he has a very deep interest in how regional planning can help set the framework for how we can better service our communities and how we can protect the important things that our communities want protected like our liveability, sustainability and amenity. Regional planning matters so we can grasp the opportunities of growth whilst preserving the things that we love about our communities. That is why I recently wrote to mayors from North Queensland to re-enliven the discussion I started last year about pulling together a regional plan for North Queensland. I am pleased to report that those responses are due back to me soon, and I think that we will have some very good conversations in relation to delivering a regional plan for North Queensland.

Here in South-East Queensland of course regional planning is especially important, and previous Labor governments have delivered very good regional plans. It is important because one in seven Australians live in South-East Queensland, and our population is forecast to grow to 5.5 million people by 2041. We need to recognise that this is an opportunity to grow our communities in a way that is sustainable and protects our amenity. The last regional plan was delivered in 2009 by the former Labor Party government, and it was a statutory regional plan. Our new regional plan is overdue, and it is overdue because the former planning minister, the former deputy premier, did promise to deliver a South-East Queensland regional plan by mid-2014 but, if my memory serves me correctly, he failed to do so. We have to try and get that regional plan out despite the lack of work that had been undertaken by the previous LNP government.

I am very happy to report to the parliament that yesterday I met with South-East Queensland mayors, and we agreed to work together to deliver a new plan. For the first time the regional plan will have a 50-year outlook and be underpinned by a 20-year planning framework for sustainable growth. With our economy transitioning to knowledge-intensive industries, the regional plan will also ensure that we identify how and where we grow and where the jobs of tomorrow are going to be located.

My department has appointed two of Queensland's most highly regarded planners to help lead the review, Greg Vann and Malcolm Griffin, who are now working under my new deputy director-general, Stuart Moseley. The review process will kick off next month with a series of community conversations which will give communities, industry and councils the chance to tell us what they value

most about our region. This feedback will help inform the development of the draft plan, and we will release this for statutory consultation before the end of the year. I look forward to reporting back to the parliament as we progress.

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance

Mr POWELL: My question without notice is of the Premier. I refer to Labor's election commitment to quarantine the dividends from government owned corporations, to invest in infrastructure and pay off debt. Can the Premier explain how her government's plan to now sell these dividends to foreign pension funds fulfils this election commitment?

Ms PALASZCZUK: The answer is very clearly no, we are not.

Social Benefit Bonds

Ms BOYD: My question is of the Treasurer. I refer to the new social benefit bonds program, announced in the 2015 state budget, and the calling for expressions of interest earlier this year for three pilot bond schemes, and I ask: will the Treasurer advise the House of the response to the program and how it will benefit Queensland?

Mr PITT: I thank the honourable member for Pine Rivers for her question. She is a hardworking member who is always talking to me about some of those very challenging areas of government which are about providing services to people and trying to work through difficult social disadvantage in the areas we are looking to cover with our social benefit bonds. I do thank her for the question.

Our social benefit bonds commitment, which was made at the 2015 budget, represents a new and innovative way of looking at service delivery—

Mr Nicholls: All the work had been done.

Mr PITT: I take the interjection from the member for Clayfield. He again tries to rewrite history. He is still living in the past. Coming up with an idea five minutes before our budget and saying that they have had it all along just does not cut it. We very clearly made election commitments around looking at further and innovative ways of doing things, so I was very pleased to put this on the table.

We have been very pleased with the strong response to the calls we put out for expressions of interest. Social benefit bonds are a cost-effective way that we think will be a way to deliver services and look at new ways of doing things. There was some commentary asking whether the government had given up in terms of trying to do this, whether we had put up the white flag and whether we could deliver in these areas. That is far from the case. We know that this is very challenging. If we are to get this right, we need to ensure we have people providing all avenues and ways of dealing with things.

The areas that are being covered by our social benefit bonds are homelessness, the rates of reoffending in young people and the challenges facing Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children. I think all members of this House would agree that those are three areas we should all be supporting and getting behind in terms of trying to deliver the appropriate policy settings and services.

We put out the market soundings after the 2015 budget. We called for EOIs in February. These closed in late March. There was a strong response. We have received 20 submissions dealing with these three policy areas. That means that there are 20 very detailed submissions coming to government from private investors and service delivery agents saying, 'We believe that we can work with the government.' If we meet all of our commitments—the agreed outcomes we are looking to achieve—we will obviously see a value in investment.

It is a very important point when you start looking at social impact investment generally. This is not a new concept. We know that we are not even the first state in Australia to do this. The value is that we are learning from where others have done well and where they have not done so well in order to deliver better services to get good social outcomes in our state.

This is another example of the Palaszczuk government's way of thinking. We are doing things in an innovative way. We are not just taking for granted that this is the way things have always been done and we must continue along that path. We are partnering with the NGOs. We are looking at innovative and cost-effective solutions, and I am very pleased to say that we will be making announcements about the successful applicants in the near future. This is a great outcome for our state.

Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Aspley, I am pleased to announce that observing our proceedings from the gallery are people from the Oxley Men's Shed in the electorate of Mount Ommaney.

Member for Springwood

Ms DAVIS: My question is to the Premier. Was the Premier aware of the serious allegations of bullying and intimidation by the member for Springwood towards the member for Cairns prior to the Premier promoting the member for Springwood to the position of cabinet minister?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Aspley for her question. My understanding is that some of the matters that she is touching on are currently before the Ethics Committee.

Mr STEVENS: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. There is no matter in relation to the member before the Ethics Committee. The matter has been written to you about, as I understand it.

Mr SPEAKER: For the benefit of the House, I will be making an announcement about this matter later today. Unfortunately, I am not in a position to make an announcement at the moment. Strictly speaking, the question is allowed.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I want to make a few comments. The Minister for Housing and Public Works, Mick de Brenni, is doing an outstanding job as a minister in my government. Members have heard very clearly today what he is doing in relation to veterans. He is out there listening. In relation to everything I have asked him to do as a minister, he is performing—unlike those opposite.

As I have said and I reiterate in this House: I expect high standards of not just my ministers and not just members of my government but also all members. If those opposite want to continue to go down the path of making personal attacks, the people of Queensland will judge them on that. The people of Queensland expect more from their elected members of parliament.

Ms DAVIS: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. My question was quite specific: was the Premier aware prior to appointing the minister?

Mr SPEAKER: I am aware of your question. I will allow the Premier a degree of latitude in answering the question because of what I indicated to the House. There is a matter that I am considering at the moment about which I will be reporting later to the House. I will allow the Premier latitude in relation to the tone and the content of this question. Premier, do you have anything further to add?

Ms PALASZCZUK: No.

Health Services, Federal Funding

Mr BROWN: My question is of the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services. Will the minister outline any recent changes to federal funding of our health system?

Mr DICK: As honourable members will know, at the recent Council of Australian Governments meeting the Premier, due to her persistent advocacy, was able to secure an additional \$445 million for Queensland public hospitals for the period 2017-18 to 2019-20. That commitment winds back, ever so slightly, the impact of the savage cuts implemented by the Abbott federal coalition government in its first budget—the budget that followed that election commitment, the promise that he made to Australia, that there would be no cuts to health and no cuts to education. That funding will provide assistance to us in dealing with the pressure that is building on our public health system, particularly due to our growing and ageing population, but it is a long way short of what we need.

If you start \$11.8 billion behind—that is where we were, on Commonwealth Treasury figures—and you receive \$445 million, you are still behind. That will have a big impact on electorates such as Capalaba in the Metro South Hospital and Health Service. When you analyse the \$11.8 billion, over a 10-year period on a population basis it represents about a \$2 billion cut over 10 years for Metro South. For the Redlands, Logan and other places like that, that has a huge impact.

There are other impacts. The national partnership agreements on dental care and health care put an enormous amount of money into Queensland. It helped eliminate the long waits for dental care. That was federal Labor money that came to Queensland. We have two months to go and the Commonwealth still will not commit to continuing that funding.

We received about \$41 million this year—about \$30 million for dental care and \$10 million for mental health care—through those national partnership agreements. There is two months left on those agreements. I raised the issue at the COAG health ministers meeting recently. All the Commonwealth would do was say, 'We will look into it in our budget.' That is \$41 million that will not come to Queensland if this is not confirmed. I can assure the House that if we do not get that \$30 million for dental care it will have an impact on long dental waits.

We need the Commonwealth to pay its fair share. It is the largest taxing government in Australia. It is the source of enormous revenue that goes to the Commonwealth through taxation. We need the Commonwealth to pay its fair share. I and the Premier will continue to put pressure on the Commonwealth right through the election—the phoney election campaign that has started. We will continue to put pressure on the Commonwealth so that Queensland can get its fair share and so that those Queenslanders who are dependent on public health care can get the services they need in our state.

CFMEU

Mr WALKER: My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations. Given that it was reported that yesterday's unlawful CFMEU action in Brisbane cost the economy some \$6 million, and it is just the beginning, what action does the government intend to take to ensure the Queensland economy is not held to ransom by such lawlessness again?

Ms GRACE: I thank the honourable member for the question. I am not sure where he is getting the figures from. Obviously they have been made up by somebody and have been put in the *Courier-Mail*. The opposition's chief of staff probably fed it to the *Courier-Mail*. As we in this House all know, you cannot believe everything—with all due respect—that you read in the *Courier-Mail*.

However, questions concerning the status of action that was taken yesterday fall squarely and truly within the federal jurisdiction, and the member opposite should be aware of that. The Fair Work Building and Construction division of the Fair Work Commission is the regulator for unprotected industrial action in the building and construction industry. Even if these matters were within the state's jurisdiction, it is very hard to answer the question—we would not be able to do it because we do not have the jurisdiction—about the status of what occurred yesterday. We simply do not know all of the circumstances for each and every worker who attended the rally. Workers may be covered by agreements that provide, for example, a two-hour meeting for union purposes subject to various notification requirements. I understand that there were 30 building sites or thereabouts that apparently attended the rally. There are a lot more than 30 building sites in Brisbane at the moment. I think there are 30 in my electorate alone.

Ms Enoch: As a result of this government.

Ms GRACE: Exactly. I take the member for Algester's interjection—that is, that that is probably because of the actions of this government. There are building cranes all over Brisbane. The exact circumstances of how those members attended that rally are unknown and it is very dangerous to jump to assumptions. Workers who attended that rally may have attended that rally freely of their own choice and based upon an agreement that is current in their workplace. Workers, for example, who may have been on leave may have wanted to attend the rally. Workers who may not have been in a job at the time could have attended the rally. I understand that some workers travelled from Central Queensland and other areas to attend that rally. When you take photographs of rallies, people enjoying an afternoon, they may be there for very legitimate reasons. This side of the House believes that the provocation of black lung disease by the ABCC by stripping away the genuine and fair rights of every other citizen should be rejected. You do not provoke and then complain about action that is being taken. The reality is that it falls under federal jurisdiction. They are the relevant authorities to deal with any breaches and I will leave it to those authorities to decide what to do.

Tourism

Mrs LAUGA: My question is directed to the Minister for Tourism. Will the minister outline how the Palaszczuk government is positioning Queensland to grow tourism in this state?

Ms JONES: I thank the honourable member for the question. I know that she is a passionate advocate for tourism in her region. In actual fact, I would describe her as a 'red hot' advocate for the tourism industry. I say that making reference to the Ginger Pride photo shoot that will be happening on Great Keppel Island on Sunday as the member is a very proud ranga from Keppel, and I am using the words of the self-nominated redheads from Central Queensland who will be descending on Great Keppel Island for the first Ginger Pride photo shoot to be held in Queensland. I am sure you will represent me admirably at that, so thank you, member for Keppel. We know that tourism jobs mean real jobs for Queenslanders, and we know that because we saw more Australians and more international visitors come to Queensland last year than ever before. Our government is absolutely committed to growing tourism. We put our money where our mouth is in our very first budget to ensure

that we are doing that and we are seeing the results up and down Queensland's coastline, in regional communities and in the outback. I am sure that there will be a number of very good representatives for the tourism industry in Barcaldine in the future.

I have a message for the member for Toowoomba South: in the words of Robyn Rihanna Fenty, he has a lot of 'work, work, work, work, work, work' to do when he gets to Canberra, and that is because the people who are getting in our way of growing tourism in this state are the Malcolm Turnbull government. I sincerely ask that if the member is successful in becoming the member for Groom he get in there and lobby to axe the backpacker tax. We know that those 160,000 people working in Queensland on that working visa are generating \$700 million for the Queensland economy. We need to scrap the backpacker tax introduced by the Malcolm Turnbull government. Furthermore, as the Premier outlined in her comments today, we know that, particularly for regional Queensland, if there are changes to the complicated visa system that is currently in place we will see many more Chinese visitors—the fastest growing economy in the world—coming to Queensland and spending their money in our economy. We know that if we see movement on visas we will see more repeat visitors to Queensland going to the big cities and then also venturing further out to see all that Queensland has to offer. I repeat: he has a lot of work cut out for him, but we know that if he goes down there and advocates to scrap the backpacker tax this will have a real outcome for Queensland.

Mr Springborg interjected.

Ms JONES: I thank the member for Southern Down for his support. I am glad that finally after months and months of us calling for the backpacker tax to be scrapped he has actually said something about it. Maybe he likes Rihanna too!

Regional Queensland, Domestic Violence

Mr KNUTH: My question without notice is directed to the Minister for Communities, Women and Youth, Minister for Child Safety and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence. Can the minister update the House on the funding and rollout of domestic violence perpetrator intervention programs in rural and regional Queensland?

Ms FENTIMAN: I thank the member for Dalrymple for his question. I know how committed he is and how committed his community is to tackling domestic and family violence. In fact, I have had the pleasure of meeting with the hardworking and committed staff at the Charters Towers Neighbourhood Centre on a number of occasions and I look forward to meeting with them and other community leaders again tomorrow with the Premier and ministers to talk about how we can tackle domestic and family violence in regional Queensland. I am sure together we will all endeavour to persevere to tackle domestic and family violence in regional Queensland. Domestic violence perpetrated by men against women and children must end, but we can only do that if we engage men and we work with perpetrators in this space. We have to send a powerful message to men that they can make different choices rather than resorting to violence. Our government absolutely believes that perpetrator programs and working with perpetrators has to be part of the mix as we tackle domestic and family violence, and there were a number of key recommendations in Dame Quentin Bryce's *Not now, not ever* report on how we should roll out perpetrator programs across this state. Perpetrator programs have been something that have been historically underfunded across this state and we are working really hard to ensure that we close those gaps. I know there are a lot of regional communities without access to behavioural change and perpetrator programs, and that is something I am absolutely committed to fixing.

In this financial year this government is spending \$66 million tackling domestic and family violence. We also announced \$3.7 million for 17 perpetrator intervention programs across Queensland, and I am really pleased to inform the House and the member for Dalrymple that those programs are now being rolled out in Cairns, Maroochydore, Townsville, Mount Isa, Toowoomba, Roma and Murgon. I know that a lot of the hardworking domestic violence services in regional Queensland are also now holding perpetrator programs with the increase in funding that we announced for them earlier this year. We are also reviewing the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act to ensure that we are holding perpetrators to account. We have seen new offences introduced just this week and the introduction of a circumstance of aggravation. We know this is about supporting women and children and making sure that our services are well funded and supported, but we also know that we have to hold perpetrators to account and work with perpetrators to ensure that this violence does not continue to happen. As part of that, we also need to work with young people, particularly young men in their attitudes towards women. Yesterday at the National Press Club the new Sex Discrimination Commissioner talked about the urgent need to work with young men and their attitudes towards women, and that is why I am so

pleased that the Palaszczuk government is rolling out respectful relationships training across all of our schools, because we know that if we are going to successfully tackle domestic and family violence we have to start with our young people.

Cooperative Research Centre for Developing Northern Australia

Mr HARPER: My question is directed to the Minister Assisting the Premier on North Queensland. Will the minister advise the House of the Palaszczuk government's efforts to secure the Cooperative Research Centre for Developing Northern Australia in North Queensland?

Mrs O'ROURKE: I thank the member for the question. Like the member for Thuringowa, I am completely excited that today we had the announcement that the cooperative research centre will be based in Townsville. This is something that I have been lobbying for and I am glad that the federal government has answered our calls. In fact, just yesterday right here in this very chamber I reiterated the reasons why the CRC should be based in Townsville. The CRC will encourage businesses, governments and researchers to work together to identify opportunities for growth which will ultimately lead to jobs.

The centre will focus on collaborative research to deliver commercial opportunities in areas such as agriculture, food and tropical health. As I have been saying all along, and as the Minister for Agriculture saw when she was in Townsville earlier this year, Townsville is the most logical place for the centre to be based. Townsville has a strong economic sector, great international connectivity, a diverse economy and incredibly strong expertise. That is exactly the argument that I took to the federal government earlier this year and exactly the argument that I also took to the federal Minister for Northern Australia, Matt Canavan, in Rockhampton last month. Finally, I am pleased to say that these efforts have paid off and we have had a win for Townsville and the north. In fact, this morning JCU's vice-chancellor, Sandra Harding, thanked me and the state government for our strong advocacy on this issue, saying that she was sure that it had made a difference.

However, this morning I was concerned to read in the *Townsville Bulletin* that Senator Ian Macdonald is using the same blackmail tactics of the Newman government and, instead of celebrating this win for Townsville, again, we are seeing nothing but doom and gloom from the federal government and holding North Queenslanders to ransom. What would make today even better for our region would be more certainty on the future of the Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility. We know that, unlike the Pacific patrol boat contract, this facility will be based in Cairns. Although the Pacific patrol boats will be built in Perth—along the Indian Ocean—I am glad that common sense has prevailed on this matter. The NAIF will be based in North Queensland instead of Sydney, as the Turnbull government had first planned. Once again, the Turnbull government has been shamed into action. After being called out for not proceeding with the NAIF legislation this week, it has tried to rush it through both houses of parliament. Yet North Queenslanders are still left in the lurch, waiting for the budget sitting next month. North Queenslanders need answers so that the financing of projects and business cases can be put forward to be assessed and we can have the certainty that we need.

Government Owned Corporations

Dr McVEIGH: My question without notice is to the Premier. Will the Premier instruct the Treasurer to publicly release letters that he has written to chairs of GOCs to do with securing private funding?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Toowoomba South for his question. On behalf of all members of this House, I wish him all the best as he embarks on a career in federal politics. If the member takes on that role, I hope that he will continue to fight for Queensland and, through his representation of people in Queensland at the federal level, he secures health and education funding as well as infrastructure funding for Queenslanders.

In relation to correspondence, I am not aware of it. The member should perhaps direct that question to the Treasurer. As all members know, there is an RTI process. Those documents, if they exist, can be accessed through the normal RTI process—as happened, as members know, under the former government.

Murri Court

Ms PEASE: My question is to the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice. Will the Attorney-General please advise the House of the progress being made by the government to deliver on its election commitment to bring back the Murri Court?

Mrs D'ATH: I thank the member for her question. I know how passionate she is about new and innovative services for our community. Last week, I formally reopened the first Murri Court in Rockhampton—the first of many launches to come in 13 locations across the state.

After a decade of operation, in 2012, after being defunded by the previous government, the Murri courts officially ceased their vital function. It is a testament to the dedication of the magistracy, the elders and the community justice groups that, even after being defunded, they did everything that they could to keep alive the spirit of the Murri Court in the form of the Indigenous Sentencing List. They were not allowed to use the Murri Court name.

The Palaszczuk government recognised the value in specialist courts and the role they play in diverting offenders from prison by giving offenders an opportunity to address their offending behaviour through intervention. We committed to bringing back the Murri Court, and we are bringing it back. The formal reopening of the Murri Court in Rockhampton starts the delivery of this important commitment to Queenslanders. I was very proud that the Minister for Police and member for Rockhampton joined me at that reopening.

Rather than just reinstating the former Murri Court as it was, extensive consultation was undertaken to develop a new and effective model for the Murri courts across the state. The Murri Court is not a soft option. These courts require offenders to work hard to address the underlying causes of their offending behaviour. Offenders are brought before their elders—in fact, the elders say that offenders are shamed before their elders—and are required to take responsibility for their offending and recognise the impact of their actions on the community.

On behalf of the Queensland government, I thank all Murri Court stakeholders, in particular, the elders and respected persons and community justice groups for their dedicated service to the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community. The Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody handed down its landmark report 25 years ago. As we mark that anniversary, it is sobering to reflect that the overrepresentation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in the criminal justice system remains a critical issue in both Queensland and Australia as a whole. There is still much hard work before us in tackling this issue and it can be diminished only by working together collectively. We need initiatives to reduce the contact that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people have with the justice system, instil trust in the justice system for Indigenous Queenslanders and contribute to a fair, safe and just state. This is why the Palaszczuk government is bringing back the Murri Court.

Mackenroth, Mr T

Mr McEACHAN: My question without notice is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer confirm if the Premier's Labor mate, Terry Mackenroth, is set to be appointed to the board of QSuper?

Mr PITT: I thank the honourable member for the question. I am very happy to confirm that the member is correct. Mr Mackenroth will be appointed to the board of QSuper. It is interesting to note that the member has a bit of a sniff of what might be happening. The usual process is that appointment is gazetted. The *Gazette* is to be released tomorrow. If the member had waited until tomorrow, he would have had his answer but, as the member asked me his question today, I am more than happy to confirm it.

Let us be clear: Terry Mackenroth has had the admiration of both sides of politics. On a number of occasions the former premier said that, on how a treasurer should act in Queensland, Mr Mackenroth was almost the standard. The former premier also appointed Mr Mackenroth to the disaster recovery and public donations body, which was a bipartisan group. That was very important. Mr Mackenroth has a very high standing.

Since coming to office, the government had not made changes to the QSuper board. We kept the chair, who was appointed by the former government, and we kept the other members. As I recall, when the previous government came into power it made eight changes to the nine-person board. The former government came to power and put the broom through the board, but we have kept the membership of the board going. This new appointment to the board has been triggered by the resignation of Melissa Babbage. For those who are not aware, Melissa Babbage is the wife of Joe Hockey, who has now taken up a position in the US. We wish both of them well.

When that appointment was made, the former treasurer did not release a public statement. He did not acknowledge that that appointment was made. He waited for a couple of months—from memory I think the appointment was made in June—and then announced it in October. That was only because the former treasurer was outed in an article by Amy Remeikis in the *Brisbane Times*. He did not want to say anything just in case there was any concern politically.

We do not do that. We are gazetting this appointment tomorrow and we will release a public statement. I am very happy to confirm that this is the case. I have the utmost confidence in Terry Mackenroth and I believe that he will be very well received on that board. As a former treasurer and deputy premier, he has overseen QSuper. He has had responsibility for it, as currently I have responsibility for it, and as has the member for Clayfield had responsibility for it. Mr Mackenroth has a very good working knowledge of that scheme. We think that this is a great appointment.

Despite the slurs of those opposite, we have every confidence that Mr Mackenroth's appointment will be well received. Apparently, once a person is a member of parliament they are always a member of parliament and are never able to do anything else to contribute to public life. It is a sad indictment on those opposite that they asked the question instead of waiting to see what the reaction was when Mr Mackenroth's appointment was gazetted. Unlike the member for Clayfield, who had to be dragged into admitting that he had made a change, I will be releasing a media statement.

Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Greenslopes I am informed we have another group of students from the St Bernard's School Upper Mt Gravatt in the electorate of Mansfield observing our proceedings. I now call the member for Greenslopes.

Passenger Transport Services

Mr KELLY: My question is of the Minister for Transport and the Commonwealth Games. Will the minister inform the House of the impact of amendments passed to the Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act 1994 and the Motor Accident Insurance Regulation 2004 last night and any consequent action taken?

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I thank the member for Greenslopes for his question and his interest in personal transport services. Last night the parliament considered the Transport Legislation (Taxi Services) Amendment Bill 2015 that was brought forward by the member for Mount Isa. During the consideration in detail stage of the bill two amendments were passed that the government did not support. These amendments were passed purely as a consequence of the support of the Liberal National Party. As a result, the definition of a person who administers a taxi service may have been significantly broadened to effectively capture anyone who provides a booking service for a service using a motor vehicle to transport passengers for a fee.

I can inform the House that these two LNP backed amendments may have significant impacts for the transport industry. I preface these comments to note that I am still seeking urgent legal advice on the full impacts of these LNP backed amendments, but these are serious matters. As I warned last night, the economic vandalism inflicted by the LNP last night may well mean that all pre-booked passenger services are illegal if they do not use taxi licences. To be clear, this may now mean that charter bus services, tourist services, chartered school bus services, community transport services, limousine services, shuttle services and hotel accommodation transport services may be deemed illegal if not operated by a licensed taxi. It also means that CTP insurance is required for some of these services and that may be, depending on the insurer, up to some \$6,300.

I will not allow the LNP vandalism inflicted last night to run chaos across Queensland's transport system. The Palaszczuk government will not allow it. Last night I instructed the director-general of the Department of Transport and Main Roads to take all necessary steps to ensure that those unintended consequences caused by the LNP's slackness and lack of attention do not impact upon our communities. Last night was a good outcome for the enforcement of support for safe and accessible taxi services and a good outcome to assist the government enforce the law as it currently stands. The government wants and welcomes innovation, but innovation does not forgive illegality. I am deeply concerned the LNP's actions last night have soured this outcome and we will be taking all the action required, once again, to clean up the messes made and left by the member for Indooroopilly.

Gold Coast Commonwealth Games, Traffic and Transportation Plan

Mr EMERSON: My question is to the Minister for Transport and Main Roads. Given the criticism by the RACQ of the minister's failure to release an updated traffic and transportation plan for the Commonwealth Games, when will the minister release the plan which is already six months overdue?

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I thank the member for Indooroopilly for his question. It is nice to have a question that combines the two elements of my portfolio and I welcome this question. It is very important and I appreciate that he has asked this question because it allows me to get on record the correction of the mistruths that the member for Indooroopilly has helped peddle in recent days in relation to this very

issue. Let me get these matters very clear on the record. My advice from Goldoc, the 2018 Commonwealth Games organising committee, on the transport planning is as follows: the Commonwealth Games Federation has mandated planning phases. The first phase of this process, the transport strategic plan, was completed in 2014 involving all key games partners. Goldoc and games delivery partners are now in the operational planning phase which concludes in September 2016. The transport operations plan will be released publicly, followed by community engagement and consultation.

The overarching transport operations plan requires the completion of venue operations plans. Venues are in various states of construction and we are systematically working through the new venue operations plans. After completion of the transport operations plan a significant community and stakeholder engagement program will be activated. Any organisation seeking an update on the progress of this planning can contact Goldoc directly. I understand that the RACQ and Goldoc are meeting and working through these issues very closely and I understand that the RACQ understands the mandates, the set out, the phased planning and the phased implementation of the transport strategic plan.

This is a great opportunity to talk about what a fantastic impact the 2018 Commonwealth Games is having on the Gold Coast and the impact that it is having in a positive sense on addressing long-overdue concerns around the transport infrastructure and the transport methods and systems on the Gold Coast. It is terrific that we have seen Labor governments over time plan for, arrange and deliver for the first stage of the Gold Coast Light Rail, something that has transformed the way that public transport, indeed transport generally, works on the Gold Coast. Now we have a Labor government again initiating and delivering stage 2 of the light rail that will connect to Helensvale and allow that heavy rail connection to Brisbane.

Mr Pitt: Something the member for Indooroopilly could not deliver.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: That is right. He could not get the federal government and the local government together on that. It was Labor governments that did it for stage 1 and stage 2. Let us move forward and enjoy the benefits of 2018.

Road Projects

Mr PEARCE: My question is for the Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports. Will the minister update the House on significant road projects that will benefit communities in Central Queensland?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the honourable member for Mirani for his question. He is a gentleman I have known for nearly 30 years and has been a strong advocate for Central and North Queensland right throughout his lifetime. Tomorrow I will be attending the start of construction of a project that the member for Mirani has been a long-time advocate for, the Eton Range realignment project. This \$189 million project is jointly funded by the Palaszczuk government and the federal government and once it is complete it will improve safety and reliability on the Peak Downs Highway, in particular for the heavy vehicle industry.

In addition, an average of 295 North Queensland direct jobs will be supported over the life of the project. The Peak Downs Highway is the only designated B-double route from Mackay West and the Northern Bowen Basin as well as the communities of Nebo, Moranbah, Dysart and Middledmount—all communities that I know the member for Mirani has close ties to. More than 4,000 vehicles, including 800 heavy vehicles, travel through the range each day—I have visited the site myself to see it—making it an important economic link servicing the mining, grazing and agricultural industries in the area.

The current Eton Range crossing has tight bends and a steep grade, rising 130 metres in a little less than 1.5 kilometres, and does have a poor safety record. The project will involve widening to four lanes and partial realignment for the existing Eton Range crossing. The grade will also be reduced from 11½ per cent to 7½ per cent, improving safety for heavy vehicles and over-dimension vehicles. I know that in that area there has been the fatality of a heavy vehicle driver. The four-lane alignment will allow for detouring traffic to reduce the impacts of accidents and incidents on the range. Construction is expected to take about two years to complete, weather permitting.

This is just one of the projects underway in Central and North Queensland. The Palaszczuk government is delivering the \$560 million Mackay Ring Road supporting over 600 jobs throughout the life of the project; the \$70 million timber bridge replacement program on the Peak Downs Highway; and

the \$80 million northern access project on the Bruce Highway, all of which will deliver significant safety and productivity gains for the heavy vehicle industry. The Palaszczuk government is very pleased to work with the heavy vehicle industry for productivity gains. We are also fast tracking delivery of a number of other projects in the region including, of course, the \$28 million Vines Creek bridges project, something that the previous government could not get going in three years. It was a do-nothing government when it came to infrastructure in Mackay. This will ensure heavy vehicles can travel to the port, lifting freight efficiency and productivity, boosting economic jobs and activity in North Queensland and supporting even more jobs.

YOUTH JUSTICE AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction



Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (11.29 am): I present a bill for an act to amend the Childrens Court Act 1992, the Corrective Services Act 2006, the Youth Justice Act 1992 and the acts mentioned in schedule 1 for particular purposes. I table the bill and explanatory notes. I nominate the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Youth Justice and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 [\[565\]](#).

Tabled paper: Youth Justice and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016, explanatory notes [\[566\]](#).

I am pleased to introduce the Youth Justice and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. The first stage of amendments, in the form of the Youth Justice and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015, was introduced into the House in December 2015. This bill gives effect to the second stage of amendments to the Youth Justice Act 1992 and the Childrens Court Act 1992, and fulfils the government's election commitment to repeal the 2014 amendments and to reinstate court referred youth justice conferencing.

Reducing youth crime in Queensland is a priority for this government. That is why we are repealing these amendments and adopting an evidence based approach to reducing youth offending. Evidence clearly shows that increasing the severity of punishment does not reduce offending nor does it reduce reoffending. The former government promised its tough on crime approach would break the cycle of youth offending by targeting repeat offenders. Youth justice data shows that the number of repeat offenders did not decrease as a result of the former government's amendments. Since 2010-11, the proportion of young people who reoffended within six months of being found guilty has actually increased, indicating the former government's amendments are not effective and do not provide a deterrent for offenders.

This bill reflects evidence on what works to reduce youth offending. The government has listened to academic, legal and community sector stakeholders who have been open in their opposition to the 2014 reforms and have continued to make submissions to have them repealed. The overwhelming majority of submissions received by the government concerning the intention to implement the current reforms before the House today were highly supportive.

It should be noted by the House that the police still maintain their powers of arrest and prosecution, and courts still have their substantial discretion to sentence young people to detention in Queensland. These amendments do not take away any of those powers. In fact, those powers are enhanced and expanded by the provision of new sentencing options. To this end, the bill will close youth justice matters in the lower court, remove the automatic transfer of 17-year-olds to adult corrections and reinstate court powers to refer an offence to a youth justice conference. In closing the lower courts, the bill reinstates the former section 20 to the Childrens Court Act 1992.

However, to make court processes transparent and to ensure victims can be involved if they choose, the bill includes a new provision for victims or their representatives to be present in closed court. This bill builds on the fundamental principles of justice for victims as enshrined under the Victims of Crime Assistance Act 2009, which requires victims to be kept properly informed of the progress of matters in which they have an interest. The proposed amendments provide for the closure of youth justice proceedings in the lower Childrens Court only, with the longstanding practice for more serious indictable offences, as presided over by a judge in the higher Childrens Court of Queensland, district or supreme courts, to continue to be held in an open court.

The government has also committed to moving away over time from treating 17-year-olds as adults for the purposes of the criminal justice system. As a significant initial step in this process, the bill will increase from 17 to 18 the age at which young people, who have at least six months to serve in detention, are to be transferred to an adult correctional facility. Furthermore, to ensure the developmental and rehabilitative needs of young people are taken appropriately into account, the bill will empower a court to delay a young person's transfer for up to six months. However, to maintain the safety of youth detention centres, the bill provides a statutory age cap for detention of 18 years and six months. Under the proposed provisions, a person who is 18 years and six months will not be able to enter a detention centre to begin serving or return to complete a period of detention. The bill also amends the Corrective Services Act 2006 to provide certainty for a young person who is transferred from youth justice to adult corrections, so that a parole order issued under the Youth Justice Act 1992 is a parole order under the Corrective Services Act 2006.

Finally, the bill provides for the delivery of an enhanced court referred conferencing program, with \$23.6 million being provided in the 2015-16 state budget to implement that initiative. Evidence supports reintroducing youth justice conferencing. Conferencing is a restorative justice process and an effective diversionary strategy. Evidence shows that conferencing can have a positive impact on a young person's likelihood of reoffending. Evidence also strongly shows there are direct benefits to victims who are involved in a restorative justice process. These include a reduction in post-traumatic stress symptoms, a reduction in the desire for violent revenge and a heightened level of satisfaction. Research also suggests that restorative justice is most effective when it is legislated as a required consideration, rather than on an optional basis.

Amendments to youth justice conferencing reinstate and enhance the pathways for the court to refer matters to conferences and provide greater flexibility to deliver diversionary restorative justice interventions. Those diversionary interventions and conferences are not soft options for young offenders. Young people are required to accept responsibility for their behaviours, confront their victims and undertake a restorative process, which can include community reparations of one sort or another.

The amendments proposed by this bill and those already being considered in the House represent an important step in moving towards a more balanced and evidence based youth justice system. The government is developing a comprehensive youth justice policy to set out reforming the youth justice system based on evidence of what works. This policy will have a priority focus on reducing the overrepresentation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children and reducing the impact of youth offending in our communities by supporting children and young people to make long-term positive changes in their behaviour.

An example of action already being taken by the government is its implementation of the Transition to Success program, which is an alternative education and vocational training program currently being delivered in a community setting to young people. The program is being trialled in partnership with Youth Justice, Education Queensland in local secondary schools, registered training organisations, and not-for-profit and local businesses. Transition to Success is demonstrating success in delivering education, training and employment outcomes and in reducing recidivism.

Through this and other evidence based initiatives, the policy will drive action that ensures the community achieves better value from the investment in youth justice. This will include an increased focus on education, skills training, improved family relationships, enhanced resilience and social outcomes for young people. The policy will build on the important amendments contained in this bill and build a world-class best practice youth justice system. 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) (11.38 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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Crawford): 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) (11.38 am), 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 Youth Justice and Other Legislation Amendment Bill by 6 June 2016.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

CONSTITUTION OF QUEENSLAND AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction



Hon. A PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (11.39 am): I present a bill for an act to amend the Constitution of Queensland 2001 and the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001 for particular purposes. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the Committee of the Legislative Assembly to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Constitution of Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 [\[567\]](#).

Tabled paper: Constitution of Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016, explanatory notes [\[568\]](#).

I am pleased to introduce the Constitution of Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. The bill implements the government's response to report No. 17 of the Committee of the Legislative Assembly titled *Review of the parliamentary committee system*. The bill has two major purposes being to: statutorily recognise the core matters of the parliamentary committee system in the Constitution of Queensland 2001; and amend the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001 to provide the parliament's portfolio committees with the power to initiate inquiries within their area of responsibility on their own motion.

On 19 March 2016 Queenslanders voted in favour of fixed four-year terms for the Legislative Assembly. This is a historic result. Not only is it the first state referendum question to have been supported in Queensland since 1910; Queenslanders' support for the Constitution (Fixed Term Parliament) Amendment Bill 2015 represents a significant moment in the history of our parliamentary system. The issue of four-year parliamentary terms has long been debated in Queensland, and the introduction of fixed four-year terms will provide the certainty that Queenslanders and our economy needs. They will provide more certainty for government, business and community planning with a set date for elections, plus fewer elections will bring cost savings to the budget.

Queensland's parliamentary committee system has been an evolutionary process since the time of the Fitzgerald inquiry in the late 1980s. Indeed in his inquiry report Mr Fitzgerald outlined the need to consider introducing a comprehensive system of parliamentary committees in Queensland to enhance the ability of parliament to monitor the efficiency of the government. Mr Fitzgerald went on to say that 'the committees could examine the expenditure and administration of government departments and associated public bodies, as well as the policies they administer' and 'the useful roles they can play are varied and diverse'.

Queensland's parliamentary committee system has evolved significantly since the Fitzgerald report. This has been especially the case since the reforms initiated in 2011, which have seen the vast majority of bills, with some notable exceptions under the former government, referred to committees for inquiry. In giving their support for fixed four-year terms, Queenslanders, in my view, rightly expect that there should be more certainty around the continued existence of the parliament's powers, through its committee system, to scrutinise government activity and to hold the government of the day to account.

The existence and extent of the parliament's committee system was an issue raised last year during the Finance and Administration Committee's inquiry into four-year terms and the fixed term and referendum bills. Arising from the FAC's inquiry report, the parliament referred to the Committee of the Legislative Assembly an inquiry into the parliament's committee system and further considered the FAC's recommendation to entrench elements of the committee system. The CLA's report on this inquiry, tabled in February, contains a series of recommendations about the parliament's committee system which have been put forward in a bipartisan way by the government, opposition, Independent and crossbench members of the CLA.

Under the bill, the core matters of the parliamentary committee system are being included in the Constitution. The Constitution, as the foundation document upon which Queensland's system of parliamentary democracy and government is based, is the appropriate statute for these provisions.

The bill inserts a new section into the Constitution which provides that: the Legislative Assembly at the commencement of every session is required to establish a minimum of six portfolio committees, whose areas of responsibility will collectively cover all areas of government activity; every bill introduced into the Legislative Assembly must be referred to one of the portfolio committees or another committee for a review period of a minimum of six weeks from the date of referral; the Legislative Assembly may, under its standing rules and orders by ordinary majority, decide to declare a bill urgent and refer a bill to a committee for a review period of less than six weeks, discharge a bill from a committee or decide that a bill not be referred to a committee; and the annual appropriation bills must be referred to committees for examination in a public hearing—that is, our estimates process.

In essence, these provisions reflect how the portfolio committees and the parliament's legislative process is operating in the current parliament. However, the statutory recognition of these matters in the Constitution will emphasise their importance on an ongoing basis and, as the CLA has described it, will 'place a psychological political impediment on altering them without just cause'.

In relation to declaring bills urgent, while my government believes that bills should be subject to review by portfolio committees, we do believe, as recommended by the CLA, that there must be a mechanism available to the assembly to declare bills urgent by majority vote if that is the majority view of the assembly. The bill provides for this accordingly.

The CLA has also recommended that the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001 be amended to provide a general power for portfolio committees to initiate inquiries on their own motion on matters within their portfolio areas. The government supports this amendment and notes that this will allow the portfolio committees, if a majority on a committee desires, to inquire into issues such as petitions received by the parliament. The exercise of this power will be a matter for each committee to decide in balancing all of their other responsibilities, but, in the context of strengthening the committee system, the government believes that this is a power that the parliament should make available to the committees.

The CLA has also recommended that all future amendments to the Constitution should be required to be passed by an absolute majority of the Legislative Assembly. In this context, an absolute majority is defined as being equal to a majority of the number of seats in the assembly—that is, at least 45 votes for the ayes in the current 89 seat assembly. Such a proposal was mooted by the Legal, Constitutional and Administrative Review Committee in 2003, with a comment at the time that the requirement for an absolute majority would prevent any government of the day from taking advantage of a temporary absence of members of the Legislative Assembly to pass legislation to amend or repeal parts of the Constitution.

As I outlined earlier, the Constitution is the foundation document upon which Queensland's system of parliamentary democracy and government is based. Proposed amendments to the Constitution should be viewed by members with care. To this end, and as I flagged in the government's response to the CLA's report that I tabled on 19 April, the government was seeking appropriate advice to ensure the constitutional validity of any necessary amendment to implement the government's response.

Constitutional amendments of this nature proposed by the CLA are complex, and the government will give further consideration to this particular recommendation before reaching a final position on the question of requiring that future amendments to the Constitution require an absolute majority of the Legislative Assembly. Once this bill has been read for a first time it will be referred to the CLA for consideration. I advise the House that once the government has come to a decision on this matter I will advise the CLA accordingly.

The government respects the CLA's view that an absolute majority should be required on votes on bills proposing amendments to the Constitution, but, in my view, we as a parliament need to be cautious and ensure that any proposal has no unintended consequences. Importantly, the bill in its current form still inserts the core matters of the parliamentary committee system into the Constitution. The statutory recognition of these matters in the Constitution will emphasise their importance on an ongoing basis and will, as the CLA has described it, 'place a psychological political impediment on altering them without just cause'. This will provide more certainty around the continued existence of the parliament's powers, through the committee system, to scrutinise government activity.

In closing, it gives me great pleasure to introduce a bill that strengthens the constitutional and parliamentary arrangements of Queensland's democratic system. This bill is very much in the spirit of the Fitzgerald inquiry reforms. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. A PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (11.47 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 Committee of the Legislative Assembly

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Crawford): Order! In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Committee of the Legislative Assembly.

Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date

Hon. A PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (11.47 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

That under the provisions of standing order 136 the Committee of the Legislative Assembly report to the House on the Constitution of Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill by 12 July 2016.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.


Motion agreed to.

RACING INTEGRITY BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from 20 April (see p. 1306), on motion of Ms Grace—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Mr BENNETT** (Burnett—LNP) (11.48 am): I rise to oppose the bill and I will outline my reasons for this in my second reading debate contribution. I thank the committee for its work. The committee deliberations were difficult. Many submitters posed a lot of questions to the committee. I acknowledge the committee staff, who did an amazing job in putting the report together. I also acknowledge the departmental staff. I will talk about that process, but I clearly acknowledge that there was a lot of work done throughout the committee's deliberations.

I did support many of the recommendations of the Agriculture and Environment Committee's—what we saw as—quite damning parliamentary report No. 15. I acknowledge that the government has proposed to implement the committee's recommendations, and I think that is a positive step forward. The Agriculture and Environment Committee, which inquired into the bill, described the department of racing's consultation as 'regrettable'. It was somewhat difficult for the committee to draft the wording for recommendation 1 with regard to the departmental officers' lack of engagement with the industry—there were a lot of submitters that talked about lack of respect and consultation—as, in a politically correct world, our first recommendation highlighted that introducing a bill for all three codes of racing based on an inquiry into the greyhound industry was going to have problems, especially when, as we heard, the communication was lacking.

I wish to clarify my comments, as I alluded to earlier, in relation to the department. I acknowledge that they are and many times were operating under instruction and were constrained to saying, 'This is outside the policy intent of the current government.' There was significant criticism of the department of racing's lack of consultation with all industry stakeholders. People like the turf clubs, animal owners, jockeys, breeders and trainers and the bodies representing them were all excluded from the drafting of this bill.

There should be criticism of the department and lack of genuine commitment to the many committee requests that still to this day remain unanswered. To be fair, the issues about the cost of implementation of the proposed bill remained unanswered until yesterday, even after several attempts

by the committee to seek clarification of this important issue. The department deflected this issue back to the minister, and it is acknowledged, as I said, that the financial proposition has been tabled and it will continue to be reviewed and scrutinised.

The department also failed to answer important questions relating to section 23 of the Legislative Standards Act 1992 in relation to the expected administrative costs to government in implementing the bill—again, referring the committee back to the minister to deal with operational issues. This left no doubt that the bill was flawed. Section 23 of the Legislative Standards Act 1992 states that the explanatory notes for a bill must include, in clear and precise language, '(e) a brief assessment of the administrative cost to government'. This issue did remain unresolved. We saw these as serious breaches in our committee deliberations. The committee heard from several submitters who were really concerned about the bill still being uncoded, with the real fear that the costs will ultimately be borne by the racing industry. Again, I acknowledge that those costs were tabled yesterday.

The committee's summary of the eight recommendations revealed that it 'could not agree whether the bill should be passed'. Without specific costs, the committee concluded that it was 'difficult to gauge whether the anticipated benefits of the bill are worthwhile'. The committee stated that this omission by the department is particularly regrettable for the state's horse racing interests and sought clarification from the minister as to how the amount of funding that racing control bodies provide for the Queensland Racing Integrity Commission will be determined and the controls that will be established to ensure the commission's costs are kept under control and to a minimum. There is now a response to recommendation 2.

I asked numerous questions of the department during the committee inquiry with regard to the implications for Queensland taxpayers into the future. We see again an attempt to further erode what appears to be the relationship between government and the racing industry. Transcripts of the department's responses to our questions left the committee somewhat surprised and intrigued. It appeared that the officers, most probably sent in under direction, were not familiar with basic information in relation to the bill. For example, they could not or would not elaborate on the arrangements for parallel legislation in other jurisdictions and they did not have the details of organisational structures, staffing numbers, possible unintended consequences, regulatory impacts on other departments, resistance to change in the industry and financial impacts on the state budget.

The committee was critical of the consultation process and lack of specific funding details. We did support the new seven-person board structure, concluding that a representative from each code was sufficient to ensure that the board was well informed. However, there is considerable industry opposition to the changes in the bill from all three codes—thoroughbred, harness and greyhound. The committee heard many submissions and serious concerns about the proposed board's capacity to govern the three codes.

The bill extends the powers to authorised officers by mirroring those powers given to authorised officers and inspectors under the Animal Care and Protection Act in relation to powers of entry, seizure and the issuing of an animal welfare direction. The bill also inserts new information-sharing powers within the Animal Care and Protection Act which are mirrored in the proposed Racing Integrity Act. These provisions raised significant and serious concerns within the industry, as was reported in the committee.

We continue to have significant reservations that the inquiry that started as a result of animal cruelty issues in the Bundaberg region has created a need to seek amendments to broaden the commission's function to include the promotion of animal welfare. I note that the minister in recommendation 4 is going to deal with clause 10. Those who listened to any of the deliberations of the committee would have heard my passion and concern about animal cruelty. The committee agreed in recommendation 4, and the minister has agreed, that the issues of animal cruelty that there the origins of the inquiry and the drafting of the bill were, up until yesterday, not adequately addressed. The commission's functions to include the promotion of animal welfare and the prevention of cruelty is a must in the industry, and I think we all agree.

Animal cruelty featured regularly during the committee's deliberations, and recommendation 6 highlighted the need to amend section 68(3)(b) of the bill to stipulate that a licence application cannot be granted for those who have a previous conviction. It was also recommended that, after 12 months of operation of the proposed Racing Integrity Act, the agreed provisions be reviewed and that further amendments to the animal Care and Protection Act may be required. It is great to see that in the bill as well.

The clear overreach capacity of the minister in the bill was addressed in recommendation 5, with the committee recommending that amendments be made to clause 13 to remove the provision of the minister giving directions to the commission in relation to a decision made by the commission under the rules. Again, this has been addressed.

Many concerns were raised in relation to the bill's intent in establishing a new Racing Integrity Commission, which dissolves the existing arrangements and separates the integrity functions of Racing Queensland into a separate body. Of significant concern was the cost—now we have firm figures. We did hear during the committee that the estimated cost to Racing Queensland, to the taxpayer, was \$8 million.

During the committee deliberations I did ask senior members of the department about where the funds would come from for the Queensland Racing Integrity Commission. The response received at that point in time did cast significant doubt over the strength or confidence that this was good policy. The answer provided stated—

The budget for the Queensland Racing integrity commission (QRIC) has not yet been finalised. The QRIC is anticipated to commence on 1 April 2016, subject to the passage of the legislation.

The budget for QRIC will be comprised principally of existing integrity-related resources from the Office of Racing, Department of National Parks, Sport and Racing and from Racing Queensland.

For the period from QRIC's commencement to the end of the financial year, additional funding required to deliver on the Queensland Greyhound Racing Industry Commission of Inquiry will be covered by the Queensland Government. These are not expected to be significant and not of the quantum reported in the media.


For the 2016/17 financial year, QRIC's budget and RQ's contribution to that budget will be established through the normal government budget processes.

The committee heard that the government had really not much idea at that point in time about the impacts. I thank the minister that clarity has now been provided for stakeholders to absorb.

The committee received significant correspondence from many submitters clearly concerned that the bill did not recognise that there are many circumstances where racing is successfully conducted. Examples were given such as thoroughbred racing is conducted both at country race meets and also at city venues, some with partnerships with the TAB. Harness racing is also conducted in the city and the country. Both can occur at other venues such as agricultural shows or other activities. What is clear is that standards are created at these different locations and arenas. The concept of 'one size fits all' was raised with the committee many times and it raised the prospect that there can be only one winner. These are not my words, but it was feared that a large section of country racing would cease based on one size fits all. Again, many submitters raised that issue.

There are many areas of concern that will affect the Queensland racing industry with the passage of this bill, an industry which is the third largest employer in the state. It has been estimated that the sector employs some 50,000 people—people like veterinarians, veterinary product suppliers, food and fibre feed suppliers and growers, transport, stock and station agents, and wagering operations. You could never count the number of volunteers from the many race tracks and related entities right across Queensland. I note my own Rotary Club, the Rotary Club of Bundaberg Sunrise, could possibly be affected from continuing our regular volunteering at the Bundaberg Race Club. We should not produce legislation that has the potential to disrupt a truly enjoyable community activity—that is, country racing. We also recognise the substantial tourism dollars and generated commercial activity related to this industry.

The fact that many stakeholders raised concerns and flagged possible implications on many aspects of the bill cast enough doubt in my mind that the issue of animal cruelty which occurred in my electorate—which was the origin of the inquiry in drafting the bill in the first place—remains a concern to me, as it did throughout the committee's deliberations. I have formed my own position that the bill should not be passed.

 **Mr SORENSEN** (Hervey Bay—LNP) (12.00 pm): I would like to make a short contribution to the Racing Integrity Bill. First of all, I would like to thank the committee, especially Rob Hansen, for all the work that has been done. We are under the pump at the moment. I would like to thank all the people who made submissions to the inquiry and all the people who attended the public hearings of the inquiry and took the time to discuss the Racing Integrity Bill.

This bill is a result of the Greyhound Racing Industry Commission of Inquiry by Mr MacSporran. After initially establishing an independent review, on 10 April 2015 the former racing minister, Minister Byrne, established the commission of inquiry. There were some 342 submissions and hearings in

Brisbane, Mackay, Bundaberg, Townsville, Cairns and Melbourne. There is quite a lot of information in that inquiry report, but that information is really all about greyhound racing. I feel sorry that thoroughbred racing and harness racing have got mixed up in this and have been discriminated against for animal cruelty.

Mr Wilson, from the Queensland Greyhound Breeders, Owners & Trainers Association, said the following in a public hearing—

I am President of the Queensland Greyhound Breeders, Owners & Trainers Association. I am also president of the Australian greyhound federation. The greyhound racing industry is supportive of the changes to a new statutory authority being created for Queensland racing. However, we are concerned that the recommendations do not go far enough. We believe there should be zero tolerance to any form of animal cruelty in greyhound racing and if you are found guilty you are banned from the sport for life. The industry believes this should be retrospective and any person found guilty prior to 2016 should not be permitted to be licensed again in Queensland. We also believe a chief vet should be employed to oversee the greyhound industry and its animal welfare responsibilities.

That is what he thinks of it all. This issue comes up time and again, and it is good to see that the government has taken on board the recommendations. I know it was not part of the bill and we were not allowed to talk about the cost of the integrity commission, but it is good to see that it is not a burden on the industry. I find it very difficult to see how you would get the clubs and each different sporting associations to pay for it. Thoroughbred racing makes up something like 75 per cent of the industry. The harness industry I believe is classed as a poor cousin—country racing, bush racing or whatever you want to call it.

There has been a lot of criticism about country racing. Country racing is important in our communities. We do not have the big prize money that the Gold Coast and Brisbane have, but racing is a huge part of any community. Even if there are only a couple of race meets a year, racing is important to the country. I am talking about the rest of Queensland, not just South-East Queensland. This is for all of Queensland outside the metropolitan areas.

Ms Grace: We put \$21 million on the table.

Mr SORENSEN: That is for the rest of Queensland.

Ms Grace: No, for country racing specifically.

Mr SORENSEN: I understand that, but at the end of the day it is not a lot of money for the rest of Queensland—from Cairns down to the Sunshine Coast and all the rest of it. Country racing is very important to the communities.

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr SORENSEN: That is right; if you want to say it that way. I feel sorry that the thoroughbred racing industry has been mixed up in this. The submission from Queensland Racing Unity Group states—

The Queensland racing industry is the third or fourth largest employer in the state. It is not unreasonable to estimate that it provides direct and indirect employment to 50,000 people. Indirect employment includes veterinarians, veterinary products suppliers, suppliers and manufacturers of animal racing tack, horse fodder producers, manufactured animal feed suppliers, transport operators, yearling sales agents, wagering organisations as well as the many who supply goods and services to the regular and carnival race meetings. There is also an unknown number of volunteers who contribute their time to this traditional Australian past-time. The people involved directly and indirectly rely on a strong industry for their income, careers and maintenance of their private racing investments.

The industry provides a genuine social purpose especially in country areas. It also contributes substantial tourist income especially from its major tourism events—Brisbane Racing Winter Carnival, Gold Coast Turf Club Magic Millions race-day and yearling sales, the Birdsville Cup and the Cairns Amateurs.

This is a big industry. It puts a lot of food on the table for a lot of people. I think bush racing or country racing should be recognised more. It should not be left out in the cold with thoroughbred racing in metropolitan areas.

The fledgling quarter horse racing industry is a different type of racing compared to thoroughbred racing. It started up in America many years ago. I think we should try to establish that more, because the industry is a big industry and we should be supporting that industry to create the jobs that we need. Country racing is classed as a poor cousin. It is a pity that we could not do more for country racing to keep it alive out there in the bush, because it brings communities together. It is of major importance out there. I quote from the following letter—

I am writing to you in regards to the labour governments attack on racing in country Queensland under the tracking toward sustainability plan racing Queensland has rolled when announced in ... out in which funding for bush racing will be cut over the next four years—

This is just a letter that came in. It continued—

... racing is a big part of my life I participate as a race horse owner I'm also a oncourse bookmaker on the bush racing circuit in central Queensland and I have served on my local race club committee ... in previous years I hold grave concerns for the survival of racing in the bush under there 4 year plan I am a underground miner a blue collar worker and have been a member of the cfmeu for 12 years and I have traditionally supported labour but there ideology's have swayed in recent years especially with there management of the racing industry in Queensland since being voted in to government country racing is the social fabric of rural and regional community's and the racing industry provides a lot of employment in country Queensland I'm writing to you to ask you to support Qrug and there plans for racing in Queensland and to return racing to the previous status quo and stability we enjoyed under the previous Lnp government.

That was one for us. The racing industry is one of the most important industries we have, especially in the Toowoomba area and places like that where there is a lot of breeding. A number of horses are bred in that area, and we need stability in the industry so people know where they are going. There is a lot of investment in the racing industry and we have to make sure we give that industry stability. Queensland can be a great place to breed horses. If we could get another Gunsynd, it would promote this state. Horses like the old 'Goondiwindi Grey' are great promotion for the industry.

One of the most interesting people who came to the public hearing was Mr William Anthony Thomas. He said—

I am a veterinarian with a strong interest in greyhounds. I do not appear on behalf of any organisation.

I thought it was good to listen to this gentleman. He spoke about ensuring the safety for all participants, including racing animals. He said—

Every racing animal must have the protection from cruelty and the benefit of welfare afforded by the Animal Care and Protection Act. Without this measure we have the potential, in my opinion, for more scandal and further harm to the industry. The Animal Care and Protection Act works for other animal industries ...

It is strange that we have one law over there and another law over here. Why not have it altogether at the end of the day? It might be very interesting. He also said—

... the racing industry is facing two major socio-economic forces. One is globalisation—


Today we have a lot of overseas betting. How are governments going to get the taxes and all of those things? We are losing all of this money out of the country. How do we get a grasp on what is happening in the global world, especially with the global betting companies? Gambling is everywhere nowadays. It can be done on your mobile phone et cetera. How do we really get on top of some of that?

Ms Grace: Racing Queensland will concentrate on that.

Mr SORENSEN: We hope. I would like to thank the committee once again. I would like to thank Glenn for chairing the committee. You are a good chairman, Glenn. You are better than some of the others.

Ms Grace: We like you too, member for Hervey Bay.

Mr SORENSEN: Do you really? I will move on to some of the animal cruelty measures. I still feel sorry that the horseracing industry is being mixed up in this inquiry. There are a lot of owners out there who only own a small share in one horse. They do not really care for the horse; they get someone else to do it for them. That is a big industry in itself. The industry needs security. How can someone invest money into a state when there is no security? We have to make sure that the industry survives in this state, especially country racing.

 **Mr MADDEN** (Ipswich West—ALP) (12.14 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Racing Integrity Bill 2015. I would like to begin by thanking the chair, the member for Gladstone, Glenn Butcher, as well as my fellow committee members. I thank the secretariat staff—Rob Hansen, Paul Douglas, Maureen Coorey and Carolyn Heffernan—as well as the technical scrutiny secretariat. I also thank the individuals and groups who made written submissions to the Agriculture and Environment Committee, as well as the submitters who appeared before the committee.

The committee's task was to consider whether the bill had sufficient regard to the rights and liberties of individuals and to the institution of parliament. The object of the bill is to safeguard the welfare of animals, to ensure the integrity of persons involved in the racing industry and to manage matters relating to betting and sporting activities. Standing order 132(1) requires the committee to determine whether or not the bill should be passed but, unfortunately, in this case the committee members could not agree on whether the bill should be passed.

The bill arose from recommendations contained in the commission of inquiry into greyhound racing report by Commissioner Alan MacSporran QC. The commission of inquiry investigated allegations of live baiting and other acts of animal cruelty in the greyhound industry. Commissioner

MacSporran found systemic weaknesses in the greyhound industry's integrity systems but, more alarmingly, he found there were weaknesses evident in all three racing codes—thoroughbred, harness and greyhound racing.

The bill proposes a number of measures to improve the welfare of animals in the racing industry. The measures were overwhelmingly supported by submitters to the commission of inquiry. The bill will create a Racing Integrity Act 2016 and amend the Racing Act 2002. The bill will also amend the Animal Care and Protection Act 2001, the Bail Act 1980, the Criminal Organisation Act 2009, the Interactive Gambling (Player Protection) Act 1998, the Liquor Act 1992, the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000, the Public Service Act 2008, the Trading (Allowable Hours) Act 1990 and the Wagering Act 1998.

The commission of inquiry found that the current system of self-regulation in the racing industry in Queensland has failed. The bill establishes the Queensland Racing Integrity Commission, which will be a statutory body. The government will meet all costs in relation to the establishment of the new integrity commission. The commission of inquiry also recommended changes to the all-codes Queensland racing industry board that is responsible for managing and administering thoroughbred, harness and greyhound codes in Queensland pursuant to the Racing Act 2002. This act also regulates racing bookmakers in Queensland.

If Queensland's racing industry is going to continue to grow and prosper, it will only happen if the community has absolute confidence in the racing board and the integrity commission. The integrity commission will have a police intelligence component to deal with organised crime, money laundering and race fixing, which are issues that can erode community confidence in the industry. The bill effectively separates animal welfare and integrity functions.

There appears to have been some misunderstanding and confusion amongst members of the racing industry as to what the Racing Integrity Bill is seeking to achieve. It has been suggested that the Racing Integrity Bill is seeking to create an all-codes board, when an all-codes racing board already exists. In July 2010, Racing Queensland Ltd replaced the three previous control bodies—Queensland Racing Ltd, Queensland Harness Racing Ltd and Greyhounds Queensland Ltd.

In May 2013 the Queensland All Codes Racing Industry Board trading as Racing Queensland became the industry's principal authority. The three codes have representation through the following code control boards: the Queensland Thoroughbred Racing Board, the Queensland Harness Racing Board and the Queensland Greyhound Racing Board. The chair of these three boards and two independent members currently form the Queensland racing board. Pursuant to the Racing Integrity Bill, the Queensland Thoroughbred Racing Board, the Queensland Harness Racing Board and the Queensland Greyhound Racing Board will be dissolved. However, the bill provides for an increase in membership of the existing all-codes racing board to increase the number of members from five to seven. Four members will be independent from the industry, that is, in the previous two years they have not had an interest in a racing dog or horse or trained a racing dog or horse, with the remaining three drawn from each of the three racing codes: thoroughbred, harness and greyhound.

A number of submissions dealt with concerns completely unrelated to the bill. Notably, the bill does not deal with changes to prize money or the number of race days, nor does the bill seek to encourage or direct Racing Queensland to reduce prize money or the number of race days. I commend the bill to the House.



Mr DICKSON (Buderim—LNP) (12.21 pm): I rise to speak to the Racing Integrity Bill 2015. The objectives of this bill are to: establish a new Queensland Racing Integrity Commissioner responsible for the management of animal welfare and integrity matters within the racing industry; amend the Racing Act 2002 to reform the structure of the Queensland All Codes Racing Industry Board including renaming the board as Racing Queensland Board, and to dissolve the three individual racing code boards, the Racing Animal Welfare and Integrity Board and the Racing Disciplinary Board; and amend the Animal Care and Protection Act 2001 to provide improved information sharing capacity, and broaden authorised officers' powers to investigate and respond to animal welfare matters and breaches of the act relating to the racing industry.

The former racing minister introduced this bill in December last year in response to the recommendations from the commission of inquiry into greyhound racing which investigated allegations of live baiting and other acts of animal cruelty in the greyhound industry. The commission of inquiry was set up following exposure by the ABC television program *Four Corners* of the abhorrent practices of live baiting in the greyhound racing industry in three eastern states: Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland. While the greyhound live-baiting scandal also affected Victoria and New South Wales, it

was only the Queensland Labor government's response that exposed the whole racing industry—meaning not only the greyhounds but also harness racing and thoroughbreds—to a level of downturn that has set the whole racing industry on an unsustainable footing. The Labor government's response to the live-baiting scandal in the greyhound racing industry has been to punish the industry in its entirety for seemingly no other reason than pure political spite. Rather than dealing with the issues decisively within the greyhound code aided by an experienced all-codes racing board, they pulled the rug out from underneath the entire racing industry.

As I have said in this House before, just four years ago the racing industry was left in an absolute shambles by the previous Labor government. The former LNP government worked hard to clean up Racing Queensland and to ensure an open, transparent and accountable industry on a sound and secure footing for the future. Some of the key initiatives included governance reform. We set up a new All Codes Racing Board along with three code-specific control boards to give each code a greater say. We have introduced integrity reforms. A new Racing Integrity Commissioner, and a new Racing Disciplinary Board was set up. There was a new approach to the provision of racing facilities by refocusing the Industry Infrastructure Strategy and its expenditure of \$110 million over five years. There was targeted financial support for country racing after Labor had destroyed it. We were delivering the 30-year \$4.5 billion new wagering agreement partnership with Tatts, now UBET, that will significantly benefit this industry. We were also delivering Australia's first \$10 million race day in 2016 on the Gold Coast with a seven-year partnership agreement between Racing Queensland and the Magic Millions.

Central to all of these initiatives and programs was the appointment of a new Queensland All Codes Racing Industry Board, QACRIB, and the three code-specific boards through a transparent selection process at arms-length from the government. That is right: it was a transparent selection process that was above reproach. Our selection panel consisted of Peter Arnison, the former governor of Queensland; Bill Carter, the former judge of the Supreme Court; and Jim O'Sullivan, the former police commissioner of Queensland. That is right: it was a transparent process, which is in stark contrast to the past appointments where the directors of the boards of Racing Queensland were shrouded in mystery and open to claims of cronyism. That is in stark contrast to the recent appointment process which has not only left the industry rudderless for over a year but is marred by controversy with an interim chair linked to the racing minister's former business interests and with one of the board members forced to resign only two days after making a highly inappropriate remark in a public forum.

At a time when we are debating integrity and accountability in racing, a dark cloud now hangs over the racing minister's own integrity in appointing members to the Racing Queensland Board. There is no doubt that the former Labor government drove the Queensland racing industry to the brink of destruction and the current government seems hell-bent on doing exactly the same. I have said this before and I will say it again: those opposite still see the racing industry as a political plaything. The racing industry in Queensland and the 30,000 people who work in this proud industry deserve better than this Labor government is actually delivering. At the very least they deserve to be consulted on a bill that will determine their future.

The committee found that the Department of National Parks, Sport and Racing did not consult with industry stakeholders or the public in relation to the content of the bill. Their report stated that, as a result, turf clubs, animal owners, jockeys, breeders and trainers and the bodies representing them were excluded from the bill's development. The committee found—

Consultation with the racing industry, community organisations and individuals should have been an intrinsic and routine part of the policy and legislative development process for the Racing Integrity Bill. Regrettably the Department of National Parks, Sport and Racing did not consult with community or industry stakeholders or the public in relation to the provisions in the Bill. As a result, racing industry participants such as turf clubs, animal owners, jockeys, breeders and trainers, and the bodies representing them, were excluded from the Bill's development.

The Racing Integrity Bill appears uncoded and will no doubt put more strain on the already stretched budget. With both the Queensland government and Racing Queensland struggling to control their finances, we are now facing the prospect of having to implement a bill which no-one can put a final figure on and which no-one guarantees will actually benefit the whole of the racing industry. In a bill that is 317 pages long, one would think that there would have been space to outline a specific cost relating to the Racing Integrity Commission.

The committee found that—


Based on the submissions to the committee, the costs for government to implement the Bill are a key issue for the racing industry. The information provided in the explanatory notes to the Bill on costs to government to meet the requirements in section 23 of the *Legislative Standards Act 1992* do not allay the concerns of the industry. In the absence of clear information about the assessment of implementation costs for government, it is difficult to gauge whether the anticipated benefits of the Bill are worthwhile.

The bill has achieved the seemingly impossible, with the Queensland racing industry coming together as one strongly opposed to the new Racing Integrity Bill. The bill has been criticised from all angles, with 148 submissions to the committee. The most common criticism relates to the Labor government's proposal to establish a new seven-member board with three industry members, one from each code, and four independent members. 'Independent' means that these four so-called independent members of the proposed Racing Queensland Board should have no relevant connection to the racing industry for the past two years. The Thoroughbred Breeders Queensland Association has come out strongly against the proposed board structure and said—

To suggest that only three of the seven members should have racing experience is ludicrous, and could potentially lead to serious mismanagement issues.

As we have seen, this appears to be a deliberate move to shift the power of the board away from being driven by industry participants. Racing Australia boss John Messara and senior Turf Club representatives also criticised this part of the proposed legislation, saying that it is impractical to have four independents sitting on a seven-person board. It is unsettling to think that four non-racing related board members would hold the majority and therefore determine the future of Queensland racing. And who do they answer to? To the industry to which they have no established links. This bill should be opposed because of its lack of information concerning costing and its complete lack of consultation with the industry. This is not good enough.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order! I would like to acknowledge in the gallery the principal and school leaders from Forest Lake State High School who come from the electorate of Algeester. I call the member for Beaudesert.

 **Mr KRAUSE** (Beaudesert—LNP) (12.31 pm): I rise to oppose this bill. I oppose this bill, and I oppose this government, and I oppose a lot of the things that this government has done because confidence—

Government members interjected.

Mr KRAUSE: I do not know why they are getting so excited about me expressing my lack of confidence in them. I would have thought that much was clear at this point in the term.

Confidence is a very fragile thing: it is a very fragile thing in the racing industry and it is a very fragile thing in the economy. It is a bit like reputation. When I used to work for a financial institution I fondly recall that one of the board members used to say that reputation arrives on the back of a tortoise and it can be gone like a hare. I think we can say that that is exactly what has happened to the Queensland racing industry under the stewardship of this minister and this government. This government has shattered confidence again in the Queensland racing industry. It did it once before during the Bligh and Beattie years and now history is repeating itself.

Ms Grace: How do you know? You were not here.

Mr KRAUSE: No, I was not here, Minister, but I was—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order! Two things: (1) Minister, I appreciate that you have very passionate views on this, but I am going to ask you to curtail your interjections; (2) Minister and member, I remind you that we do not have conversations across the House. Address all of your comments through the chair, please.

Mr KRAUSE: Yes, Madam Deputy Speaker, I was just taking the minister's interjection. Who can forget the scandals and mismanagement that went on during the Bligh years and the fact that they destroyed country racing in Queensland. It was the LNP that rebuilt country racing in Queensland and put some confidence back in the entire industry by putting in place a board that was dedicated to building racing—not tearing it down and not destroying confidence. Unfortunately, we have seen the destruction of confidence in the racing industry yet again.

The lack of consultation with all parts of the industry is scandalous, and the capricious action taken by this government to sack the entire Racing Queensland Board last year on the back of a scandal or an issue in one code alone is absolutely disgraceful. It shows that they have learned nothing from the Bligh years and Bob Bentley—

Mr Dickson: And Bill Ludwig.


Mr KRAUSE: Bill Ludwig as well—which destroyed confidence in Queensland racing. My electorate of Beaudesert and the Beaudesert area in particular has a big stake in the racing industry and the thoroughbred industry, and hundreds of jobs depend directly and indirectly on the racing industry.

Mr Rickuss: Don't you have 120 trainers there?

Mr KRAUSE: Something like that, member for Lockyer. There are many trainers. It is a great industry, and during our term in office great works were undertaken by Racing Queensland under the stewardship of Kevin Dixon and the minister for racing at the time, the member for Buderim. A sum of \$4.7 million was injected into that course to bring meets back and they now have over a dozen meets. It took an injection of confidence in the industry to be able to bring those meets back, to get the people back and to get more people training there. In fact, at Beaudesert their training roster is so full that they almost need another expansion already to accommodate them all.

The Showcase Country Series was a great thing for Beaudesert racing and in fact for all country racing. The capital investment enabled more meets to come from other courses when there was work being carried out through other capital injections at other courses, which is all a great boost for the local Beaudesert economy. When the Racing Queensland Board was sacked last year, confidence in the local industry and the statewide industry disappeared on the back of a hare just like reputation does. When it comes to racing here in Queensland, the reputation of those opposite disappeared on the back of a hare around that time as well.

I will be opposing this bill because I have no confidence in the stewardship of this government in the racing industry. The racing industry has no confidence in this government's stewardship of the industry, and we should all be opposing this bill.

 **Mrs GILBERT** (Mackay—ALP) (12.36 pm): I rise to support the Racing Integrity Bill 2015. This is an important bill. It protects the welfare of animals within the industry and also gives integrity and confidence to the racing industry. As the member for Burnett mentioned earlier, the industry needs to have stability and security, and that is what this bill will give them. The racing industry is a vibrant industry in Queensland. It provides thousands of jobs. The racing industry is intertwined with hundreds of small businesses in rural Queensland. The racing industry is an important economic and social element in Queensland. It is reported that the industry contributes about \$85 million to the state's economy and employs approximately 30,000 Queenslanders in the industry's three codes of thoroughbred, harness and greyhound racing.

The racing industry was tainted by its lack of integrity and the live-baiting scandal in the greyhound industry. No-one wants to see the abuse of animals in industry. This bill will put protections in place for all licensed animals within the racing industry. Change is difficult within industry. There has been some strong opposition voiced from sectors within the racing industry, and we saw this throughout the inquiry. The status quo cannot continue if this industry is going to continue to grow, thrive with confidence and have the confidence of the community.

This bill's objectives are to establish a new Queensland Racing Integrity Commission which is responsible for the management of animal welfare and integrity matters within the racing industry. It will amend the Racing Act 2002 to reform the structure of the Queensland All Codes Racing Industry Board, including renaming the board as the Racing Queensland Board; dissolve the three individual racing code boards, the Racing Animal Welfare Integrity Board and the Racing Disciplinary Board; and amend the Care and Protection Act 2001 to provide improved information-sharing capacity and broaden authorised officers' powers to investigate and respond to animal welfare matters and breaches of the act which are related to the racing industry.

The committee took the issues of animal welfare very seriously and has recommended that clause 10(1)(l) of the bill be amended to broaden the commission's functions to include the promotion of animal welfare and the prevention of animal cruelty and that the function must include the provision of training to racing industry participants in these areas. It also recommended amending clause 68(3)(b) to stipulate that a licence application cannot be granted for an entity whose executive officer has a prior conviction for an animal cruelty offence in Queensland or another state.

Never again do Queenslanders want to see another episode of the ABC *Four Corners* program 'Making a Killing' being played out in our state. The uncovering of the alleged cruelty to animals through live baiting in the greyhound industry resulted in the Queensland Greyhound Racing Industry Commission of Inquiry. Commissioner MacSporran identified a significant loss of public confidence in the greyhound industry. He uncovered other animal welfare issues affecting greyhounds and other animals used for live baiting. The commissioner also highlighted the failure of self-regulation in the industry to safeguard animal safety and welfare. This failure extended across all racing codes. He pointed out that there was a failure to manage risks by Racing Queensland, linked to inherent conflicts of interest in the industry's governance. Commissioner MacSporran reported that the live baiting could not have been engaged in without so many standing by—those who were not directly involved but who would have had to turn a blind eye.

This bill proposes to amend the functions and responsibilities of the racing control bodies and establish comprehensive corporate governance measures for the Queensland racing industry. There will be a new internal review process for administrative decisions made under the Racing Integrity Act relating to accredited facilities and processes for dealing with samples following race meets.

There was confusion on the part of some submitters, who believed that prize money and the number of race days would be cut. There are no provisions in this bill to make those changes. Prize money and the timetabling of race meets are not covered in this bill.

Some submitters were concerned that clauses 30 and 31 of the bill would remove industry participants from influencing decision-making for their particular code of racing. They believed that boards would be devoid of any current industry experts, with corporations put in place. This is not the case. The bill does not propose to appoint corporations as control bodies for thoroughbred, greyhound or harness racing. Queensland Racing will be the established control body under the amendments to the act. The approved corporations under the bill will be approved by the minister for new codes of racing. They will require a new corporation to be established when new codes emerge.

The making of standards for codes of racing also concerned some submitters. They were concerned that the code would not be suitable, with a one-size-fits-all standard for clubs—that the small country tracks would be disadvantaged and not be able to meet the same standards as the large metropolitan tracks. They believed that the bill did not recognise the range of circumstances under which racing takes place. They were concerned that country racing would be eliminated under this bill.

Advice from the department clarifies that the bill provides for the commission to set standards relating to animal welfare and integrity. The commission will work with industry and stakeholders to set standards. The commission has the ability to set standards that address animal welfare risk associated with racing and to ensure that acceptable levels of safety are provided throughout Queensland. The application of standards will not require all clubs to be the same, so there is no intention to exclude any size club from racing.

The new laws will have the ability to require the lifting of infrastructure and change procedures at tracks to improve animal welfare and safety. There will be a need for individual clubs, vets and other participants to work with control bodies to develop standards and licences that are both workable and represent best practice.

Country racing is steeped in tradition across the length and breadth of Queensland. In some communities, country race meets are the social lifeblood that brings the community together. Some of the country's race meetings in small centres are famous. The Birdsville race meeting, for example, brings tourism opportunities to the regions. I think I read somewhere the other day that it is already booked out. The Palaszczuk government is committed to country racing, aware that it provides jobs in regional communities. It does bring communities together.


On 3 December 2015 the government released a financial recovery plan, *Tracking towards sustainability*, after extensive consultation with industry during August and September 2015. This program commits a further \$21 million over four years to ensure racing in the regions continues. The funding will be directed towards supplementing the amended prize money structure for country racing. It will also be used to help country race clubs build capacity to improve their long-term financial position. The plan contains initiatives and strategies for Racing Queensland to operate a surplus from 1 July 2016. The government believes that financial recovery should not be to the detriment of country racing.

The racing industry is important to Mackay. The Mackay Cup will be held on 2 July. It is one of the most important race meetings in the Mackay calendar—a big TAB meeting. A big meeting like this helps the Mackay club keep financial. It also provides a great social day on the calendar of tourist events in Mackay. We hope we will be lucky enough to see Honey Toast make a start in the race.

When I recently visited the Mackay Turf Club with Minister Grace, the board members expressed their thanks to the Palaszczuk government for the support we have given the turf club. They are really pleased with the upgrades to the track. I believe we have spent over \$7 million upgrading the Mackay track. They were absolutely horrified when Campbell Newman announced to them when they were having difficulties that his plan was to sell it off. They are very pleased that the Palaszczuk government has saved their club. The Palaszczuk government supports the racing industry in Queensland—

Mr Dickson interjected.

Mrs GILBERT: I am not misleading the House. I should have recorded it; it was brilliant. I thank my fellow committee members for their work. They all worked very hard on this bill. I also thank the past acting chair, the member for Logan. I especially thank him for his support and commend him for the efficient and professional way he led the public hearings here in the chamber—a job well done. I thank the parliamentary support team, Rob and Paul, for their support. I also thank the minister for clarifying in her second reading speech the issues the committee had. That gives me a lot of confidence in commending this bill to the House.

 **Miss BARTON** (Broadwater—LNP) (12.48 pm): I rise to speak against the Racing Integrity Bill. At the outset I acknowledge the great work that has been done by the shadow minister for racing, the honourable member for Currumbin, over the past 15 months. I do not think there could have been a more dedicated shadow minister when it comes to building strong networks, relationships and connections with the industry. Certainly those I have spoken to on the Gold Coast have very much appreciated the time and effort the shadow minister has put in, not only to meet with them and understand their concerns but equally to do so around the state.

There are a couple of issues that I want to touch on in my brief contribution to the House today. Coming from the Gold Coast, I am very proud to say that the Gold Coast Turf Club is the home of the Magic Millions and is a great host of racing in paradise every weekend. I have had the opportunity to talk with representatives of the Gold Coast Turf Club and they have expressed one or two concerns with the bill which I want to raise today. The first concern that they have raised is with respect to the disciplinary process of the board. They are incredibly concerned that the process and the powers are rather broad sweeping and that that has the potential to be abused. Equally, they are concerned with the broad scope of possible directions that could be made by the board. Not only would the board have the ability to suspend racing events; they are particularly concerned that the board will have the ability to suspend other operations that really are integral to their operation and integral to their revenue stream. As I am sure we would all appreciate, racing clubs across Queensland, particularly those in regional and rural areas, are the hosts of many events in their communities, not just racing meets, and representatives of the Gold Coast Turf Club have expressed concern particularly with respect to their regional colleagues.


One of the other concerns that has been raised is the fact that the minister has been unable to provide a clear idea of how much this is going to cost and representatives of the industry have expressed great concern that that will mean that the industry itself will have to bear the cost, which will put further strain on the industry. Equally, they are incredibly concerned—and this is something that the shadow minister has been particularly vocal about—with the lack of consultation. Each and every day this government claims that it is a consultative government and it wants to go out and talk to Queenslanders and talk to stakeholders, but the feedback that has been overwhelmingly received—and it was even acknowledged by the Labor members of the committee that considered this bill—is that there was no consultation done with the very stakeholders and with the industry, and that really is quite concerning. Given that the government talks about the fact that it wants to be a consultative government, the only thing you can say is hypocrisy thy name is Labor.

Having had a look at the remainder of the speaking list, I know that a number of my colleagues from rural and regional Queensland intend to make contributions to this debate. They are incredibly concerned that this will be a disaster for country racing as well as the industry generally. The member for Burnett, who is also the deputy chair of the committee that considered this bill, spoke particularly about the impacts that this bill will have on country racing in his area. Like many of my colleagues, I have received emails from racing clubs across Queensland that express great concern about what this means for them. Particularly where they are racing clubs that might have one or two meets a year, they are incredibly concerned about what this legislation is going to mean for them.

Finally, this bill is supposed to be entirely about integrity and integrity in the racing system. When we consider that the industry has expressed a real lack of confidence in the minister, I just have one question for the minister. Yesterday in question time there was an opportunity for the minister to table the Integrity Commissioner's advice with respect to any potential conflict of interest. Given that this bill is entirely about integrity in the racing system, I would like to give the minister the opportunity to clear the air and to affirm what she claimed yesterday in question time. I would like to ask the minister if she would, in responding to the second reading debate, please table the advice from the Integrity Commissioner with respect to any potential conflict of interest when it comes to the appointments of the boards. If the minister could please address that in her response to the second reading debate, that

would be very much appreciated by not only me and all members on this side of the House but also the industry that is supposed to have confidence in her and her claims that she is talking about racing integrity.

As I said, I will not be able to support this bill. Again, I commend and thank my good friend and colleague the member for Currumbin for the great work that she has done because she has been an incredibly strong advocate for this industry. At a time when that has been sorely lacking from the government, those in the industry have been able to turn to the LNP and the shadow minister to be their strongest advocates in this state and in this parliament.

 **Mr MILLAR** (Gregory—LNP) (12.54 pm): It gives me pleasure to rise to speak on the Racing Integrity Bill 2015. We will be opposing the bill because of a lack of information on costings and a complete lack of consultation with the industry. Let me repeat that: a complete lack of consultation with the industry. I have been dealing with this issue involving the racing industry for the last 12 months. Country racing means a lot to regional Queensland. Not only is it a great form of a social opportunity for people from Western Queensland to come together to catch up with old mates, family and friends; it also provides an opportunity for jobs, because many people in regional Queensland and Western Queensland are jockeys, strappers and trainers. This industry provides additional income for them, which they need. They also love being involved in an industry such as country racing that brings together friends and family from far and wide across regional Queensland.

There has been a lot of confusion and certainly a lot of angst in country racing over the last 12 months in terms of its future and whether we will continue to see these race days which are so important—so important—to regional Queensland continue. One only has to look at Longreach. We had the 125-year anniversary of the Longreach Jockey Club last September—a massive day. That was not only a combination of being at a big day celebrating 125 years of the Longreach Jockey Club and the racing industry in Longreach but also an opportunity for people outside of Western Queensland such as Brisbane to come up and help us not only celebrate the day but put much needed income into that community. Well over 3,000, 4,000 or 5,000 people turned up to the Longreach racecourse that day. There was generous support—absolutely generous support—from Alliance Airlines, UBET and all of those people associated with racing from South-East Queensland who came to Longreach and played a critical role in putting much needed cash into that town. As most members in this House know, I continue to talk about drought and the need to have money in these towns, and that is what racing does. That is what racing does to communities such as Longreach all the way to the Bluff Amateurs. Of course, Bluff is a special place in my electorate just 20 kilometres east of Blackwater and they are also very proud of their racing there. Not only does that provide an opportunity for us to get together and have a beer and for those who want to have a punt; it is certainly an opportunity for us to catch up with many people across our region, and the racing industry plays a critical role in that.

The racing industry is important for Western Queensland, as I said before, with regard to jobs. It is critical because the passion of thoroughbred horseracing and the passion of racing is in our DNA in Western Queensland. I honestly think that we need to ensure that we have a racing industry that survives for a very long time. The one-day events and those events in Longreach and Emerald are very important. My concern is we have a 2½-year commitment at the moment, but we need a longer commitment because we have people who invest in these industries, invest in these horses and invest in the infrastructure. Most importantly, the people involved in racing in Western Queensland are volunteers. They are people off the land, they are people who own the newsagency, they are people who have lived in those towns for a very long time and this is their pastime and racing is of critical importance.

I also want to give recognition to everybody who gets involved in racing across Queensland. Plenty of trainers, bookmakers and strappers come up to me all of the time and say, 'What is our future?' They have had a very nervous time over the last 12 months in terms of knowing what is going to happen to the racing industry out there. Storkie, who is a good mate of mine, is an absolute champion for the Emerald racing industry in the Central Highlands. Whether he is behind the bar or taking the photographs on the finish line—

Mr Cripps: Holding it up.

Mr MILLAR: Yes, holding the bar up. We all hold the bar up out there. He has such passion for the racing industry. I call on the Labor government to support country racing, to support racing as a whole and to ensure that we have more opportunities than 2½ years—that we can plan out five years, 10 years—to ensure that we keep an industry which is important to the economic wellbeing of Western

Queensland not only by employing people such as strappers, jockeys, bookmakers and trainers but also to provide opportunities for us to fundraise for the Royal Flying Doctor and for the Western Queensland drought appeal. For the many netball, touch football and Rugby League clubs, that is what racing does out there and it is important that it continues to be that way.

My main concern at the moment is that we need a commitment of more than 2½ years. We need four years or we need 10 years, but we need to have that confidence out there so that people know that what they are doing is going to stay, because it is an expensive sport for people who are involved in this. When they invest in horses—when they invest in those thoroughbreds—it plays a critical role.


Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I ask you to adjourn the debate, I acknowledge in the public gallery Mr Dale Shuttleworth, the former member for Ferny Grove.

Debate, on motion of Mr Millar, adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 1.01 pm to 2.30 pm.

PRIVILEGE

Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Contempt of Parliament


 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, on 19 April the member for Cairns sought to table documents in the House which led to subsequent rulings by me on that day. The documents that the member for Cairns sought to table included letters to me making formal allegations of contempt regarding the member for South Brisbane and the member for Springwood. In my first ruling in relation to these matters on 19 April I advised that I will forward a copy of the correspondence in relation to the allegations about the conduct of the member for South Brisbane to the Ethics Committee for that committee to consider in relation to a matter already before that committee. I also advised that, in respect of the allegations regarding the member for Springwood, I will consider them in accordance with standing order 269 and report back to the House.

I have now considered the allegations made by the member for Cairns regarding the member for Springwood and I have decided that, as these allegations will require examination of questions of fact and as the allegations are so closely linked with the matter regarding the member for South Brisbane already before the Ethics Committee, the allegations should be referred to the Ethics Committee for their consideration.

On 20 April this year, the Deputy Premier and member for South Brisbane wrote to me regarding the comments made by the member for Cairns in the House on 19 April this year. In her letter the Deputy Premier has made an allegation that the documents sought to be tabled by the member for Cairns contain inaccuracies that could constitute a deliberate misleading of the House by the member for Cairns. Again, as that allegation will require examination of questions of fact and as the allegation is so closely linked with the matter already before the Ethics Committee, I have decided to also refer that matter to the Ethics Committee. In relation to both of these referrals, I emphasise that I have formed no view as to whether there has, in fact, been a breach of privilege or contempt, but rather that there are sufficient issues in play to warrant the further attention of the House via the committee.

In relation to the referral of the member for Cairns, I make it clear that this referral is not in respect of the breach of standing order 271, which was dealt with by the member's apology and my vacating of that referral.

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

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, on 22 February 2016 the Leader of the Opposition wrote to me alleging that the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services deliberately misled the House in his private member's statement when he made allegations about the Leader of the Opposition's chief of staff in the context of Ethics Report No. 162. I then wrote to the minister.

On 17 March 2016 the minister rose on a matter of privilege and made it clear that his statement on 22 February was his personal inference and not a factual conclusion reached by the Ethics Committee. The minister apologised to the committee, the Leader of the Opposition, his chief of staff and the member for Warrego for not clarifying that it was his inference and not a finding of the committee.


Given the minister's explanation and apology, I have decided that the matter does not warrant the further attention of the House via the Ethics Committee and I will not be referring the matter. I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 22 February 2016, from the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Lawrence Springborg MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an alleged misleading of the House by the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services, Hon. Cameron Dick [569].

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 24 February 2016, from the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services, Hon. Cameron Dick, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an allegation of misleading the House made by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Lawrence Springborg MP [570].

PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Martin, Mr R


 **Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (2.34 pm): On Good Friday, 25 March 2016, a good friend to all the Stevens family and my son Louis' best mate, Ryan Martin, gave his life to save a young girl in a horrific surf beach tragedy at Fingal Beach, just across the border from the Gold Coast in New South Wales. Ryan was only 30 years old and was a fit and competent swimmer who jumped into the water without hesitation when a little seven-year-old girl from Toowoomba was being dragged out in a strong rip, which would undoubtedly have led to her demise without Ryan's immediate intervention to keep her afloat until help arrived. Unfortunately, by the time help arrived to assist Ryan, he had succumbed to the devastating power of Mother Nature. Although efforts continued to try to revive Ryan, he died at the scene.

Ryan is the first hero I have known personally and I am in awe of his unselfish and brave determination to save that little girl without fear or second thoughts for his own safety. We shared a love of a punt, a Rugby tipping competition, the odd drink or two and his indefatigable smile would always light up the room no matter the result of our betting exhortations. Ryan was the quintessential Aussie good guy. As my wife and I enjoyed a jug of sangria with Ryan in a Barcelona cafe, we both could not help reflecting on what a lovely, fun-loving, easygoing Aussie Ryan Martin was. Besides the hundreds of people Ryan brought laughter, happiness and friendship to, his great gift on earth was to give his life to a seven-year-old girl who, I am sure, will go on to bring great credit to the life of Ryan.

Heroes are not born that way, heroes are not trained to be that way, nor will they ever know if they will get the chance to be that way, but we know that Ryan Martin died a hero. I will do everything in my capacity to ensure that Ryan Martin's incredible bravery is recognised, remembered and cherished for all time.

To Robin, Ryan's mum, and Josh, his big brother, my heartfelt condolences go out to them for the loss of their champion son and brother. Nothing will ever replace the loss of his presence in our lives. Ryan's life reminds me so much of a brilliant shooting star that shone so brightly for what seemed to be such a short time. As was said at his funeral service eulogy, Ryan Martin: forever young, forever a hero and forever in our hearts. Rest in peace, Ryan Martin.

Queensland Cricket


 **Mr RYAN** (Morayfield—ALP) (2.37 pm): We do not just like cricket; we love it. With over 230,000 Queenslanders playing cricket this year, we can see why. In fact, Queensland is leading the country in the growth in the game of cricket, with an overall increase of 60 per cent in the number of cricket players since 2010. In the Moreton cricket region, of which the Morayfield state electorate forms a part, there is a total of almost 20,000 people playing cricket—an extraordinary number. Certainly, cricket is a very popular sport in the Morayfield electorate.

It was a real pleasure to attend the recent trophy presentation of the Burpengary Brumbies cricket club last weekend. With the incredible success of the Women's Big Bash League, the number of females playing cricket in Queensland continues to increase. In Queensland, one in every four people playing cricket is female and with four Queenslanders picked recently for the Southern Stars team—Australia's Twenty20 team, which competed in the recent Twenty20 World Cup in India—the future is very bright for Queensland cricket.

I congratulate Queenslanders Holly Ferling, Jess Jonassen and Beth Mooney on an outstanding result for the Southern Stars, who just went down to the West Indies by one run in the World Cup final a few weeks ago. Unfortunately, the other Queenslanders picked for the Southern Stars, Grace Harris, had been ruled out with injury. We wish Grace a very speedy recovery. Whilst the Australian men's Twenty20 World Cup team did not quite make the finals this year, we are nonetheless very proud of their efforts and congratulate them on their performance.

With the 2016 Twenty20 World Cup in India now all done and dusted, the focus now turns to the next Twenty20 World Cup. The 2020 Twenty20 World Cup will be held in Australia and it is expected to be a massive event. The stats for the 2015 Cricket World Cup in Australia were mind blowing. It was watched by over 1.5 billion people worldwide and broadcast in 212 countries and over one million people attended games in Australia. It delivered a huge economic benefit to Australia, with more than \$1.1 billion of direct expenditure, over 8,000 jobs and almost 300,000 visitors from overseas or interstate. In 2020 Australia has the opportunity to do it again in the fastest growing, most exciting format of the game. The 2020 Twenty20 World Cup in Australia will be huge and there is a great opportunity for Queensland, Brisbane and our famous cricket ground, the Gabba, to benefit from the 2020 Twenty20 World Cup as a host city.

Cyberbullying


 **Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (2.40 pm): I rise to address the related issues of cyberbullying and internet trolls. There is no doubt that the modern era of differing modalities of technological communication has had some distinct advantages for all of us, however, there is also a darker, more sinister side to such communication modalities, including those of the internet and social media platforms. The notion of ordinary citizens being able to freely communicate with each other, elected representatives, media organisations and others in theory should enhance the idealistic notion of full participatory democracy. However, what has emerged is a truncated version of liberal democratic process due to a failure of basic manners, poor ethical conduct by some, personality and personal-attack politics, combined with a rudimentary knowledge by some of civics and citizenship.

On Facebook and Twitter, and within comment sections on media sites to name but a few, often what can be found are ill-informed, offensive, derogatory, threatening, racist or sexist comments which add very little to informed public debate. Often grammar mistakes and incorrect spelling are a feature of such comments. In a *Courier-Mail* article on Friday, 2 January 2015, Paul Williams identified a number of important issues. Whilst I do not intend to quote exactly what he said, he did identify that online abuse generally falls into a number of categories: firstly, attacking the writer or contributor, not the content but the personal characteristics, intelligence or appearance of the author of an article, post or blog while casting aspersions as to reasons or motivations as to the content being written by the writer or contributor in the first place; then there is the second category where there is an attack on fellow readers, attacking the motivation of readers or the perceived bias of readers with the aim of closing down debate; and a third category involves comments targeting the veracity of a journalist's neutral sources, including disputing peer reviewed research.

The intolerance of differing opinions is the antithesis of free speech in a western democracy. Unfortunately, such conduct is being seen also within our parliaments around Australia. Such intolerance was seen most recently in the Queensland parliament with speeches by some Labor members during the debate on the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Amendment Bill 2015, such content clearly inspired by health unions.

We are seeing children as young as 10 establishing fake social media profiles in order to bully fellow students and/or friendship groups. As parliamentarians we have a responsibility to show leadership, set a standard and assist teachers, parents and our youth to not contribute to or become victims of cyberbullying, ill-informed debate and/or unethical conduct on the internet or via social media forums such as Facebook, Twitter and Instagram. Through educating our young people, together with parents and teachers, hopefully we can address some of these important social issues.

Jobs


 **Mrs GILBERT** (Mackay—ALP) (2.43 pm): Thousands of new jobs in regional Queensland have come a major step closer with the Palaszczuk government's approval of the mining leases for the \$21.7 billion Carmichael mine and rail projects in the Galilee Basin. The recent approvals of three individual mining leases mark a major step towards this project after extensive government and community scrutiny. The approval of Adani's Carmichael mine project comes after previous setbacks

as a result of the bungling of the federal environment minister Greg Hunt. Minister Hunt's haste in granting environmental approvals without giving due consideration to vulnerable animal species resulted in legal challenges that put the project into considerable delay. The Palaszczuk government's responsible and thorough approach to statutory assessments and decision-making processes has been robust and comprehensive to minimise any risk of further legal challenges. Adani's approval process has included extensive and detailed environmental impact studies of more than 32,500 pages for its mine, rail and port projects. The Palaszczuk government is committed to protecting the Great Barrier Reef and its actions to ensure no dredge spoil will be dumped in the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area.

When Labor came to government one of its first tasks was to restore balance to the Adani ports project and ensure the environment was protected. Labor promised at the last state election there would be no dredging for Adani's coal terminal at Abbot Point until it had demonstrated that it had necessary finance in place for the full-time mine, rail and port project. I know the people of my electorate in Mackay welcome the latest progress for the potential jobs and economic development it brings closer for our community. At the same time, stringent conditions will continue to protect the environment, landholders and traditional owners' interests and our iconic Great Barrier Reef. Adani has estimated the mine, rail and port project will generate more than 5,000 jobs at the peak of construction and more than 4,500 jobs at the peak of operation. Local employment and economic opportunities will remain a key priority for Adani and its subcontractors.

I am immensely proud of the Palaszczuk government's efforts to progress Adani's Carmichael mine project while facing enormous pressure from stakeholder and interest groups all lobbying for various interests to be considered while all wanting the same outcome: jobs. When the Premier says, as she has, that nothing will stand in her way when it comes to creating jobs in Queensland, she is not making a garden variety promise, but a promise one can take to the bank. Leadership—that is how you do it!

Queensland Nickel

 **Mr HARPER** (Thuringowa—ALP) (2.46 pm): I rise today to update the House on the situation in Townsville following the administrator's report into QNI to recommend liquidation of the company. Tomorrow, 22 April, will see the second creditors meeting where no doubt discussions will be had and a vote taken on whether to liquidate the company. We know at the very core of this are local Townsville families that are doing it extremely tough. Recently there was a QNI community forum hosted by radio personality Alan Jones. On that point, it took local state members, community workers and a fellow of Alan Jones's stature to put the problem of the fair entitlements guarantee in the national spotlight—something our Premier had written to the Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull requesting be activated in February. I am glad that has finally happened. We heard directly from families at that forum whose banks were foreclosing on their homes. I hear families are now selling their belongings in a desperate attempt to keep their piece of Australia. I know of schools in Thuringowa where parents in affected families have come in asking for assistance to keep their children in those schools. Of course, those schools must carry the weight of the assistance by waiving school fees and levies for textbook hire and other costs. These families have endured enough. Last week I was at the Bohle industrial area visiting the great volunteers from NQ Food Relief led by a champion bloke, Mr Brad Webb. They are putting out thousands of food packages weekly to meet the increase in demand because of this situation.

Now is the time for the federal government to get on board with the Queensland government's plans to create major infrastructure projects like the Townsville stadium. We need to see something tangible and we need to work collaboratively on something that we know will create over a thousand jobs and generate momentum to activate an area and, importantly, encourage private investment which will drive further jobs not only in construction but also in the retail and hospitality supply sectors. Townsville and Thuringowa families cannot rely on hope any more. It is not a strategy. They have endured enough. We need something tangible.

North Queenslanders have been down before when challenged by natural disasters. We are a community that comes together to overcome adversity, but we still need a hand up from all levels of government to recover. A sum of \$5 billion in federal funding was available through the northern Australia infrastructure plan, but in Townsville we have seen nothing tangible. The stalling of that program by the federal government further delays and slows down things in Townsville. I call on the federal government to come good, to stump up and to help deliver for North Queensland. In stark contrast, our government is doing everything it can, such as through the Accelerated Works Program, to create jobs.

Cycling Laws



Mr EMERSON (Indooroopilly—LNP) (2.49 pm): The news that the LNP's lifesaving minimum passing distance laws for cyclists will be retained by the state government is a welcome decision. These groundbreaking laws, which were the first in Australia, have been emulated in other states around the country and have been a success for Queensland cyclists. In 2013, before we introduced the laws, there were 13 cyclist fatalities. It was clear that something had to be done to stop such tragic deaths, because the reality is that one death on our roads is one too many.

As transport minister, I was incredibly proud that we were able to lead Australia in introducing laws that would save cyclists' lives. It is very encouraging and a testament to the new goodwill fostered between cyclists and motorists that in the two years since the introduction of the laws we have seen a drop in the number of cycling fatalities. In 2014 there were nine cycling fatalities and in 2015, despite the overall road toll going up, there was another drop in the number of cycling deaths to four. New South Wales, South Australia, Tasmania and the ACT have all adopted our laws. That is good news for cyclists.

It was important that the laws were supported by an effective and informative advertising campaign directed at both motorists and cyclists. Six cycling fatalities so far this year is a horrific start to 2016. I encourage the government to commit to ensuring that we have an adequate cycling road safety campaign in place. These laws have support from cycling groups and motoring groups such as the RACQ, which all agree that they are playing a critical role in driving a cultural change in attitude towards cyclists on our roads, but we cannot be complacent.

There will always be motorists and cyclists on our roads who do the wrong thing. Our roads need to be shared, not treated as some sort of battleground. It is clear that the LNP laws, which have been followed in other parts of Australia—laws that led the way across the other states—have made a difference and have made our roads safer. I am proud that I was the minister who introduced them. I am proud that in 2014 the LNP government and its road safety action plan saw the lowest road toll in Queensland history under our policies. The cycling laws were an important part of those LNP policies.

Southern Oil Refining



Mr BUTCHER (Gladstone—ALP) (2.52 pm): I rise to speak about a fantastic win for the state of Queensland and my electorate of Gladstone. A few weeks ago in Yarwun, I joined the Premier, Minister Lynham and Minister Bailey at Southern Oil Refining's refinery in Yarwun to announce that a \$16 million advanced biofuels pilot plant will be built in my electorate. If successful, the pilot plant will be expanded to a large commercial-scale refinery, costing \$150 million and producing over 200 million litres of advanced biofuel annually, suitable for military, marine and aviation use. The plant will be Australia's first commercial-scale advanced biofuels production facility.

A fully-fledged biofuels industry has the potential to play a key role in our economic future and this pilot plant is a giant step towards reaching that goal. The pilot plant is essentially the launch site for a Queensland biofuels industry. If we can develop the plant into a large-scale refinery, it will mean jobs in Gladstone and could also see new investment and job creation opportunities around Queensland. The Palaszczuk government has not only secured this investment but also taken it out of the hands of New South Wales, which makes this announcement even sweeter.


The Palaszczuk government is committed to supporting the industry of the future. As a testament to this, we will deliver the biofuels road map and tenure plan by midyear 2016. Southern Oils refinery manager, Tim Rose, said that making the decision to put this important piece of technology at the Wagga Wagga plant in New South Wales or the new refinery in Gladstone was made a lot easier with the announcement of the Palaszczuk government's road map. He stated that the road map 'is the only forward-thinking policy in Australia for this critical industry'. The pilot plant is expected to be operational by later this year and, within the next three years, aims to have produced one million litres of fuel for use in field trials by the US Navy as part of its Great Green Fleet initiative and also by the Australian Navy.

Southern Oil Refining currently operates a waste lube oil refining plant in the Gladstone State Development Area, as a joint venture with J.J. Richards & Sons. The \$70 million plant is the only waste lube oil refining facility in Queensland and has the potential to process all of the state's 100 million litres of waste lube oil produced annually. The advanced biofuels pilot plant will be co-located within the Yarwun refining facility. The plant will use biomass materials such as sugar cane as feedstock for the production of biocrude oil, which will be then distilled into saleable kerosene and diesel products.

Queensland is positioning itself to be the biofuels industry leader. The foresight of the previous Labor government brought cutting-edge technology and industry into Gladstone with the LNG project and this is another example of the forward thinking that is at the heart of our Labor government in Queensland.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Crawford): Order! Before I move on, I acknowledge in the gallery Father Twigg and student leaders from Iona College, Lindum, in the electorate of Lytton.

Miller, Mr B

 **Ms BATES** (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (2.55 pm): Last month I rose in the House to tell of the plight of Barry Miller, a former soldier, security guard and first responder with St John Ambulance who lives in my electorate and suffers from post-traumatic stress disorder, acute anxiety and acute depression. I spoke of how, after two suicide attempts, Barry sought help from Robina Hospital, but tragically he was turned away; he was told to go home. At the time, I told the minister that if Barry presented to the hospital again for suicidal tendencies I would do everything I could to have him admitted.

On 3 April, I awoke to a chilling email, the likes of which no-one in this place should ever have to receive. It read—

I hope that this email finds you all well, healthy and happy.

Unfortunately, I have some bad news for you today.

I killed myself last night.

Everything that has occurred or happened in my life since my first suicide attempt on 24 August up until today, have all contributed to increase my anxiety, deepen my depression and release the PTSD head demons to send me over the edge.

The Mental Health Unit at Robina is not an option as they still haven't resolved my complaints so I have no faith in them.

I am sorry,


Barry.

Without hesitation, I called 000 and told the dispatch controller what had been sent to me, and requested police and ambulance response to Barry's home. Thankfully, the police and ambulance service were able to track down Barry before it was too late. Anything could have happened by the time I received the email, but thankfully emergency services did get to him in time. It was then that I knew that I needed to find a way to get Barry the help that he needed so that this would never happen again.

I place on record my sincere thanks to the Gold Coast Hospital and Health Service and, in particular, its chief executive, Ron Calvert, and board chairman, Ian Langdon, for urgently admitting Barry so that he could finally get the help that he needs. For the benefit of the House, I table a copy of the minister's response to me, although not for a second did I ever think that I would have to take his advice on this matter. Never did I think that in my time in this place I would have to call 000 to save the life of a constituent. I hope Barry will now find the help that he so desperately needs.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 4 March 2016, from the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services, Hon. Cameron Dick, to the member for Mudgeeraba, Ms Ros Bates MP, regarding Mr Barry Miller [\[571\]](#).

South Sea Islanders, Apology

 **Mr WILLIAMS** (Pumicestone—ALP) (2.58 pm): Today I rise to make a request of our premier, Anastacia Palaszczuk, my government colleagues and all other honourable members of this House. I ask that this House unreservedly apologises to the 62,000 South Sea islands people, formally known as Kanaks. Men, women and children were kidnapped by blackbirders who brought them to our shores, where they entered a life like slavery to build a young Queensland. For over 100 years those people have cried out and it is time that we said sorry. We have given them recognition, but we need to say openly that we are sorry that their lives were stolen away in slave-like conditions.


From 1860 onwards my ancestors started to arrive in the Mackay region. They told of days when chained islanders would be run through the streets of Mackay. These islanders worked on sugarcane farms and on cotton farms. In place of wages they were permitted food, lodging and not much else. Some rebelled and were shot dead for their trouble.

Around Federation blackbirding, as it was called, was outlawed in Queensland, but it did not stop. Blackbirding continued until about 1914—just before World War I. After this practice ended many islanders were purportedly returned to their own island, but in many cases this never happened. They were simply loaded aboard ships, taken a few hundred kilometres up the Queensland coast and dropped back on our shores. They never went home.

In my youth growing up in Mackay I would often visit the coastal sentimental area called Slade Point. I have vivid memories of a shanty town of rusty corrugated iron shacks with hurricane lanterns. This is where these islanders spent their days. I went to school with many of the descendants of these South Sea islanders who were stolen away from their homeland. My heart has always remained heavy for their plight. This causes me to speak for them this day in this House—the opportunity afforded me by God.

All of Queensland was built on the back of the blood, sweat and tears of these islanders. I say that no-one deserves the atrocity endured by these people. Nothing we can ever do will replace the loss suffered by them. As the state of Queensland we need to say that we are sorry.

Rural Debt and Drought Taskforce; Hann Highway

 **Mr KATTER** (Mount Isa—KAP) (3.01 pm): Recently the Rural Debt and Drought Taskforce completed a tour of Queensland. I am very grateful to the member for Ipswich West and the member for Nanango for touring with me. Some of it was eye-opening for me. Other members of the House attended. The main point to make is that there are still some deeply rooted structural problems in many of these rural communities. I would describe this as a rural crisis which was brought on acutely by the drought. There are some deeply embedded problems that need fixing.

Part of the discussions centred around the fact that infrastructure projects play a role in this. That is quite an obvious response. I want to park the discussion about the agricultural industry for now and talk about some projects. We are looking for value-for-money projects that have widespread benefits. We all have our own projects and our own problems.

One of the greatest opportunities in terms of infrastructure that runs through my electorate is the Hann Highway. We are at the point where we need a commitment. Everyone is talking about it. Everyone agrees it is a terrific idea. The US Army built the highway during the Second World War. They recognised that strategically Queensland needed an alternate route that does not run down the coast in flood-prone areas. It needs to be west enough so that it is not subject to the influence of the high rainfall rivers. The US Army built the Hann Highway at that point.

It has never been sealed since. The good news is that this is not just a local road that is used for cattle; this is a road that Blenners Transport Mackay and the Australian banana industry use. It is churning out hundreds of millions of dollars of bananas each year. Most of their bananas are sold in Sydney and Melbourne. They can get them there eight hours earlier via the inland route. They can take triple road trains up the middle instead of taking B-doubles along the coast where there is more traffic load. That would mean fewer trucks on the Bruce Highway and more trucks that get down south eight hours earlier. Most of the benefits are felt in the Tablelands and Cairns. Even though the road goes through my electorate, the benefits are widespread. That is why Advance Cairns and the like put this as one of its priority projects.

It must be funded. The games between the federal and state governments about who is going to go first have to stop. Everyone talks about funding this highway. It absolutely needs that funding to gain these advantages. The problem in my electorate is that we have Georgetown and Hughenden—two towns on their knees—that desperately need work. Their problems are very serious. They are losing critical numbers and teachers at their schools. That precipitates into more families leaving town. Businesses are closing down. In these small towns there are no alternate industries at the moment. There is an opportunity ahead. There is a future ahead. They need these industry-enabling projects that will pay themselves off in the long run. They will benefit all of Queensland. They need to be done.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order! The time for private members' statements has expired.

ELECTORAL (IMPROVING REPRESENTATION) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 19 April (see p. 1011).

Second Reading

 **Mr WALKER** (Mansfield—LNP) (3.04 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

As I mentioned on Tuesday during the introduction of this bill, this is not a new debate for this parliament, but the issue of representation for all of Queensland and access to that representation is an important issue that we on this side of House believe deserves due consideration. At the outset, I put on the record that the response from the Premier and other members of this government to this important public policy issue has been disappointing.

The glib responses and the media spin to simplify this issue to a debate about self-interest and jobs for politicians versus jobs for Queenslanders makes a mockery of our system of representative parliamentary democracy. There is a substantive issue here about the representative nature of this parliament and its ability to properly represent the people of Queensland, wherever they live. That is a much more serious issue than can be disposed of by glib one-liners.

At the same time, I want to acknowledge some of the more considered comments in this debate, particularly from the members for Mount Isa, Dalrymple and Cairns. I quote a statement released by the member for Cairns yesterday afternoon which illustrates what this debate is all about. He said—

Queensland is a diverse state, with a densely populated south east corner, reaching out to the rural and remote regions in the far north where the population is much more dispersed. Our state has a broad range of issues, and this tyranny of distance can sometimes make the policy making process complex.

Regionally, elected members have further to travel to meet face to face with constituents, and constituents have to compete to have time one on one with their elected member. Communication networks are getting better, but we are still challenged by connectivity and reliability issues.

The timing is perfect with the current redistribution process taking place. There is not a moment to lose to ensure people get the representative they want sitting in Parliament representing their needs. With no upper house, every voice matters.

In addition to one-liners about jobs for politicians, the word 'gerrymander' has been thrown around. The Leader of the House used it in the debate the other day. I point out that there is nothing, of course, in this bill which affects in any way the weighting of one seat against another. This bill is quite simply about increasing the number of seats. It does not change the weighting. Any attempt to refer to a gerrymander in the course of this debate is misguided, misplaced and an attempt to deceive those who are listening.

Despite the exaggerated hyperbole by the Attorney-General and other members of the government, the bill does not impact upon the upcoming 2016 redistribution, which has not even commenced—in fact, the commissioners have not even been appointed—other than to add four additional seats to the process of ensuring that all Queenslanders have better access to representation in this parliament. The transitional provisions in this bill ensure that the commencement of an enlarged parliament does not commence until after the next election when, if passed, the people of Queensland will be electing 93 members to the House rather than 89.


The Electoral and Administrative Review Commission, EARC, which was born out of the Fitzgerald inquiry, recommended that the number of electoral districts in Queensland be reviewed every seven years by an independent body. That has not occurred since the recommendation was made in 1991. I point out that this side of the House gave the opportunity to the House to have an independent body review the numbers in a bill introduced last year. That was rejected by the House.

The seven-year review, which was recommended 30 years ago, has not yet been effected. Since that time, the population of Queensland has almost doubled, and the proportion of those living outside the south-east corner of the state has diminished. That should be seen in the context of Queensland being the most decentralised state in Australia just behind New South Wales, having the second highest ratio of representative to resident population. Add the fact that electorates such as Mount Isa are the size of France and the technology in many parts of rural and regional Queensland is either inadequate or non-existent, then the issue of how we deal with representation across the state of Queensland needs to be dealt with now before the redistribution comes into effect and we lose the chance to deal with this issue for another seven years.

Finally, I want to foreshadow an amendment to the bill that I will be moving in consideration in detail. The bill installs a new process for bipartisan appointment arrangements for commissioners to the Redistribution Commission. The amendment that I will move will stipulate that if agreement for the appointments cannot be reached between the party leaders within 14 days the process will be finalised by a resolution of the Legislative Assembly. In other words, if the leaders of all of the nominated parties in this parliament cannot agree then it will come back to this chamber for resolution. This will ensure that the commencement of the redistribution process cannot be frustrated by a political deadlock during the consultation stage. It was interesting to hear the argument put that this bill was in fact a strategy to ensure that a redistribution did not occur. It is rather strange that, when we are pressing for one to occur

under new rules, we would want to use those same provisions to frustrate. In order to put that matter beyond doubt, I will move that amendment in consideration in detail to ensure that there is no possibility of that occurring. There are two amendments to clause 8 to bring this change into effect. I thank honourable members who have mentioned this issue to me since the bill was introduced on Tuesday.

I hope that this debate is a serious one which recognises the importance of this difficult public policy issue, one which will give the House a chance to do what I believe Queenslanders want—and that is to ensure that there is sufficient representation in this House for Queenslanders right across the state, wherever they might live, to have adequate representation, to be able to see their member face to face if they so desire and to ensure that their issues and interests are properly aired within this parliament. EARC recommended 30 years ago that we look at these numbers every seven years. We have not done that. We should do it now and we are able to do it in time to ensure that the upcoming redistribution contains this reform and that Queenslanders have adequate and sufficient representation in this House. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (3.11 pm): I rise to speak against the bill before the House. As the member for Mansfield said, it is a serious debate and it is something that we need to give serious consideration to—but we have twice before. This is the third time that this matter has been before this House. The question does have to be asked where the priorities are of the opposition that they are coming back to debate this issue for a third time. This is their top priority. We are not here for the third time having a debate on health funding or infrastructure or education or training or jobs. We are not back here for the third time having a debate on those important issues. What are we here for the third time for? To debate whether we should have four extra members in this parliament. That is a serious issue, but it is such a serious issue that it should not be brought in here and rammed through in the same week when we have already had the debate twice before.

We heard the shadow Attorney-General say, 'This is a simple change. It is for extra seats. It is not that complicated.' It is complicated. It is significant. It has been decades since we have increased the number of seats in this chamber. To increase the number of members in Queensland is significant. It comes at a significant cost. The number four might seem really small but it comes at a significant cost to the people of Queensland—four new members, the salaries that attach to those members, the new offices that would be established for those members, the staff that would work in those offices, the servicing of those members, the allowance those members would be entitled to. That is what would come with those four. It comes at a significant cost.

The question has to be asked: is now really the time, when we are seeing job losses across this state, when we are seeing people struggling in the resources sector and other sectors, that we should be saying that is where the money should be spent—on more politicians? I am working hard for the \$240 million Skilling Queenslanders for Work program to help 32,000 people across this state get jobs. Yet we are standing here debating four new politicians and the significant cost of that. That money could go towards training in my portfolios and helping people who are unemployed and other people who need to be skilled and re-skilled.

These are important issues. The member for Mansfield did not go into any detail about anything in the bill, to be honest, but specifically on the proposed changes to the Redistribution Commission and the intention if this bill is supported by a majority in this parliament today. That would mean significant changes—again, that have not occurred for many years—to the appointments to the Redistribution Commission and how those appointments are made. Currently under the act, as the Attorney-General, I am to consult with the Leader of the Opposition. I am also consulting with the leader of the Katter party and I am also consulting with the chair of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee. Interestingly enough, I wrote to all of those people on Tuesday morning with my nominees for the new Redistribution Commission so that we can get the process underway. This process has already been delayed. It has been delayed as a consequence of the local government election and the referendum, so we need to get this moving right now—to have these appointments made and get the redistribution happening so submissions can be open, so a draft report can be released later in the year and a final report released well before the next election.

What these changes do is guarantee a delay in that happening, because it means that the nominees I have put forward already I will need to step back from. I will need to find additional nominees. I will need to write to all of the parties again. I have to give them at least 14 days to respond. I am speaking to the member's amendments; I appreciate that. It requires me to write to the parties and wait for their response, and I know that the proposed amendments include a mechanism to come back to the parliament. These are significant delays in the process—delays that I believe we cannot afford. If

these amendments go through, what we will see is that the redistribution in this term of parliament is at great risk of not happening, which means we go to the next election on the current boundaries that are not proportional. When we look at seats like Murrumbidgee that are well over their quota—

Mr Whiting: Sixty-five thousand.

Mrs D'ATH: Sixty-five thousand constituents. We will be going to the next election without the redistribution finishing, which means that the vote of the people in Murrumbidgee does not count as much as the vote of the people elsewhere in this state. That redistribution needs to occur and we need that parity and equity happening. That is what the redistribution is supposed to do and it needs to happen. This will seriously put that at risk. I cannot even start this process until the bill is assented to. Then I write to the parties and then we go through the rest of the process. I would like to think I would get quick support, but there is no guarantee. We had that conversation last night in relation to the CCC. We have had that issue with the PCCC. I cannot guarantee that we will get a quick resolution as to who those individual appointments should be.


We need to give serious consideration to these clauses and the changes. I do not believe that a case has been properly made out to change the way that the Redistribution Commission is currently appointed. I do not believe even when the bill was last considered that there was sufficient evidence to say that there was a problem with the way the system currently works. For a party that claims they are all about removing red tape, this creates a whole lot of process for a system that currently there is no evidence was having a problem to begin with as far as the appointments and determinations of who goes on to the Redistribution Commission are concerned.

We certainly oppose the changes to the Redistribution Commission. We have consistently said we do not believe that this parliament should increase its numbers at this point in time. This is not the time to arbitrarily say, 'We need an extra four seats. That is what we are going to do.' By tonight it is highly possible that that is exactly what this parliament will do—it will choose to have four extra politicians, and that comes at a cost to the community. We will stand by our position. We do not support the amendments to increase the number of electoral districts to 93. We make that very clear and our position remains unchanged on that.

We ask members of the parliament to think long and hard about these changes and to oppose both of the key elements in this bill: the increase of electoral districts from 89 to 93 and the changes to the Redistribution Commission. Do it on the basis of the arguments that have been put forward that it would significantly delay and disadvantage voters and constituents across the state to progress that.

I will continue to argue my point that I get that it is a challenge whether you are in a city, metropolitan or regional electorate—we all have our challenges—to try to engage with all of our constituents. It is a challenge, but I do not necessarily accept that 89 members cannot represent all of the voters in this state. I have been a federal member for six years and have represented over 90,000 voters. I do not hear the LNP at a federal level saying they are going to reduce the size of the federal seats. It can be done. We do it. That is our job. That is what we are voted to do. We should just get on with our job. I ask members of this chamber to think seriously about this bill and to oppose it. This is not the right time. This is not where we should be spending our money. The case has not been made by the opposition to justify this bill.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Before calling the Minister for Transport and Commonwealth Games, I inform members that there will be a photographer taking photos from the normal positions during this debate.

 **Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (Minister for Transport and the Commonwealth Games) (3.21 pm): It is with some surprise and pain that I rise to speak in this debate on the Electoral (Improving Representation) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I spoke about some matters earlier in the week as to why I am disappointed that the member for Mansfield got the support of the House to ignore the practice of not having to reconsider and not voting again on matters that have been dealt with by a parliament in the same term of parliament. However, I respect—and I will be reminded by people of this as we go along—that this House is its own master. I understand that this House is its own master and I respect that utterly. I trust everyone else will respect that. That is why it is important we debate this matter today in a sensible and respectful way. We should do so in a way that accepts that this House is its own master, but I ask this House to reject this bill. I ask the House to reject this bill because it is wrongly motivated and it is the wrong time. These are the same arguments that those of us on this side of the House made when the Electoral (Redistribution Commission) and Another Act Amendment Bill was debated in October. The reasons we put then are the same reasons we put now. I feel like we are

invoking in the chamber the great American baseball manager Yogi Berra: it is *deja vu* all over again. We are getting that experience here today having had this experience in October last year, but the arguments on this side of the House remain the same.

Now is not the time when so many people right across the length and breadth of this state are concerned about their job security and are looking for employment and jobs. The time of this House should be devoted to how we can support our economy to grow jobs and grow opportunities for Queenslanders right across the length and breadth of Queensland. We should not be spending our time creating jobs for more politicians. We should not be creating four more jobs in this chamber; rather, we should be striving to create the thousands of jobs that we want to see right across the length and breadth of this state.

I am very proud to say that this government during the time we have had debates on this topic a number of times in this chamber has been focused on jobs for Queenslanders. That is why we see our job creation record starkly strong in comparison to the record of those opposite when in government, but that is not the issue we are debating today. We are forced to debate this matter because the House is the master of its own activities and its own decisions. We respect that, but I ask the House to reject this proposal to increase the size of the Queensland parliament at this time.

I do so because we want to make sure that we are focused on the things that are important to us. We want to focus on jobs for Queenslanders, not jobs for politicians. Earlier in the week I saw David Crisafulli, the former local government minister and former member for Mundingburra, wandering around George Street. He obviously had a sniff of something going on; that there were jobs coming up in the chamber. He is lining himself up for those opportunities. We have to be focused as a House on making sure that we support jobs for Queenslanders. I am not maligning Mr Crisafulli. I encourage his ambition—

Mr Dick: And his participation in democracy.


Mr HINCHLIFFE: That is right, but I think he can amply achieve that ambition with 89 seats in the Queensland parliament. He does not need to have his mates and others secure an extra four slots to have that opportunity. I want the House to be its own master and to reject this proposal. When we look at the detail, all it will do is hamper the process of democracy. We heard from the Attorney-General that there is no explanation or justification for the expansion of the Redistribution Commission. There is no evidence that this commission of three, which has been in place since 1991 in this state, has been some sort of failure or manifest problem. There is no challenge in that regard.

In terms of the appointment process, there have been no suggestions, as far as I can see, that there has been a manifest failure in the way those electoral commission appointments have been made to provide the independent, rigorous process that they do. I can assure the House, having been through the process of a redistribution while a member of this House, that people on the government side are not always happy with how it works, and that is how it should be. It should be fair and independent, and it has been over the past 20 or so years. I do not accept the view that there is a manifest need to change the nature or make-up of the commission.

As a consequence of what is proposed, the Attorney-General will need to start the process again if this bill with those elements are successful. This House needs to be the master of how many members we have in this House and the master of the process which fairly and appropriately conducts the redistribution. That is why we should oppose this bill before the House—not just because we are doing it all again but also because it remains the wrong time and the wrong action.

We on this side of the House do not support more jobs for politicians. We want to focus the time of this House and our government on supporting Queenslanders to get more jobs for them and their families. That is why we should oppose this bill. In particular, we should oppose the way in which it has been brought back to this chamber. I ultimately accept that the House is its own master and that those people who secure the numbers secure the result. I completely accept that. I look forward to everyone accepting those decisions as the day goes on.

I encourage members in the House to oppose the Electoral (Improving Representation) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill because the detail is wrong and the detail is flawed. The detail will cause a delay and challenge to the redistribution process, which may result in the state going to the next election with the boundaries as they currently are because the process has not been finalised. That would, in effect, create a malapportionment and a distortion of the numbers at the next election. I encourage members to vote against the bill because of that detail. I fundamentally call upon all members of the House to oppose this bill because now is not the time for more jobs for politicians. Now is the time to be focused on more jobs for Queenslanders and their families right across the length and breadth of this state—not an extra four politicians.


 **Mr PYNE** (Cairns—IND) (3.31 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Electoral (Improving Representation) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. We should always embrace opportunities for reform. In terms of parliamentary structure, many people have called for the reintroduction of an upper house in Queensland. I do not support that call; I never have. My personal preference is for a system of mixed member proportional representation. For example, one day the Queensland parliament could include 100 MPs, with 50 elected by direct election and 50 by proportional or party vote. New Zealand has this sort of system and I believe it works well. Today, however, my choice and my chance to make a difference is by voting on this bill introduced by the member for Mansfield. I believe this bill is a step forward for Queensland. This is about ensuring improved access, representation and restoring democracy to Queensland people.

I want to correct one ignorant and completely incorrect allegation made that this is a gerrymander. First of all, I did not even know that the member for Everton had a brother called Gerry. Seriously though, based on recommendations to the Fitzgerald inquiry and then subsequently to the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission, EARC, there was a weighting applied to electoral districts over 100,000 square kilometres in area. This bill does not change that weighting and, therefore, any allegation of gerrymander is complete rubbish.

Queensland is a diverse state, with a densely populated south-east corner, reaching out to the rural and remote regions of Far North Queensland where the population is much more dispersed. Our state has a broad range of issues, and this tyranny of distance can sometimes make the process of policymaking quite complex. Regionally elected members have further to travel to meet face to face with their constituents, and constituents have to compete to have time one on one with their elected member. Communication networks are getting better but we are still challenged by connectivity and reliability issues.

This legislation seeks to improve representation by increasing the number of seats in the Queensland parliament. This is the fiscally better option, in the opinion of the Clerk of the Parliament, rather than adding staff or resources to already overstretched members' offices—especially when considering that the people who voted will still only have one person to talk to and to listen to their voices. This is also a fairer option, with the current bill not affecting the weighting as recommended by the Fitzgerald reforms. This is great news for the regions.

The timing is perfect with the current redistribution process taking place. There is not a moment to lose to ensure that people get the representative they want sitting in parliament representing their needs. With no upper house, every voice matters. We have had 89 seats since 1986 and things have significantly changed since then. The numbers alone tell the tale—each member represents over 33,000 voters. The task is immense and even more overwhelming when considering that some of the biggest electoral footprints exceed 570,000 square kilometres. This review is well overdue. I am supporting this bill as it would improve representation in our regions. I always support reforms that increase access, representation and democracy for the whole of Queensland.

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (3.35 pm): I rise this afternoon to oppose the Electoral (Improving Representation) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill because I do not believe expanding the parliament at this time is the appropriate way to improve representation. I join with my Labor parliamentary colleagues and my cabinet colleagues—the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills and the Minister for Transport and the Commonwealth Games—in the comments and contributions they made to the debate this afternoon.

I have read the bill and the explanatory notes, and I think it is fair to say that the explanatory notes could not be described as being a very extensive document. It is quite short in compass, and I do not believe it appropriately canvasses in the detail this parliament requires the arguments to support an expansion of the parliament at this time.

One issue I want to address at the outset is this argument about geography and geographic size. This is an argument that is constantly put in this parliament—that we need to adjust our democratic system on the basis of the geography that people represent and not the people whom the members of this House represent and the needs of those people whom we are required to advocate for, argue for and represent in this place.

The argument that is constantly put in relation to the seat of Mount Isa is that it requires there to be a change to the electoral system in Queensland. The Mount Isa electorate is very large at some 570,000 square kilometres, but there is a tolerance in our current electoral system that allows the member for Mount Isa to represent a smaller number of people than other members of the House. In

fact, an analysis of the last election shows that 50 per cent of votes cast in the electorate of Mount Isa were cast in the city of Mount Isa. That means that 50 per cent of votes were cast in one city—a city of some 22,000 people. It is not a very large city compared to other regional cities in Queensland, but 50 per cent of votes were cast in one place. I accept that there are smaller communities throughout the electorate of Mount Isa. Hughenden comprises another 3½ per cent of the electorate. I do not accept the argument set out in the explanatory notes that—

Contemporary problems facing those living in these particular areas—

that is, electorates with weighting so they have smaller numbers of constituents than the rest of us—

are as challenging as those that applied 25 years ago. ...

I do not believe that. I do not believe with the explosion in technology over the last 25 years that that is the case and that those problems cannot be overcome by additional facilities and technology. It is the number of people we represent which is the cornerstone of our democracy—one vote, one value. That is a value that has been held very importantly by the Australian Labor Party for many years. It is the needs of our communities. I can tell members of this House that an electorate like Woodridge which I represent has many needs. It is one of the most multicultural communities in Queensland. There are 214 nationalities and ethnicities in the city of Logan, and on many days most of them have a presence in the Woodridge electorate. It is a community with great needs, with many people living on the margins and many people living difficult lives.

It is the needs of those people that have to be properly expressed through resources provided to members of parliament. As I have said in the parliament before, we have had days when 18 people have been lining up out the door of the electorate office simply seeking the signature of a JP. I do not believe geographic demands cannot be overcome through appropriate resourcing. I believe it is an argument for more resources. I do not begrudge any member of this parliament who represents large electorates—I do not begrudge any of them—seeking greater resources. That is something that I would personally support. I do not think the argument has been made there.

I certainly do not think the argument has been made that there needs to be a change to the electoral Redistribution Commission. There is no satisfactory explanation as to why that system needs to be changed. I believe the member for Mansfield has conceded there is a flaw in the proposal. He acknowledges that, by requiring the consent of all leaders, the establishment of that new commission will become a victim of politics. I believe that if a leader of a political party wishes to act unreasonably, they could hold up the establishment of that entity. The member for Mansfield has foreshadowed an amendment saying that if that system fails there needs to be a fail-safe, a circuit-breaker—that is, there needs to be a motion of the House: more politics. That may be a matter that the member for Mansfield will explain, but the problem that this amendment seeks to solve has not been properly explained. It has not been properly put to this House why the system needs to change and what the flaw has been in the operation of redistribution commissions since the Fitzgerald era and since the electoral reform bill was put through this parliament by the Goss Labor government. I believe the system has acted effectively and delivered fair outcomes for Queenslanders, and fairness needs to be at the heart of this.

The government, of course, opposes the expansion of the parliament to create four new jobs for members of this House when our focus should be on creating jobs for Queenslanders. I thought those matters were put very clearly by the Minister for Transport and the Attorney-General. That is the priority of our government. The priority of our government is to create the business environment for the private sector to grow in Queensland, for business investment to flourish for those new sunrise industries that the Minister for Science and Innovation—the minister leading the Advance Queensland program for this government—the member for Algeester, talks about at length to create that environment, the transition that our Queensland economy is in. That is the focus of this government. I am certainly focused on the new opportunities for research and commercialisation of research—research going from bench to bed to business, the three Bs. That is very important for me as the Minister for Health considering the significant amount that the state invests in research to develop new cures, new treatments but also new industries and new jobs for the future.

The other flaw I see in the bill is that it has never been satisfactorily explained why the parliament needs to increase by four seats. As far as I can see it is not articulated in the explanatory notes. Why four? Why not three? Why not seven? What is the rationale? Is it because we can all fit into the chamber without additional cost? Is that a rationale for expanding? Is it an arbitrary figure? I would ask the member for Mansfield to address that later in the debate or in the consideration of the clauses in detail. It seems to be an arbitrary number. Whether and to what extent that takes pressure off regional members of parliament remains to be seen. I do not support it on that basis, nor do I support the idea


that the redistribution would not occur until after the writ for the next election is issued. That would entrench the disparity that already exists in seats across Queensland. Some seats are 16 per cent over quota.

Mr Ryan: Outrageous!

Mr DICK: I take the interjection from the member for Morayfield that it is outrageous. Some seats are over quota while other seats are considerably under quota. It would disenfranchise some Queenslanders because their votes will not be equal. There will be disproportionate impacts on how people vote.

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr DICK: I take the interjection from the member for Brisbane Central, my ministerial colleague, that it is back to the bad old days. Perhaps that is not the intention, but certainly it would be a perverse outcome if that were to continue. For those reasons I oppose the bill before the House.

 **Mr POWER** (Logan—ALP) (3.44 pm): I rise to express real concerns—and I hope that others in the House will share those concerns—about the electoral bill that is before us. We know that the redistribution process is upon us. It is five to midnight. We know that the Attorney-General has already begun to put out letters of consultation with various parts of the party in order to get a fair and democratic group of three who can go through the process of redistributing our seats. I think this process to hijack, to blow up, to put a bomb under the process of redistributing the state is a real concern. It also is of real concern in the attitude of those opposite, how they treat the electoral process and what they think of this process.

I also noted that the member for Mansfield told us not to speak of gerrymanders. He assures the House—and I take him at his word, although this bill has been put to us in a hurry—that this bill will not further disproportionately weight one vote over another. That is to say there is an odium that hangs over any bills put forward because his speech was very much a concession that the last bill was one about malapportionment, about the ‘Joh-mander’, about returning to the history of distorting our state. I hope that this is not the intent, but we know that a bill has already been put forward in this place to do exactly that. I take the member for Mansfield at his word, but we must concern ourselves to always reject such malapportionment whenever we see it, and we know that it has been put forward previously in a bill.

We know the history of the Liberal National Party when it comes to elections. They are the kings of the gerrymander, the ‘Joh-mander’, of malapportionment, of islands made up of Aboriginal communities connected only by a single road or not connected at all in order to prop up the margin of another. We know that they selectively set the sizes of electorates in order to gain maximum advantage. How do we know this? We know this from erudite legal types from the suburbs of Brisbane. We know that from gentle folk who held the electoral process in high regard. We know that from an old party, one that members may have heard of, the Liberal Party of Australia, which has no presence in this place and, unfortunately, no presence in this chamber. In the eighties they at least argued that malapportionment of this sort should be taken away altogether. In the last debate I read extensively about how the Liberal Party held up that flag in this place. Now we have no-one in this place from the opposition doing it because we know the Liberals and their values are dead and buried, subsumed by a beast that has eaten them.

As I said, I am disappointed. What we see here—and some of the other speakers have touched upon it—is that this is all about the LNP’s intention. It is the creation of four jobs in this place while 40,000 go begging outside this place. We should be focused on jobs outside of this chamber, not four extra jobs for their friends, for their mates. This may be uncharitable of me—and pull me up if it is unparliamentary—but I also have suspicions that this is about sorting out problems in preselections or disputes over boundaries or where various MPs should go in a likely redistribution. That is what concerns me about the intentions of the other side when they put this bill up so close to the process of the redistribution. They are so desperate to get these extra seats that I think it is to fix problems within their own riven party. I am disappointed that we have to vote on that in this House.

I am especially disappointed that our redistribution process could be delayed. Redistributions are at the heart of our democracy. They keep the value of one vote, one value and the proportionality between a person who represents Logan to a person who represents Gladstone all the way to Cairns. This value is essential because we have the innate belief that all humans are created equal. It does not matter whether they come from the tip of Cape York or the backstreets of Browns Plains, all have value and all are equal. The redistribution process puts that at risk.


Redistributions are vital to democracy. I know that a fair number of electors per electorate is much more essential to democracy than the number of people who are elected to represent them. As long as we have within the electorate proportionally the same number of electors, then we can have a fair democracy. We have seen how the federal electorates have over 90,000 people in them, but because they are fair within each of the states—let us forget Tasmania—we know and have confidence that our federal parliament is a democracy. No-one claims that because the Attorney-General formerly represented 90,000 people in her electorate—and very well too, I might add, Attorney-General—that the federal parliament is not a democracy, but if there were to be an electorate of 180,000 people versus one of 80,000 people in the same parliament, then we would have concerns about whether that is a democracy.

You might ask what that has to do with redistributions. We know that the British system of elections fell apart in the 1820s because of the very long process of never going through a redistribution.

Mr Hinchliffe: Rotten boroughs.

Mr POWER: Rotten boroughs indeed; the Leader of the House knows this story well. I read this out in the last parliament, but it seems that some have yet to understand this point. In the 1820s in England, a seat based in the mediaeval town of Dunwich had only 32 voters. This once prosperous market town had slowly been eroded by the North Sea and had fallen into the ocean, yet it still maintained its boundaries because there were no redistributions despite all the townspeople leaving. No doubt this putting at risk and pushing off redistributions would be in no small part what the members opposite intend, because surely that is the reason for throwing this bomb into the electoral redistribution process at the last minute.

In this place our first job before any other is to ensure that there is a legacy of fair and democratic systems. I think that these issues should be canvassed carefully and judiciously. I know there have been many electoral issues. We have debated this since the fall of the Joh regime in the 1980s and we had EARC. These things have been widely canvassed, and one could make an argument that these things have been debated and widely understood by both the electorate and the community. I recognise the argument made earlier by the member for Mansfield that the House is the master of its own domain, but where there is such mistrust of the National Party's legacy I would have concerns with anything they put forward. I suggest to the House that many of us should also have concerns with what they are putting forward.

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Communities, Women and Youth, Minister for Child Safety and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (3.53 pm): I echo the words of the Attorney-General in the House this afternoon: this issue does require serious consideration. I have to say that it is not the first, second, third, fourth or even fifth issue that my local constituents in Waterford raise with me when I am out and about in my electorate. I have travelled the length of Queensland and met with community organisations in regional centres like Rockhampton, Toowoomba, Mareeba, Biloela, Moranbah, Mackay and many others, and I can honestly say that not one person has ever raised this issue with me.

What they tell me is that they are relieved that they now have a government that listens to them and wants to work with them to build a better Queensland, to grow Queensland. I think it is really important to focus the efforts of parliament on the priority issues of building a new economy, securing jobs for the future and keeping our families safe and supported, yet here we are again debating this issue for a third time when it is just not something that Queenslanders are telling us they need. It is not a priority for them. Queenslanders do not want four new jobs for politicians; they want jobs for them and jobs for their children. They want to see a government that is delivering new jobs and is focused on new industries, harnessing innovation and the great work that our Minister for Innovation is doing with Advance Queensland.

Young people want to know that politicians will put their efforts into grappling with the big issues that affect their future. During National Youth Week it was a real privilege to travel throughout Queensland to attend the youth forums that we have been holding right across Queensland and to talk to young people about the issues that concern them. There are a lot of challenges for our young people today. Youth unemployment is a real issue, and this government is doing much to tackle youth unemployment. Our young people are worried about where the jobs that they will have are going to come from. They are worried about making sure they have access to TAFE and to skilling and to higher education. During the last election campaign I was so proud when the Labor government announced that it would rescue our TAFEs, because we know that so many of our young people rely on getting

those skills to make sure that they can find meaningful employment. These are certainly the themes that are coming through loud and clear during our consultations with young people right across Queensland.

Young people are also telling us that they want us to protect the environment, and I know that the minister for the environment is making sure that they have world-class educational training opportunities. They want us to tackle gender inequality; they want us to tackle domestic and family violence; they want to make sure that they have access to the best quality health care; and they want to see an inclusive society. These are the kinds of issues that my constituents raise with me locally. These are the issues that Queenslanders raise with me as we travel to community cabinets and I meet the hardworking Queenslanders who work in our community services sector. Not only is this a distraction from the important work of governing Queensland but it would not even be close to the top of the list of reforms required to change the look, the shape and the feel of this parliament to make sure we truly are a modern parliament representing a modern Queensland.

There are more than 225 cultural groups proudly calling Queensland home. We are a true multicultural success story. As the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services raised during this debate, our home town of Logan is an incredibly diverse multicultural society with 216 different ethnicities. There are more people from different ethnic backgrounds living in the city of Logan than there are in New York City, so the challenges that Logan faces and the priorities for this government are about making sure that we have community cohesion and social cohesion and that we continue to promote and celebrate the work of our multicultural communities. I think the passage of the multicultural recognition legislation was a key issue for those multicultural groups.

These are the issues that Queenslanders want this parliament to be focused on, and these are the issues that I am proud to say this government is working hard on. I think we should be talking about putting some effort into making our parliament better reflect the people we represent and better reflect the community.

It was a real honour to chair one of the sessions for the youth parliament late last year. One of the things I remember so strongly about sitting where you are today, Mr Speaker, and looking out across our youth parliamentarians was the diversity of representatives. There were so many women and so many representatives from diverse backgrounds. If we are going to talk about reshaping this place, these are the issues we should be considering and the debates we should be having. How do we make the parliament a more diverse place? How do we better represent different parts of our community? How do we as a parliament reflect the broader community?

What people do not say at my mobile offices, on talkback radio or in letters to the editor is, 'Please can we have more politicians.' I am not sure any member of this place, as they are out and about talking to voters, would have had a request from a constituent for more politicians. I have absolutely no doubt that representing a large electorate would have its challenges.


Ms Grace interjected.

Ms FENTIMAN: The member for Brisbane Central is telling me about some of the challenges she faces with an inner-city urban seat. Also, some federal members have bigger electorates and they seem to make that work. As a result of the focus we have on innovation and technology, being able to hear from and represent constituents will become easier and easier as we make these advances.

I find it particularly interesting that those opposite have suddenly found a passion for this issue—something they were dead silent on when they were in government. The fact that we have come back to this a third time displays a desperation from a former government that still cannot accept that they lost the trust of Queensland.

We do not need more politicians. What we need is a strong government like the Palaszczuk government that has the commitment and the compassion to improve the lives of everyone in the community; that is delivering on our election commitments; that is out there listening to the people of Queensland; that is delivering on jobs now and jobs for the future; that is delivering on quality healthcare services, more teachers, more nurses and more doctors; that is delivering on tackling big social issues such as domestic and family violence, which I have spoken on many times in this place; and that is providing a new direction for child and family support so that we can better support vulnerable families.

These are the issues that our constituents want us to focus on in this place. They certainly do not want us to focus on having more politicians. If we are going to talk about delivering jobs for Queensland, let us talk about delivering jobs for the mums and dads of Waterford. Let us talk about jobs for the students who are concerned about getting quality training and finding jobs for the future. Let us talk about the issues that matter to Queenslanders, not about how we can get more politicians.

 **Ms FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (4.02 pm): I rise to speak against this bill. Although I do not think anyone will be surprised to hear that my arguments are very similar to those that have been made by my colleagues on this side of the House, I nevertheless want to give a perspective of my own on Queenslanders' views on having more politicians. I think that was brought to light when I was very privileged to be the chair of the Finance and Administration Committee last year.

As members of this House know, our committee travelled right around the state holding public forums. I think we held 11 public forums in total on the question of four-year terms. Other members of the committee might be able to correct me, but we had nearly a thousand submissions. We also held quite a number of public hearings in Brisbane. One of the issues that was brought up quite strongly during the conversation about four-year terms was whether it was a problem that there was no upper house in Queensland and what could be done around the committee system. Of course, the Committee of the Legislative Assembly examined that question in detail and made some quite considered recommendations about it.

In not every single forum but certainly in a number of forums someone from the floor would say, 'What we need to do is bring back the Senate.' That suggestion was also made in written submissions. What became quite clear to me in that really comprehensive undertaking was that people absolutely do not want more politicians. It is probably a shame for all of us that that is about the fact that Queenslanders do not have enough trust in politicians. It is a shame that people feel that way, but it was a very strong message.

I talked about the four-year-term issue quite a lot in my electorate as I went around to schools and community groups. The resounding message from people was that they do not want more politicians. In fact, woe betide anyone in any of those forums who suggested we have a senate, because they were howled down a bit with an argument about not needing more politicians.


When I go back to my electorate and people ask me what I did in parliament this week, if I say, 'We spent quite a bit of time talking about getting more politicians,' I know what they are going to say. When they ask me what we did in parliament this week—that is where I think we really have to focus our attention—I can tell them that the other night we passed the Criminal Law (Domestic Violence) Amendment Bill. I have spoken on every single domestic violence bill that has been introduced. It is a topic I feel extremely strongly about. I posted on Facebook about strangulation being made a separate offence with a maximum penalty of seven years imprisonment. The reaction I got from those in my electorate to the passing of that legislation was nothing short of astonishing. I got a very strong reaction to it on social media. From the minute I posted it late that night I was getting Facebook messages and email messages. The next morning I was at my local ferry terminal talking to people, and I had people queueing up, some of them in tears, to tell me how important it was that we had passed that legislation. It is those sorts of things that we should be talking about in this House. They are the things that really matter to people.

We already have so much legislation on our books—important legislation, legislation that we took to the election. We have set a cracking pace in getting that legislation through, but there is still so much more to do. It is legislation that people said to us was important to them. By voting for us they said, 'We want you to do these things.' Even in the area of domestic violence alone there is still so much more to do. The other day when debating that bill I referred to the Attorney-General's agenda. She seems to have two or three pieces of legislation before the House every sitting week.

Mrs D'Ath: I've got five this week.

Ms FARMER: She has five this week. I take that interjection. As we can see from the committees' workload, there is so much to be done. Bills are queueing up to be passed.

They are the main points I want to make. This is just a waste of parliament's time. People are just not happy that we spend our time talking about such frivolous things. I really cannot support this legislation.

 **Mr WALKER** (Mansfield—LNP) (4.08 pm), in reply: All that has been said by those on the other side can really be summed up in this proposition: adding four more seats to this House reduces democracy. If that is their argument, it cannot fly. How can the addition of four more seats to this House reduce democracy? They have tried every way: 'It is a gerrymander,' 'It is going to cost too much,' 'It is going to delay the process.' They have said everything except the simple proposition that adding four seats to this House cannot reduce democracy—quite the contrary.

After 30 years, despite the recommendation arising out of the Fitzgerald inquiry that the number of seats be reviewed every seven years, nothing has been done and finally a proposal is coming to this House that acts upon that recommendation. Going firstly to the Attorney-General, who made a big point

about the cost of four new members, that is an interesting proposal coming from the government that announced only in the last week or two that the number of public servants outside this place—we are public servants in this place—had increased by 4,907 since this government came to power. We are adding another four, to take the total to 4,911. That is hardly critical in the cost of running this state and it cannot be used as an argument against adding four more members. That is a modest increase to this House to cope with a doubling of the population over 30 years—less than five per cent of the seats of this House—a modest increase.

The Attorney said that we need to get this moving right now. She is quite right: we do need to get it moving right now, and that is why we sought the support of the House, which was given, to deal with it this week. The Attorney-General talked about the delays that might be incurred. The delays, by her own admission, are precisely 48 hours. It was two days ago that she started the process by advising her nominees, so we start again tomorrow. We are a couple of days down the track. It is hardly a critical delay in the time frame which the Attorney-General herself has had the responsibility for and which, as she said, by strange coincidence on Tuesday morning she had started the ball rolling. There are no present time frames for consultation within the legislation. This new legislation will allow specific time frames—a 14-day time frame for agreement or otherwise the matter comes to this House.

I turn to the comments of the Minister for Health, who talked about, for some reason, the issue of the size of the seat of Mount Isa—a seat which we know is already the size of France—and about which the Clerk of this House has said, somewhat tongue in cheek but still making an important point, that if we do nothing about the size of this House and the electoral arrangements for rural and regional Queensland the boundary of that seat will extend towards the western suburbs of Toowoomba. That is what is inevitably going to happen. If we stay with 89 seats, that is what is going to happen and we have to do something and we have to do it quickly—and we are doing it, as the member for Cairns rightly pointed out, at the most opportune time, just as we start this redistribution process.

The health minister referred to the issue of deadlock within the committee. While there is an issue of deadlock to be resolved, and my amendments deal with that, I point out that the proposal that we have in this bill puts forward the most democratic, transparent and real bipartisan—in contrary to the bipartisanship that those argued in relation to the CCC last night—position in relation to the appointment of these important commissioners and the addition of commissioners that will allow extra skills to be brought to bear when we are looking at where the boundaries should be drawn, how they properly service communities of interest and, in particular when we are thinking of rural and regional members, how their particular issues can be best addressed. It adds skills. It does so in a bipartisan way and is therefore clearly a positive addition to the bill.

This bill deals with an issue that has been lying dormant for 30 years despite the recommendations of EARC that we look at this issue every seven years. The population of Queensland has doubled. It provides two things: it provides a modest increase of four members to deal with that population increase and it provides a transparent and bipartisan method of appointment of the redistribution commissioners. I commend the bill to the House.

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

AYES, 44:

LNP, 41—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, 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—Pyne.

NOES, 42:

ALP, 41—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, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 1—Gordon.

Pair: Stewart, Boothman.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1 to 5, as read, agreed to.

Clause 6—



Mrs D'ATH (4.20 pm): I seek leave to move amendments outside the long title of the bill.

Division: Question put—That leave be granted.

AYES, 45:

ALP, 41—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, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 41:

LNP, 41—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, 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.

Pair: Stewart, Boothman.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Mr SPEAKER: I propose all future divisions to be of one minute.



Mrs D'ATH (4.26 pm): I move the following amendments—

1 Clause 6 (Amendment of s 2 (Definitions))

Page 5, after line 12—

insert—

(1A) Section 2, definition *exhausted ballot paper*—

omit.

2 Clause 6 (Amendment of s 2 (Definitions))

Page 5, after line 22—

insert—

(4) Section 2, definition *first preference vote*, 'or a tick or cross'—

omit.

I table the explanatory notes to my amendments.

Tabled paper: Electoral (Improving Representation) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016, explanatory notes to Hon. Yvette D'ATH's amendments [\[572\]](#).

These first two amendments are part of three amendments that I will be moving in this debate. These amendments are about reducing the number of informal votes that we see at state and federal elections and to create more consistency between state and federal elections. These amendments will introduce compulsory preferential voting into Queensland elections.

Mr SPRINGBORG: I have never heard such a preposterous assertion from anyone in this parliament. We have just heard from the member for Woodridge, who seems to be the 'minister for retractions' in this place. In the past few weeks he has retracted more things than he has said.

The Fitzgerald process is a matter of convenience for the Labor Party in Queensland. Indeed, just as the bill that we are debating in its substantive form before the parliament had its genesis in the Fitzgerald inquiry process in 1990 and 1991, what Labor is proposing to undo with these amendments was also recommended against by the Fitzgerald process in 1990 to 1991. Indeed, it is exactly the same process that recommended the electoral system in this state with the very special weightage in that small number of seats, recommended a periodic review every seven-odd years of the number of seats in this parliament and also recommended the introduction of optional preferential voting in Queensland. That should not be forgotten. Many people, with the effluxion of the past 25-odd years, would have forgotten that fact.

One thing that we have seen in this parliament over the past 25 years has been, when it comes to administrative reform and electoral reform in this state, an adherence to the Fitzgerald recommendations. Indeed, in that regard the parliament has voted accordingly. It is critically important that that consideration be the ultimate consideration.

If there is a determination of this parliament that there should be a process to review whether we move from optional to compulsory preferential voting, then that should be subject to a full and proper committee process.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: One moment, members. There is too much noise. The Leader of the Opposition has the call. There will be ample opportunity for other members to participate in the debate if they choose to. I would urge members to allow the Leader of the Opposition to finish his contribution. I call the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr SPRINGBORG: The bill which is the hybrid bill, the substantive bill that we are debating today, has been through a committee process twice. What has just been moved here by way of amendment by the Attorney-General, who professes accountability and openness, has not been considered once by a parliamentary committee. If this parliament is determined to go this way then at least we should have respect for the Fitzgerald process and it should go to a form of parliamentary committee for proper review and consideration.

Mr WALKER: The members of this House have had precisely 18 minutes to look at the amendments that have been circulated by the government. This is from a government that claims the high ground on consultation and making sure that everything is going to go through the proper system. The members of this House have had 18 minutes to consider this proposal. The people of Queensland have had no time to consider this proposal. It has not been to them for consultation, not even the barest of consultation.

The proposal that we have before this House today has been out twice for consultation. It has gone throughout Queensland. I went to Mount Isa to sit with the committee while there was consultation about it there. The committee went to Townsville and other parts of the state to consider the issue of an increase of the number of people in this House. Yet we see absolute hypocrisy from the other side in giving the members of this House 18 minutes to consider a very important matter and to consider it in circumstances where, as the opposition leader has pointed out, the Fitzgerald inquiry EARC process recommended quite the opposite. Here we are going in the teeth of the Fitzgerald inquiry, no consultation with the members of this House and zero consultation with the people of Queensland. It is a disgrace and the House should not support these amendments.

Mr NICHOLLS: I have heard some pretty lame introductions from the Labor Party in this House in terms of amendments but this has to be—

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I rise to a point of order. The proposer of the bill has just spoken. Surely that has closed the debate on this matter.

Mr SPEAKER: The advice I have received is that the member for Mansfield had unlimited time. He is the mover of the bill. The Attorney-General moved an amendment and I now call the member for Clayfield for his contribution. He has a maximum of three minutes.

Mr NICHOLLS: As I was saying, the introduction of these amendments and the speaking to these amendments by the Attorney-General is possibly the lamest introduction of amendments of such a significant and far-reaching nature that I have ever heard in this place.

Government members interjected.

Mr NICHOLLS: I hear the groans of those opposite. I have heard plenty of lame introductions. I can remember the introduction of the urgency motion back in 2007 for the Rockhampton Hospital. I remember that being rushed through in one night when Rob Swarten was the member at that stage of proceedings. That was a lame one. I can remember the vegetation management bills that were brought in after the 2006 election. That was a lame introduction. But in terms of an explanation as to the necessity for this amendment, the one delivered by this Attorney-General this afternoon is the weakest and the lamest and, in fact, it is also the most wrong.

The Attorney-General said this is to deal with the problem of informal ballots. The whole reason optional preferential voting was introduced was to avoid the problem of spoiled ballots of people who do not complete all the boxes. The whole reason it was brought in was to ensure that every possible vote that can be counted in an election is counted—and that is done by optional preferential voting. If someone fails to complete every box, or if someone only goes 1, 2, 3 and makes some other mistakes that vote will be still counted, ensuring that voter gets the representation that they want at least by marking their first preference.

Not only was it a lame introduction, not only is this an appalling amendment to move at such short notice by an Attorney-General who holds herself out as the paragon of transparency, openness, consultation, dealing with the judiciary and bipartisanship; she also stands up and gives a lame excuse that does not, after one minute's consideration, hold water. If you want more people to have their votes counted—and this is the rationale behind it—you have optional preferential voting. What is happening here today is Labor is trying to deny people their vote. Not only are they trying to deny proper representation in the regions, not only are they trying to deny proper representation in the cities; they are also trying to deny people who to the best of their ability fill in their ballot paper by valid vote by introducing compulsory preferential voting, something they abolished in 1992.

Mrs D'ATH: The hypocrisy we have heard from those opposite is absolutely overwhelming. They carry on about rushing this through and the short notice. They are the ones who rushed this bill through. They are the ones who have brought this bill on. They did not distribute the private member's bill ahead of time.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, you will all have an opportunity to participate. I want to hear the Attorney-General's contribution.

Mrs D'ATH: The LNP came in here on Tuesday morning, dropped this private member's bill and immediately moved an urgency motion to have this bill debated this week having not circulated any of this ahead of time. To come in here and say they have had 18 minutes to look at this is, quite honestly, absolutely meaningless considering the way this bill has come to this House. There were 56,000 informal votes at the last state election. We should be doing everything possible to reduce these informal votes. Anyone who has been out there listening to their constituents after elections has heard them say, 'Why don't we have consistency across the state and federal elections? It is too confusing when you have compulsory and optional preferential voting.' I have certainly had it raised with me numerous times.

Mr Springborg interjected.

Mr Nicholls interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, you have had a chance to make your contribution. Member for Clayfield, you have had a chance to make your contribution. If you continue to interject, I will make a ruling.

Mrs D'ATH: I am happy to hear from the member for Toowoomba South to see if when he becomes a federal member he plans on moving a motion that he wants to go to optional preferential voting in the federal parliament. Are those opposite saying that should happen in the federal parliament? What we are putting forward today is reasonable and sensible and deals with that confusion that the community is talking about after each election about why there is compulsory preferential voting at one election and optional preferential voting at the next election. This is an opportunity to address this issue.

We have already brought ourselves into line with other states in relation to four-year fixed terms. We believe this is another opportunity to deal with inconsistencies, to deal with that confusion out in the electorate and we believe that this amendment should be supported by this parliament.

Mr STEVENS: There is a lot of mirth and merriment on the other side of the House this evening. They are thinking they have performed a wonderful little shoddy trick to bring forward the Greens votes at the next election. I can quite clearly see all the happy little faces. This is a Premier who came into this House espousing accountability, espousing consultation—18 minutes worth—espousing her honesty. She is in charge of this unbelievable little trick in terms of the parliamentary processes where this particular motion, outside the long title of the bill—nothing to do with the bill to be debated—is being added in at the last moment to give some succour to the members over there that they will have had a win as opposed to the democratic processes.

Prior to the shadow Attorney-General moving this amendment, we were debating a bill the subject of which had been discussed twice in this House. In fact, we heard members complaining that they were over it because we have discussed it twice before. Not for one second can they say that this is a new bill brought into the House. However, the amendment has been the subject of no discussion. There has been no committee input whatsoever. There has been nothing said in the community. The government is not prepared to put this matter forward. It is even more galling that their wonderful mate Terry Mackenroth, who has been put on the board of QSuper this morning—

Mrs D'ATH: I rise to point of order. My point is relevance. I think it speaks to itself. How is that relevant to this amendment and this bill?

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you. I call the member for Mermaid Beach.

Mr STEVENS: She did not let me finish my sentence. Their wonderful mate Mr Terry Mackenroth, who was elected to the QSuper board only this morning, brought in the optional preferential system with 'just vote 1'. At that time it suited the Labor Party right down to its knees and now these guys want to run away from it. They want to introduce another methodology to try to hold up their flagging support within the community by chasing down Greens preferences at the next election. This is the most embarrassing and desperate measure I have seen to pick up a vote in the community at a time when Queenslanders are saying that they are doing nothing. This is all about trying to win another election by introducing to this House a dodgy and late piece of legislation. This is nothing to do with democracy; it is all about trying to get the Labor Party, which is on the nose, re-elected.

The Premier should hang her head in shame for letting this shoddy bit of politics take place. On television we always see her smiling face. Now the public can see that there are dirty tricks being played despite the smiling face that they see on television. They can see that the Premier will stoop to anything to enhance her electoral prospects at the next election, which are flagging badly because this government has done nothing for infrastructure, jobs, employment and business across the state.

Mr CRIPPS: This afternoon in the chamber, we are seeing the politics of spite and the politics of opportunism from the Labor Party. This afternoon, amendments have come before the House that have not been the subject of any debate or public discourse in the state of Queensland for at least a decade. As the opposition leader alluded to earlier, the concept of moving to optional preferential voting was a recommendation of the PCEAR process and the Fitzgerald inquiry. The concept of Queensland moving to that system of optional preferential voting has been established and upheld for more than two decades in Queensland. It was subsequently investigated by LCARC, the successor committee to PCEAR, and re-endorsed as the most suitable arrangement for the state of Queensland in terms of state elections. Since that time, no serious proposition has been put forward to incorporate full preferential voting in state elections in Queensland.

The proposition put forward by the Attorney-General in these amendments is completely disingenuous and farcical because, as I have said, it has not been part of public discourse and debate for years and years in Queensland. The government is embarrassed because it lost control of the agenda of parliament on Tuesday when, on behalf of the opposition and the crossbenchers who had indicated their agreement, the opposition introduced a bill so that the House could reconsider issues previously debated in the parliament during this term. Earlier in the debate we heard from the member for Cairns who, upon reflection, has determined that he has a different view in terms of the way that the people of Queensland will be represented in this House going forward. The House made a decision to allow members to consider that question again.

However, the public has not considered, as a matter of debate, the introduction of full preferential voting in Queensland. On Tuesday the government was so embarrassed about losing control of the agenda of this parliament that they retreated to their smoke-filled back rooms and came up with these spiteful amendments, which are designed to trump those members who sought to have the democratic process in Queensland reconsidered. Members of this parliament deserve an opportunity to reflect again on the circumstances under which state elections will be run and on how many members of parliament will be returned to this parliament. This is a totally opportunistic move by the government. I urge all members to reject the amendments moved by the Attorney-General on that basis.

Mr BLEIJIE: If members need any more understanding of the shame that government members feel in moving this amendment, which should be in a bill of its own, they need only look at what one could describe as a bit of an argument that occurred on the floor of the chamber between the Attorney-General and the Leader of the House as they tried to work out who was going to get the hospital pass and have to move this amendment. I saw it go back and forth and wondered who was going to move the amendment. In the end, the poor Attorney-General had to move the amendment. At this point, everything that the Attorney-General and the Premier have said about openness, accountability, transparency over the past 12 months—

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Pause the clock. Government members, I urge you to allow the member for Kawana to make his contribution in silence.

Mr BLEIJIE: Today, everything that Premier Anastacia Palaszczuk has said about accountability and transparency has gone out the window. We need look no further than at the explanatory notes which state, under the heading 'Consultation', 'No consultation has been undertaken

on these amendments.' This is a Premier who, time and time again, has come into this place and said that she wants consultation with Queenslanders. She has said, 'I'm going to be a consultative Premier right around the state'.

We know the reason that these amendments have been moved this afternoon. The bill introduced by the member for Mansfield is in its third iteration. The crossbenchers should consider that the amendment should form a bill in its own right and it should be introduced at the next parliamentary sitting. The people of Queensland can then have an understanding of what is going on here. Let us compare and contrast what is happening here with what happened in 2013, when the LNP released the discussion green paper on electoral reform in Queensland. We gave all Queenslanders the opportunity to have a say about electoral reform in Queensland. The Labor Party did not take this matter to the election.

If so much rorting is happening in the optional preferential voting system why, under a month ago, did the state government allow a council election to be undertaken with the same system as the state system? Why did they not announce this and apply it to the council elections? If there is rorting taking place and there are unaccounted votes, why apply it to the state parliament but not to the local government? This is the 'save South Brisbane' amendment. We know that this is about saving the member for South Brisbane. No longer can the Premier say that she is a consultative Premier. In the words of the government's amendments, 'No consultation has taken place.' I urge the crossbenchers to reject the amendment now and let the matter be introduced in a separate bill at the next parliamentary sitting. By doing that, we can have a proper debate about the merits of optional preferential voting.

Mr POWELL: I, too, rise to object to the amendment that has been moved this afternoon. What we have seen here is, as my colleagues have said, a dirty attempt to try to move through this House something that requires considerable consideration by the broader population of Queensland. We have heard the rationale behind why we have optional preferential voting in this state. We have heard why it has remained untouched for many years and for many elections in this state.

What we are seeing here today is nothing but a last-minute attempt by the members opposite to ensure that they can continue to hold onto Greens preferences at future elections. We know that there are some nine or 10 members sitting in the seats opposite who are only there because of the partial preference flow of Greens candidates throughout the state. Imagine how many more Labor members would be sitting there now had it been compulsory preferential voting and how many more LNP members would have lost their seats had there been compulsory preferential voting.

It is as simple as that. That is why we are having this eleventh-hour debate on compulsory preferential voting this afternoon. This is a grubby tactic by a party that is getting increasingly more desperate and by a government that has no plan and does not know what they are doing and resorting to dirty tactics.

My colleagues have said that the bill we are debating this afternoon did not need to go through the committee process again because it has already been through the committee process twice in this parliament. On both occasions it has been given due consideration by a wide range of interest groups throughout the state that need to know or want to have input into how their MPs are elected and the representation by their MPs. In particular, we heard from those who represent regional and remote Queensland—those members who have huge electorates that would become larger if we had not debated this bill this afternoon.

To suggest that a vote on compulsory preferential voting can occur without similar committee consideration is ridiculous. It should not be supported. I call on all members, including the crossbenchers, to vote this amendment down.

Ms SIMPSON: This is not only an opportunistic amendment moved by the Attorney-General; it is a dishonest one. The only argument the Attorney-General has put before the House for a fundamental change in the voting system is based on a fallacy. It is based on an untruth. It is based on a deliberate misleading of this parliament. Anyone who has studied the difference between voting systems knows that by going back to a full preferential vote there is a greater opportunity to disfranchise voters when they go to the ballot box and make a mistake.

With an optional preferential voting system, voters are able to best express their intention with their vote. They are less likely to have their vote ruled invalid. They are less likely to find that, when it is counted by the scrutineers, it is knocked out.

That is why it is incredible that this Attorney-General, who tries to present herself as a professional face on legal matters, has completely discredited herself. She has completely shredded any semblance of fairness or willingness to consider the intention of voters. This is about disfranchising voters. This is about taking away options for them to express how they want to vote at the ballot box.

Is it not typical of Labor—they say one thing and do another. They are using this opportunity to take away a voting option that people in this state have had at the recommendation of the Fitzgerald inquiry. This option was a Fitzgerald inquiry recommendation. It has been stripped away by this Labor government with only 18 minutes notice. It is completely dishonest.

This Attorney-General can no longer go out publicly and in any way claim that she is one who consults and in any way claim that she is there to franchise voters. By her dishonest actions in this parliament today she will forever be branded as somebody who shredded people's rights in a way which is completely contrary to the Fitzgerald inquiry recommendations.

Shame on this Attorney-General. It is a shame to see her discredit her own reputation in a way that is undermining the rights of the voters of Queensland. The Attorney-General's shameful performance will hang around her neck. It is shameful the way Annastacia Palaszczuk, as Premier of this state, has brought this before the parliament. To undermine the rights of voters in Inala, to undermine the votes of voters in Redcliffe is a shame.

The legislation that the LNP has brought before the House is in fact about ensuring that Queenslanders are franchised and that they have access to their MPs. It does not in any way change the weighting, even though there are 10,000 more voters in Maroochydore than there are in Indooroopilly in Brisbane. The legislation we have introduced is about ensuring that people have a fair go, rather than this deceitful amendment of the Attorney-General.

Mr DICKSON: What we see here today is great opportunism by the Labor Party.

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members of the government, I am not able to hear the member for Buderim. If you persist someone from the government side will be warned.

Mr DICKSON: Very clearly the Independents and the Katter party members had a great opportunity to vote with the LNP to give the people of Queensland an opportunity so there are the appropriate number of seats in Queensland. Today the Labor Party has put forward an amendment that the people of Queensland have not had the opportunity to see. I am sure that members would like to take this back to their electorates to give the people of Queensland a say.

Optional preferential voting is an integral part of the voting system in this state, and it has been for a very long time. Are we going to change the way local governments vote? Are we going to upset every council in Queensland? This is far too big a change to make in such a hurry. This should be referred to a committee. It should be referred to the people of Queensland.

I am sure the Premier and Deputy Premier of this state are very proud of the fact that they believe in democracy and believe in people having their say and the opportunity to peruse information. I believe that if the people of Queensland do not get the opportunity to do that I think they will have a big say at the next election. The Labor Party may not get the outcome they are bargaining for today.

Fellow colleagues, this amendment is being rushed through way too quickly. We have spoken earlier about the extra four seats. That is a common-sense solution. I call upon the Independents and the Katter party members to support leaving optional preferential voting in place because that is the system that we have in this state.

If the Labor Party is so keen on putting different voting systems forward then they should put out a whole variety of voting systems. They should look at the options they use in Tasmania if they want to bring some really controversial voting systems forward. They should look at all the options we have and give the people of Queensland a say. If this amendment goes through tonight they will be seen for exactly what they are in front of the people of Queensland: sneaky and conniving. They are pushing this amendment through with the intent to do the people of Queensland over. That would be a very sad day in this state and something that nobody in this parliament would be proud of, even themselves.

They should not take that sneaky opportunity when they have it. It is like somebody being on the ground and somebody walking over and kicking them. That is not what the Queensland parliament should be about. It should be about giving people the opportunity to study what is being put before the House today. It should be about giving the people of Queensland the opportunity to understand what is being put forward. This is a brand-new voting system. This is something totally different that the people of Queensland are not used to at state elections or council elections.

Mr ELMES: This is more than a strange debate that we are having today. The opposition and the crossbenchers have brought before this parliament now twice very considered pieces of legislation that protect the rights of Queenslanders to have a fair say in the running of their state, to make sure that when they go to the ballot box they are protected by the systems of this parliament and to make sure that the legislation that is passed by this parliament is considered and reasoned, has gone through the committee process, has been debated and voted on.

As someone said here a few minutes ago, members on this side of the House first saw the amendments that the government has put forward that we are considering today 18 minutes before the debate started. How can that be considered? How can that be reasoned? How can that be in the interests of the people of this state?

We have a system of voting in Queensland that has stood the test of time. It was a recommendation of the Fitzgerald inquiry going back to the early nineties. I find myself at a loss as to why we have a government that every time we talk about Fitzgerald in this place they wear it very proudly as some sort of badge on their lapel, but when it suits them they are prepared to discard it—discard it with 18 minutes notice, not a couple of decades—and then expect this parliament to fall into line with them to make what is certainly the most hurried decision that I have seen in my 9½ years in this place.

I know they will vote according to what their masters say. We will vote because we are determined to make sure that this sort of amendment does not pass. I say to the members of the Katter party and the crossbench: if you want to see fairness in your own seats and the way democracy is played out in this state, you will reject this amendment put forward by the government. You will dismiss it out of hand. If anyone here feels that there is some crying need that we need to debate this, let us bring in the legislation. Let us get the committee process underway. Let us have a proper, reasoned debate at the proper time about making sure that the systems of this parliament and the history of this parliament are upheld.

(Time expired)

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: It is absolutely incredible that we are standing in this House, as the previous speakers have said, debating an amendment that this supposed consultative government has brought into this House with 18 minutes notice given to all of us.

Ms Jones: You gave zero minutes.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I hear the member for Ashgrove continually talking about the bill that was introduced here on Tuesday. That is a bill that has gone to a committee twice within this parliament—twice.

Mrs D'Ath interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: The amendment was brought before this House 18 minutes ago. By the time the piece of paper got to my desk it would have been even less than that. That was the amount of time that we were given to think about an amendment that had absolutely nothing to do with this bill. It brings in a whole new focus to this bill in relation to preferential voting.

It is incredible as well that the Attorney-General of this great state has come before us in this House and said in her introduction to this amendment, a one-line statement—it was very short—apart from the fact that there has been no consultation, that the reason for going to this way of voting is to get rid of the number of informal votes. That was the reason that optional preferential voting was brought in in the first place. As the member for Maroochydore said, it is incredible that she did not think through that line or two before she came into this House and at least give herself some time to consider a debate on this issue.

We are here before the House because we are trying to give regional people representation in this great state. I heard a member opposite talk about the fact that the size of the seats was not going to change and that one of the members over here was lying when they said that. How does she know? How does she know how big her electorate is compared to some of the other members on this side?

Ms Grace: How do you know?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I know very well because I have one of those larger seats. What we are talking about here is this amendment, which has been brought in with 18 minutes notice—18 minutes notice for the minor parties and the crossbench and the opposition. Not even in the introduction of the amendment could the Attorney-General give us a decent argument as to why anyone in this House should be voting for this ridiculous amendment, which is just making the government and the Premier look less consultative than they are already.

(Time expired)

Mr McARDLE: For those of us who have been in the House for a number of years, this is the real ALP. This is the real ALP. They start by saying, 'We will be transparent and we will consult,' but when it comes down to it they do not change their cloth. They are the same ALP they have always been. If they can find a sneaky, underhanded way to achieve an outcome, they will do it—bet your bottom dollar they will do it. There are shades here of Anna Bligh and Peter Beattie and Terry Mackenroth coming back in, because this mob cannot be trusted.

The Premier made it quite clear when she came into power that the ALP we are facing today would be transparent, would be open, would consult and would be honest. Not one of those words can apply to what is taking place here in this House this afternoon. Literally saying to the people of Queensland that they do not need to be consulted on one of the major changes to electoral laws in this state is arrogance of the highest limit from a government that has sat here for 15 months and accused the LNP of doing everything underhanded and sneaky. Yet today we find them cutting out four million Queenslanders on the right to have a say in how they are going to vote at the next state election. Is that fair? Is it right for this government to sweep aside the rights of Queenslanders to make a comment on the changes they are proposing? It is not.

For the Attorney-General, the first law officer of this state, to stand in this House and make the statement she did—that they were trying to stop informal votes—is simply a nonsense. It belies the role that office holds in this state as part of the executive and as part of this government. The Attorney-General should be ashamed of herself. She should give a full explanation as to real reason she is making this point and moving this amendment. To stand here and make a nonsense comment like that belies and belittles the role of the Attorney-General in this state.

The people in this state have every right to be offended and to feel that they have been duded by this government because they have not been asked to comment on what is taking place here. They have not been asked to comment on the fact that what they are going to do at the ballot box will be different from many years past. This has been done without any consultation. If the government had the gumption, they should introduce a bill into this House and make certain that people have a right to have a say.

Fitzgerald made the issues to do with the role of the government, the executive and the judiciary very clear. The government has swept that aside in what I call one of the most diabolical attacks on the rights of Queenslanders to deal with this matter.

Mr SPEAKER: Your time has expired.

Mr McARDLE: They should hang their heads in shame.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Caloundra, you have had ample opportunity.

Mr WATTS: Today we see democracy die. We see a party that cannot convince people to vote for them. They have to bully people into voting for them—'If you don't want to vote for us first, if you don't want vote for us second, if you don't want to vote for us third, fourth, fifth'—however many you can run. The bottom line is that the government has to bully people into getting their vote, and it has done it without even consulting the very people that it intends to bully into voting for it. This could have been an act of parliament that it introduced at any time. No, it wanted to do it in a sneaky way as an amendment to a bill that is well outside the long title of the bill because it did not want the people of Queensland to know what it was doing. The government wanted to bully their vote over to it without telling them what it was doing. Yet government members stand there and talk about integrity, transparency and accountability. These are words that I do not think they could find if they looked in the dictionary. Government members are a disgrace to bring this on at such short notice without any consultation with the people of Queensland.

Those opposite talk about one vote, one value. I heard everybody in the previous debate talk about one vote, one value. This is not one vote, one value. People get to vote once, twice, three, four and five times. How many times does someone have to vote before a person finally says, 'They are absolutely terrible as a government but I am going to choose them anyway'? If those opposite truly believed in democracy they would be able to get a first preference vote, but we know they cannot get a first preference vote. They know they cannot get a first preference vote. They know that more Queenslanders voted for us as their first preference than for them and yet they still sit here as a government willing to bully those very people who would not vote for them into finally voting them in.

I think the ALP should be ashamed of themselves. They are doing this without consultation. How can they possibly ever utter the words 'accountability', 'transparency' or 'integrity' in this place again and put them next to an ALP member's name? Those opposite should all be very ashamed of

themselves. If we had an upper house in Queensland they know that this amendment would not get through. They know there would be a discussion and a debate, but they got rid of the upper house. They do not want more members of parliament. They do not want people to have a free primary vote, to be able to say, 'That is the only person I want to govern. Other than that, I do not want to continue my vote.' They do not want an upper house. I do not know why they did not move a motion to abolish everybody from here and leave Trades Hall in charge of the place.

Mr LANGBROEK: If anything proves that this is all about politics from the ALP as opposed to what we have proposed, which is about representation, we only have to look at the reason the Attorney-General gave for introducing this amendment. She said that the prospective change this amendment addresses is to ensure there is less informal voting in Queensland. We only have to look at the informal voting rate in federal elections, which is at six per cent, compared to the informal voting rate traditionally in Queensland, which is two per cent. That is why it was recommended to have optional preferential voting in Queensland, which we currently have.

Anna Bligh, the then premier in the 53rd Parliament, considered bringing in these changes and quickly dropped the idea. That was after a period of consultation undertaken by a parliamentary committee. Contrast that to this government, which maintained under the leadership of the member for Inala, the Premier, that this would be a government characterised by openness, transparency and accountability. This Premier has done something that a former premier, the former member for South Brisbane, Anna Bligh, tried in the 53rd Parliament and quickly dropped. Yet this government thinks it can do something like this with virtually no notice when it could not even get people to speak up against this bill in its original form in the original debate that we had.

It is my clear contention that this has been done because it is all about the politics of saving the member for Mount Coot-tha, the member for South Brisbane and the member for Brisbane Central. Compulsory preferential voting may well satisfy the Labor Party and may get them the results they want in an election, but they are doing this without consulting over three million voters in Queensland and nearly five million people who are residents of Queensland who deserve to have something like this put to them as opposed to what we are seeing today. This is a specious attempt to introduce an amendment with no notice. The very characteristics of the amendment do not stand up to any scrutiny.

The simple message to the crossbenchers and those who may be opposing this amendment is: this may well have repercussions in their own seats that will not lead to increased democracy but will lead to more people being disenfranchised, more people losing their vote, as we see in federal elections at the six per cent informal rate, and poorer representation in our parliament by a Labor Party that has shown its true colours today. Whenever they come in here and say with zealotry that they are better than those of us on this side, today will be their final condemnatory action of what they actually are as opposed to what they say they are.

Mr EMERSON: It is an extraordinary situation today to see an Attorney-General come in here and move a motion to change the electoral system without any consultation at all with the public. This is a government that over and over again claims to be open and accountable. We see an Attorney-General who will have to live with the disgrace of today for the rest of her political career. We had 18 minutes notice before this amendment was to be moved. It is such a significant motion that will disenfranchise four million Queenslanders who would want to have a say on this. What we see here, as the member for Surfers Paradise just indicated, are Labor's true colours.

I suspect I am one of the few people in this House who saw the Fitzgerald inquiry. As a young journalist, I covered the Fitzgerald inquiry. As a young ABC journalist, I covered the formation and the hearings of the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission headed by David Solomon. I remember the recommendation flowing from that for optional preferential voting. To hear an Attorney-General come in here today with the specious argument that this will reduce informal voting shows her lack of credibility as a minister in this government.

The argument at the time was that the move to optional preferential voting would reduce informal voting. They might say that is a long time ago and maybe things have changed since then. In the time this debate has been going on, I had a quick look to see what Antony Green, who does the ABC election analysis, says about optional preferential voting and what it does for informal voting. He was talking about bringing optional preferential voting into the federal system. It is interesting, especially for any crossbenchers considering what to do about this amendment. This is what he said—

The main advantage to flow from optional preferential voting will be to halve the scandalously high level of informal voting at federal elections.

It will halve the informal vote. Imagine what the opposite will do here in Queensland. Get rid of optional preferential voting and you bring back massively high informal voting. The disingenuous argument of the Attorney-General here today goes against EARC, Antony Green and what this House has decided previously. It also robs Queenslanders of a chance to discuss this, to be consulted on this and to decide on this. Instead, with 18 minutes notice, they have come in here and moved an amendment. As has been said before, tonight we have seen the true colours of the Attorney-General and the Labor Party.

Mr MANDER: I have to agree with my colleagues, particularly the member for Caloundra and the member for Indooroopilly, in that this is base politics at its lowest. This is the difference between this side of the House and that side of the House: they are all about pure politics. This is a tricky initiative that has been moved today. This is a sneaky one. This is one that is full of hypocrisy. At its very core, this is about payback politics. Since the government were embarrassed on Tuesday, they have met around the clock to try to work out how they can pay us back and how they can get one up on us. They were laughing, jeering, cheering each other and slapping each other on the back when they realised that maybe they have got one on us. This is what that party is about. It is a party that talks about transparency, honesty and integrity but it is a facade. They think they are going to get away with this, but the Queensland public will not accept this.

Why, with such a significant change to public policy, can we not go through the committee process? Why, with such a significant change of policy, can we not let the media run this for a period of time so we can hear what the public says about this? Why can we not allow MPs to go back to their constituencies to talk about this so people can understand what the change is?

If this amendment goes through, the Queensland public will wake up tomorrow morning and read the *Courier-Mail* and find out for the first time that a significant change has been made to public policy about the way we vote in this state. This is about the member for Maryborough, who got 25 per cent of the primary vote. This is about the member for Mount Coot-tha, who got 32 per cent of the primary vote. This is cynical politics; it is totally about trying to gain some electoral advantage, rather than giving us what is the best system. It may also be about the billboards they have stashed away that they used to misrepresent the voting system in the last state election. They told everybody that they had to fill in every square, and it was in ECQ colours. Again, it was trickery to suck the Queensland public in. Now that they have all of those billboards, they have to use them. I am not too sure.

We must remember that ultimately this goes back to the Premier. The Premier would have had to agree to this amendment to this bill, or did she know nothing about it? Have they done it without her knowing about it? Have they done it in secret? This is a Premier who is not in control of her own party and is allowing this absolute hypocrisy to run supreme.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, at the end of this debate, the division bells will ring for four minutes. When they ring for one minute, it is usually when things are happening quickly in here. However, members have left the chamber and I realise that members have other business to attend to. When the bells ring at the end of this debate, it will be for four minutes.

Miss BARTON: It gives me great pleasure to rise this afternoon to join my LNP colleagues in opposing this absolutely disgraceful amendment that has been moved at such incredibly short notice by the Attorney-General. As I said today in the House, hypocrisy, thy name is Labor. They spent the entire debate on the substantive bill talking about how disgraceful it was that this bill was introduced on Tuesday—a bill that has previously been considered twice by the committee—yet they have given this parliament 18 minutes notice of an amendment that the Attorney-General was going to move. This is an amendment that significantly changes the way Queenslanders will have an opportunity to express their democratic rights and freedoms in this state.

It is the Labor Party which introduced optional preferential voting in this state. It is the Labor Party in Canberra which says that compulsory preferential voting leads to more informal voting. We have seen time and time again that the Labor Party is being absolutely cannibalised in Brisbane by the loss of votes to the Greens. They are losing votes left, right and centre to the Greens. The member for Mount Coot-tha needs to rely on Greens preferences. I would hazard a guess that after the result in the Gabba ward in the most recent Brisbane City Council election even the member for South Brisbane is slightly concerned about what optional preferential voting would mean for her vote. The Deputy Premier needs to rely on Greens preferences to hold the seat of South Brisbane. The environment minister needs to rely on Greens preferences to hold his seat. The Minister for Industrial Relations needs to rely on Greens preferences to hold her seat.

What we have seen time and time again is the Labor Party coming into this House and saying that they want to be a consultative government, that they want to talk to the people of Queensland. If they want to talk to the people of Queensland, then what is the problem with drawing up a bill, introducing it into this House and referring it to a committee? The Premier stood in this House today and said that committees should be given an opportunity to consider new things for a minimum of six weeks, yet this is the first time this House has had the opportunity to consider this amendment. The Attorney-General has come into this House and shown contempt for the people of Queensland and the voters of Queensland. She has absolutely ripped out from underneath them the foundation of the way in which we vote in this state.

Only weeks ago, people across Queensland were able to exercise their democratic vote and they could vote 1 or fill out all of the boxes if they wished. It is an absolute disgrace, and the Attorney-General should hang her head in shame that she has such contempt for the people of Queensland. She did not even consider talking to them about the amendment she has moved. She has tried to sneak it in and take advantage of what is an incredibly important bill to ensure fair representation across the regions. She has disenfranchised Queenslanders across this state. It is a disgrace. She should hang her head in shame.

Mrs SMITH: This just reeks of desperation. If ever I have seen anything that reeks of desperation, it is this attempt of the Attorney-General to come in here with this amendment. This is where we see that Labor is a pack of wolves dressed up in sheep's clothing. Their face and their colours have been shown today. The Attorney-General could have been given a little bit of credit if she had not come in here and treated the Queensland people as fools. That is exactly what she did when she stood in here today and said that this is to stop informal voting, when we have clearly shown that this will actually increase informal voting. She got it wrong; the buzzer has gone off. The Attorney-General knows in her heart, in her profession, that she is being sneaky and dishonest.

I was on the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee that reviewed this issue not just once but twice. There is one thing about our bill that we have put forward. When we went around to the regional centres, such as Mount Isa, and spoke to the people—and I was only at the Oxley Men's Shed today—even the person on the street would say that it was absolutely ridiculous to think that one man could effectively service an electorate that was 570,000 square kilometres, and I am just giving that one example of Mount Isa. That is just ridiculous.

The member for Brisbane Central said, 'This isn't going to matter. We're not too sure if his seat is going to expand.' What a ridiculous thing to say. If it is kept at 89 seats but it is divvied up even further and further, of course it is going to have an impact. This is where Labor gets confused and that is why their finances with their mathematics are not real clever. When they make statements like that, we then understand why we are in the financial position we are in.

They come back and say one thing and one thing only and it is typical union tactics—'We want to consult, consult, consult.' However, at the end of the day what we see time and time again is Labor just doing this for themselves and feathering their own nests. Again, I say it smacks of desperation. I would absolutely say to the Attorney-General that she got it wrong.

Mrs STUCKEY: I too rise to join in the opposition to this amendment. I have to say that if it is so tickety-boo and such a fantastic idea, why aren't all of the government members lining up to say how fantastic it is? I echo the sentiments of my colleagues. I echo them loud and clear. They have said what most Queenslanders are feeling when something that is politically driven is thrust upon them in a very short time. This is a fairly major step in how Queenslanders vote and, therefore, it deserves proper time for consultation. It is not only offensive to the people of Queensland; it further expresses the hallmark that is Labor—that is, a lack of consultation. Where is their lack of consultation the greatest? It is to the people west of the divide. They do not care about regional Queensland. They know they are stretched at difficult times in drought, they know they are stretched in their communities and they know they are stretched with their MP representation too. We have had some incredible speeches in this House from the member for Mount Isa and others, and if they did not touch your hearts then you have not got one. It really beggars belief that they would argue against the bill that we actually had passed here earlier.

Let us look at what we have before us. Who could forget the Beattie 'Just vote 1' campaign? It was not that long ago. How many people were swept in under this Beattie 'Just vote 1' campaign? It was a very successful campaign and it actually threw out people's optional preference. People were not encouraged to have an optional preference. Here we are now saying, 'Wait a minute. We want mandatory preferential voting,' which is a total turnaround to the popular Labor premier Mr Peter Beattie. They tried on the 'vote 1' again at the council elections in 2016. I do not know why they have

changed tack now and are going into mandatory referential voting. It does smack of a political agenda overriding sensible consultation and fairness to Queenslanders. The Labor Party wants to change the rules to suit themselves. They need to take it to Queenslanders, because I am sure they will hear a very different story if they did that.

Mr HART: Here we have a government that has told us on numerous occasions that they are transparent, accountable and consultative. They have told us over and over again that they are consultative. As the member for Burleigh on the Gold Coast, I represent over 35,000 people. What I do in terms of consultation is I go down to the markets, I go down the street, I stand in the park and I talk to people. It is entirely appropriate—

Government members interjected.

Mr HART: That is consultation. I take the interjection from the members across the chamber who are laughing about consultation. They do not know what consultation is. Do the members opposite really think it is satisfactory to come in here with an amendment to a major bill and give members of parliament 18 minutes—and I am not even sure it was 18 minutes—to go through all of it, to look at the ramifications, to look at what the unintended consequences of doing something like this might be? Is it really appropriate to not have the opportunity to consult with the 35,000 voters whom we each represent? Should we instead be converting this into a bill of its own, putting it through the parliament, sending it off to a committee and truly consulting our constituents on it? That is what would be appropriate.

I have noticed the media scrambling up there trying to get the word out to the people of Queensland. It is now late on Thursday afternoon. I wonder how the people of Cairns feel about this particular amendment. I wonder if they have had the opportunity to think about it. I wonder if the people in Dalrymple have had the opportunity to look at this and see what ramifications it may impose on them. I wonder about the people of Mount Isa. I would urge the members who represent those areas to vote with us on this—to vote this amendment down. I urge them to convince everybody to put this into a bill and give us the opportunity to really consult with the people whom we represent. Members of parliament are not doing this all alone. We represent 35,000, 36,000 or 38,000 people and it is more than appropriate to go back to them, give them the opportunity to think this through, give them the opportunity to consider how this affects them, give them the opportunity to see how they want to vote about this and then tell us what they think.

Mr MILLAR: As a new member of parliament I always look at the explanatory notes when I go to look at bills. When I looked here under 'consultation' I saw that it states—

No consultation has been undertaken on the amendments.

There was no consultation whatsoever—in black and white, or black and green in this case—which is disappointing for many, many regional Queenslanders. There was no notice whatsoever that members opposite were going to put this amendment through. There was no opportunity for people in Longreach, Emerald, Charleville and Western Queensland to know that this was coming forward. We are talking about something the meaning of which every Queenslanders who is eligible to vote has to understand. Many people out there put 1, 2 or 3 on their voting form. That is what they have been used to doing. That is what they continue to do. However, we have had no consultation with any Queenslanders on this whatsoever.

What happened to transparency? What happened to accountability? What happened to integrity on this? Members opposite go on about the fact that they have accountability and integrity. They say, 'We're having a conversation with Queensland.' They have not had a conversation with Queensland on this. They have slipped this through at one minute to midnight without any consultation whatsoever.

I call on the crossbenchers and the Katter party to, if they do support this, at least make it go through the committee process so we can explain to Queenslanders what exactly it is those opposite are doing. It would provide people with an opportunity to at least speak to the committee, to be able to put in a submission, to be able to understand this and for us to have a conversation with Queensland that we are changing something fundamental in the voting process across this state. They deserve that. Surely Queenslanders deserve to be given an opportunity to understand what is actually happening here.

We need transparency. I agree with that. Where is the transparency of introducing this at one minute to midnight with no notice? People around here have been saying that they had 18 minutes before they knew this was coming in. We got this as it was coming in; we were all sitting down. There was no consultation with anybody—no consultation with stakeholders—

An opposition member interjected.

Mr MILLAR:—apart from themselves. I will take that interjection; they have consulted themselves, but they have not consulted Queenslanders. Where is the accountability? Where is the integrity? Where is the transparency on this? Can members opposite stand up and say, 'This is transparent. This is accountable. This has integrity,' when this was done at one minute to midnight? Why do that?

An honourable member interjected.

Mr MILLAR: It was four o'clock in the afternoon. No-one else knows about it. I call on the crossbenchers and the Katter party to at least let this go through the committee system and have a proper process.

Dr ROWAN: This is why the Tree of Knowledge in Barcaldine is dead and is rotten to the core. It is as hollow as anything. When the member for Logan, the health minister and the Premier head up there on Labour Day, they should have a good look at the Tree of Knowledge—dead and rotten to the core because the Labor Party stands for nothing. They do not stand for transparency, they do not stand for scrutiny and they do not stand for accountability. Tonight is a clear example that they stand for absolutely nothing.

With these amendments the Labor Party is all about short-term expediency and politics. There was no consultation and only 18 minutes for Queenslanders to see these proposed amendments that they have introduced. They selectively quote the Fitzgerald reforms. It is absolute hypocrisy. Over the last 15 months that I have been here I have heard them selectively quote from the Fitzgerald reforms. It is extraordinary. The Attorney-General, the member for Redcliffe, should hang her head in shame in relation to that. They gave only 18 minutes for these amendments. They do not want to have any accountability or transparency or allow Queenslanders to have their say in relation to their proposed amendments. They are scared of scrutiny. This is cynical politics and it absolutely should not be supported. It should be utterly rejected.

This is failed leadership by the Premier. It is extraordinary and unbelievable for the Premier of this state to support these amendments and to come in here at this time and have no scrutiny of what is actually being proposed. It is absolutely disgraceful. They should be seen for what they are. It is cheap, short-term expediency. As I said at the beginning, this is why the Tree of Knowledge is dead and completely rotten to the core. I would urge the crossbenchers, the Katters and others in the parliament—all parliamentarians—to absolutely and utterly reject these amendments.

Mr CRANDON: This is absolutely typical of this government. I have been talking about the committee system in this place for the last 12 or 18 months, talking about the fact that we have to strengthen it. Only today, just a few hours ago, we had the Premier stand in this place and bring in a bill, the Constitution of Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016, which is precisely intended to strengthen the committee system in this House. That is what it is intended for. When we were talking about four-year terms it was the Finance and Administration Committee that recommended that that should happen. What we see today is something that flies in the face of what the Committee of the Legislative Assembly has recommended and what the members of this place want to see and yet here we have this government that comes in here with a minute's notice—I did not have 18 minutes notice. I got to read this thing as it was being spoken about.

They talk about consultation. This is the epitome of the worst possible consultation. There has been no consultation. This is the worst. We have seen it before. Back in Anna Bligh's day we had the situation where the committee system was thrown out the window. We saw it happen then, but at least we had a few hours notice. They say that this bill was brought to this place with no notice, but it has been worked on by the committee on two prior occasions. We know that it is the right way to go, the crossbench know it is the right way to go, and deep down the backbenchers on that side of the House know it is the right way to go to give the people of Western Queensland the opportunity to have representation in this place.

There is massive growth in the electorate of Coomera and other electorates in South-East Queensland, and the legislation tells us that we have to increase the number of seats in this area. The bottom line is that that is at the cost of people in the wider parts of Queensland in the areas out west and up north, and that is why these four additional seats are being pushed for.

It is no loss to the crossbench to have this sneaky piece of legislation go through the committee, and the member for Rockhampton knows that. At the end of the day this Attorney has trashed the whole idea of the committee system in one fell swoop.

Mr KRAUSE: With this amendment coming to the House with 18 minutes notice I need to paraphrase one of the doyens of the left, and on this day in particular all members should reflect on this: well may they say 'God save the Queen', because nothing will save this Attorney-General. The people of Queensland will figure you out and they will figure the Labor Party out as well, because this is nothing but a cynical ploy to prop up the Labor Party's electoral fortunes in Queensland. They are constantly polling at 30 per cent and they need something to prop them up. The people of Queensland will figure you out, Attorney-General.

I have heard all of these people over there talk about how this bill, which was brought before the House by the member for Mansfield, needs to have proper consultation. We have had proper consultation, because this bill reflects something that has been looked at twice already by this parliament.

Mr Power interjected.

Mr KRAUSE: It is not different, member for Logan; it is the culmination of both of those bills. In the first report we had a list of 16 submissions, including submissions from the Western Downs Regional Council, the Southern Downs Regional Council, Katter's Australian Party, the CCC, Brisbane City Council, Greg and Joyce Newton, the LGAQ, Professor Graham Moore and the list goes on. There were public hearings on 30 July, 5 August, 25 August, 31 August, 1 September, 2 September and 3 September. We consulted on this proposal. The members opposite have brought this in with 18 minutes notice in a sneaky attempt to prop up their electoral fortunes, and the people of Queensland will figure you out.

We should reject this. If compulsory preferential voting is going to be reintroduced into Queensland, the people of Queensland need to have a discussion about it just as they had a discussion about the proposal in this bill. When we were in office we put out a green paper on electoral reform and gave it to the people of Queensland to have their say. The decision was made to retain optional preferential voting because that is the system that people want. It gives people the ultimate freedom to preference as many people as they like or nobody if they choose to do so. This is an anti-democratic move, and all the members of this House—but particularly the crossbenchers—should reject this amendment in the House tonight.

Mr RICKUSS: I rise to make a brief contribution to this amendment and outline why it should be rejected. I just happen to have received, via some of my colleagues, a how-to-vote card for our previous Labor premier Anna Bligh. It says, 'Vote 1, Anna Bligh. Support Labor'. I would imagine that the current member for South Brisbane was on that campaign committee. This is just typical Labor shenanigans.

I had the misfortune of being in a returning office with Pauline Hanson recently. Pauline Hanson, who has been involved in politics for some 20 years, was totally confused by the preferential system. Pauline Hanson's party at one stage had 23 per cent of the vote in Queensland, so this is what this group wants to do—confuse somewhere in the vicinity of 20 per cent of Queenslanders by this sort of policy. Pauline Hanson did not understand optional preferential voting or preferential voting. She had stand-up arguments with the returning officer about preferential voting and how it was unfair because I was getting a vote that was No. 3 and she was No. 2. She was making crazy arguments about how preferential voting worked. She felt that a No. 2 was worth more than a No. 3 in the preferential system, and this is a person who was the leader of a political party and who has been around for that long.

As many of my colleagues have said, no consultation has been undertaken on the amendments. This really highlights how this government and the Premier who is leading this government have failed to consult with Queenslanders. This is a pointless amendment that is really about self-interest. I think it was Keating who said, 'Back a horse called self-interest because you know it's always trying.' This mob over here is trying to back something that will support them. I table this document.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Vote 1 Anna Bligh' [573].

What is more damning than 'Vote 1, Anna Bligh'? That is not confusing and that is what the people of Queensland expect. They can hate the option of having optional preferential voting or they can vote 1, and for years that is what the Labor Party supported. There has been no consultation on the other process. This is an absolute disgrace. I do not know how the Premier can show her face in this place and say that she is consulting with Queenslanders. I am astounded at the hypocrisy of this place. It is just totally, totally arrogant.

Mr COSTIGAN: I also rise to make a brief contribution in relation to this debate. It goes without saying that this amendment is an absurdity of the highest order, and a number of MPs on this side of the House have touched on that tonight for obvious reasons. I think the member for Gregory makes a good point, so let us go to the greens. What does it say here? 'No consultation has been undertaken on the amendments.' It has been fascinating to sit in this chamber tonight and hear from the Attorney-General, but where are the government MPs who are talking it up and backing the Attorney? Where is the consultation? I suspect they will have some explaining to do to their constituents in the days ahead.

All we have seen here is 18 minutes of madness. We see a desperate government looking to do anything and say anything to stay in power. The 'Red Army' has form. We have seen it before and we are seeing it again as it unfolds here in this chamber tonight. I have to say that the people of Queensland, no matter whether they live here in the big smoke or in the bush, from Coolangatta to the cape, deserve to be part—

A government member interjected.

Mr COSTIGAN: There are some places there that the Minister for Tourism should visit. The people of Queensland deserve—

A government member interjected.

Mr COSTIGAN: We will not be holding our breath, otherwise we would be in the hyperbaric chamber at Townsville Hospital. The people of Queensland deserve the opportunity to be part of this conversation. To wake up tomorrow morning and find out there is a new order when it comes to elections in Queensland is absolutely disgraceful. I appeal to the crossbenchers here tonight to see this for what it is. The people of the bush are looking to them—and of course Her Majesty's opposition—to tell this government to put this amendment 'where the sun don't shine'.

When I came into the chamber today, this was the last thing I expected. I think it was the last thing the people of Queensland expected. This is a dictatorial administration of the highest order that will do anything and say anything to stay in power. I think the Attorney-General is kidding herself here. I ask again: where are the government MPs backing up the Attorney-General on this one?

Mr MOLHOEK: I rise to speak against the amendments before the House. I find it amusing that in the explanatory notes there is the comment—

It is important that those candidates that are most preferred by the voters of Queensland should be elected.

If that were the case, we would not have a Labor government here tonight. As I recall, at the last election the LNP outpolled Labor by some 200,000 votes across Queensland.

What I want to know is: what does Labor have against regional Queensland? The people of regional Queensland deserve to have fair representation. We have heard all the nonsense over the past few weeks and months about gerrymanders, the Fitzgerald inquiry and all sorts of other allegations about integrity. What we have not heard about is fairness and people in regional Queensland getting a fair go.

I do not know if government members understand, but we have a lot of elected members in South-East Queensland. Yes, we have a large population in South-East Queensland, but South-East Queensland is dependent on the money that flows from mining royalties, agriculture and tourism right across the state of Queensland. I do not believe there has been a more important time, in the history of this parliament, to ensure regional Queensland has a fair voice in this parliament. Some may be critical of that.

There was some commentary in the local media the other day about the members representing the Gold Coast, but there are 10 of us. I reckon 10 of us can speak up pretty loudly and clearly for the needs and priorities of the Gold Coast. What we do not want to see is large portions of Queensland not fairly represented. I understand that this is the third time we have had a go at this, but we have done it because we believe in fairness. We have done it because we understand how important regional Queensland is to the Queensland economy and the prosperity and wellbeing of South-East Queensland.

I find it unbelievable that there are members on the other side of the House—from Townsville, Cairns, Central Queensland and down the coast to Mackay, Gladstone and some of those areas—who are prepared to institute a system whereby the rest of Queensland does not have a fair voice in this

parliament. They would rather support the centralist control we have seen under Labor. They stripped away health boards and have stripped away local autonomy. They would rather see that centralist control in Brisbane than give the rest of Queensland a fair go.

I will not be supporting this amendment. I refer to the hypocrisy we saw in relation to the legislation discussed last night. We have seen years of Labor just manipulating the system. They will do anything to hold on to power. They will change the system to suit themselves. We have seen that time and time again. I am just waiting for them to introduce an integrity bill and then suggest that we bring back lying in the parliament so they can get their mate Gordon Nuttall off again.

(Time expired)

Ms DAVIS: Can members imagine the hue and cry had we brought a bill of this nature into the House when we were in government? Can members imagine the member for South Brisbane standing on this side of the House pointing, screaming, waving her hands and telling us that there is no openness, no accountability and no transparency?

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Ms DAVIS: The member for South Brisbane would have been waving her arms and screeching across the chamber about how this was undemocratic and about how we were not consulting with Queenslanders. It was always an animated time when the member for South Brisbane got a bee in her bonnet. What we know is that this bill is all about the member for South Brisbane. The member for South Brisbane would have been absolutely mortified to see the outcome and flow of votes during the council elections. This amendment before the House is an amendment for the member for South Brisbane.

I remember 2001, because it was the first state election at which I handed out how-to-vote cards. I was at the Petrie School of Arts. At the Petrie School of Arts you could not move for A-frames carrying the words 'Just vote 1'. I remember very clearly at the end of the night—it was not a great outcome for the coalition at the Petrie School of Arts in 2001—how excited and animated the Labor Party members and Labor Party supporters were, because they had been so clever. Terry Mackenroth had been so clever to devise this 'Just vote 1' strategy. For them to come into the House this afternoon with this new view of life when it comes to preferential voting is absolutely astounding.

Anyone in this House who sat through the speech of the member for Mount Isa when he introduced this bill could not have been unmoved by it. As a member of parliament who represents the south-east corner—I can drive across my electorate in 10 minutes and anybody who wants to come and see me can make an appointment and do that—I was devastated to hear the words coming out of the mouth of the member for Mount Isa. He spoke about sleeping in his ute and being unable to get to schools, like we can. I truly believe that we need to ensure there is appropriate representation for those Queenslanders west of the Great Dividing Range.

Dr McVEIGH: This is my last day in this chamber as a member of the Legislative Assembly. I am, quite frankly, aggrieved. I am ashamed that our opposition would bring such an amendment to this parliament tonight. This government is opposed to regional Queensland and is simply trying to pull a sneaky one, as the member for Gregory said, at the eleventh hour, at five minutes to midnight.

Government members may think this is amusing and funny and it may make them smile—it apparently does right now—but I think we need to come back to the key issue that they are ignoring in terms of bringing up this distraction, this retribution, this act of simple self-interest. The key issue that has been discussed in this parliament today and earlier this year is about fair representation right across our great state. We all know that the topic outlined in this bill was covered very passionately by a whole range of members of this House, most particularly those members who represent the vast majority of the geographical region of this state: the members for Callide, Warrego, Southern Downs, Gregory, Nanango, Dalrymple and Cook. Most particularly, we heard that very passionate presentation by the member for Mount Isa.

This government just does not get it. It does not understand that consideration of the issues contained in this bill is well and truly in line with recommendations of the Fitzgerald inquiry. By bringing this amendment here with very little notice, it is in fact ignoring particularly regional Queensland but

also Queenslanders at large. It does not want to consult with those Queenslanders. It does not want to present this plan, this ridiculous amendment, to Queenslanders. It is about distraction. Most particularly it is about self-interest.

I ask the Premier and those members of her apparent working cabinet committee—as I understand it they are visiting Charters Towers perhaps even tomorrow, if my memory serves me correctly—to explain to the member for Dalrymple’s constituents in Charters Towers, the home town of the member for Mount Isa, why they are doing this. They should say to them that they are—apparently—consultative, open-book and transparent yet they are sneaking this through at the eleventh hour.

Mr CRAMP: I, too, rise to provide a brief contribution to the debate tonight. Having been in the parliament for just over one year, right from the beginning I have had so many people around Gaven and some of my former colleagues in the ambulance asking me what it is like to be a parliamentarian. I said that it is fantastic representing your community but that the parliament itself was a very steep learning curve. One thing I did tell them about being in parliament was that I could not be prouder to be a part of this LNP team which seems to be the only party—I used to say this at the time—that takes democracy seriously in this House, and today that statement could not be more true. Today we are seeing the Labor Party taking a sneaky, cheap grab at changing the democratic rights of the people of Queensland without any notice at all. With Labor’s actions—the very party that brought in optional preferential voting—it suddenly smelt a rotten opportunity to increase its dwindling stocks of primary votes and grab some of those votes back on the second, third, fourth, fifth or sixth preference from the Greens mainly in the city areas—the very party that is taking its votes from it.

Mr Crandon: Trade ‘em in!

Mr CRAMP: I take the interjection from the member for Coomera. With regard to the opening statement by the Attorney-General that this will decrease informal voting in an area like Gaven where you have a very large number of candidates—seven—this will only increase that. The mistakes with optional preferential voting were still high. By making people fill these out, those opposite are taking away people’s very democratic right not to vote for everybody at all. Some people do enjoy the democratic right to ‘just vote 1’ but, no, Labor will take that away as well. After a year, as I said, I could not be prouder in the LNP. We seem to be the only party that wants to uphold and continues to uphold democracy in this parliament. We were the only party at the last election that achieved over one million primary votes. Based on first past the post, Queenslanders overwhelmingly supported the LNP. The only way it seems the Labor Party will ever be in government will be to continue to steal the democratic rights of Queenslanders, as it is doing today.

Ms LEAHY: We hear a lot about arrogance from those on the other side of the House. The height of arrogance is these sorts of changes that are rushed in with no consultation with the people of Queensland. I ask those opposite: have you had the opportunity to discuss these changes with the people in your electorates? I have not had the opportunity to discuss them with the people in Roma, the people in Charleville, the people in St George, Thargomindah, Mungindi or any of those other communities such as Chinchilla or Miles or Jandowae. I have not had that opportunity and I dare say members opposite in this House have not consulted with their electorates either. It is the height of arrogance to rush through these sorts of changes and this sort of legislation. It is also rather disrespectful to the crossbenches in not allowing them the opportunity to consult with their electorates. They might like the opportunity to talk to their constituents but, no, they are being denied that opportunity in the way that this amendment is being handled.

Here we have one of the biggest Labor Party flip-flops that we have ever seen. In 1992 Labor wanted optional preferential voting, and it has ever since. Now what we have is that flip-flop. At two minutes to midnight when it wants to make a change, it rushes it in with 18 minutes for us to look at it with no opportunity for the people of Queensland to comment. It is interesting to note that the reason we heard that it wanted this change was to reduce informal voting.

I have something very interesting to say that might interest members of this House. There were a lot of people in my electorate who did not even get their ballot papers in the council elections. They did not get the opportunity to even have an informal vote because they never got their ballot papers. It is interesting to note that that is the reason behind rushing this through—to reduce informal ballots. We have some fundamental issues in our system because people in my electorate were denied even getting their ballot paper despite constantly being in touch with the Electoral Commission. I find it very interesting that there are some 20 members on this side of the House who have spoken in relation to this amendment but there has been one speaker from the other side of the House. Why are they not all speaking in support of these amendments?

Mr Costigan: Missing in action!

Ms LEAHY: I take that interjection from the member for Whitsunday: they are missing in action and asking one person on the other side of the House to carry it.

Mr MINNIKIN: I must admit that when you come to parliament you analyse and you listen and on this side of the chamber our ideological enemy is over there. Having said that, that does not mean that everything that is uttered all of the time is absolute dross. You listen and you analyse, but as an avid reader it is very poignant that in the last couple of days I have been reading a book by Mark Bahnisch, *Queensland: Everything You Ever Wanted to Know But Were Afraid to Ask*. I want to quote from that book because I think it is timely tonight given this debate, and I would be prepared to table a copy of the pages, not the entire book. Page 151 states—

... despite its minority share of parliamentary seats, suggests

that is, the ALP—

that there is no turning back the clock. Queenslanders were open to a change of government, and happy for a new administration to sweep the broom clean after a series of scandals and a perception of declining public service standards.

That was a condemnation of the way that the previous government ran and we paid the price, which is why when I speak tonight I speak from this side of the chamber. The book continues—

It also shows, however, that they were not happy for Joh's ghost to stalk the land again

...

It will make some members on the other side of the chamber happy to hear those words, but it says more. It says that society wanted more: it wanted policy characterised by openness, transparency and, above all else, accountability. The book continues—

If even KAP state leader Rob Katter can laud these values at a conference just after the election, then the modernisation project—
of Queensland—

has a momentum that may endure.

The bottom line is this: at the last election a lot was made about a lot of the economic issues but, just as importantly, it was also in relation to that whole notion that goes to the heart of politics—who do you trust? The people spoke, but tonight we have seen their actions—18 minutes. In my remaining 30 seconds I could paraphrase a lot of the great things that have been said already, but I will merely say this: I have a great deal of respect for the Attorney-General, but the way this is going this afternoon will certainly come back to haunt the ALP. It might not come back to haunt them after the noose is wrapped up by around about nine o'clock or 10 o'clock tomorrow, but this is very dangerous ground for the ALP to embark upon. It wants to make out that it is the doyens and the paragons of transparency and accountability and hope to espouse the ideals of Fitzgerald, which many members in committees talk about, but this is the wrong way to go about it.

Mr McEACHAN: This evening I rise to join with my colleagues to express my disappointment with this deceitful underhanded amendment. This is the ugly core of the Labor Party revealed—a party where the real ethos is not about the working people. Its real defining principle is power is its own reward. Labor will do and say anything to hold on to power. In moving this amendment, it pours scorn on its own representations of openness, consultation and accountability. I will not urge those opposite to reconsider their position. I have quickly learned as a new member in this House that my Labor opponents will not exercise integrity when power is at stake. They would just be amused at my naivety. Labor is adept at manipulating the electorate and the electoral process for its own empowerment. It is the hallmark of a party that lacks integrity, lacks real representation of its electorates and is itself manipulated by unelected union heavies and an unknown pervasive green agenda.

The manner of the introduction of this amendment is in keeping with the Labor that we have come to know. From last-minute motions to make it legal to lie to this House to protect Labor mates to retrospective laws to turn law-abiding Queenslanders into criminals, tonight, this Labor government has removed any doubt about its pedigree. It is there for all to see. It is an ill-tempered, ugly, mongrel cur. This cynical political move disrespects the people of the Redlands electorate, it disrespects the people of Queensland. I utterly reject this amendment and its ugly motivation.

Mr PERRETT: I rise as a new member of this parliament to make a contribution to this debate. I am disappointed that the Labor Party would make such a move without consulting Queensland.

I was part of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee that travelled around Queensland to consider bills that were before the House. I travelled with my colleagues opposite to Mount Isa, North Queensland and to some Aboriginal communities to seek the opinion of those people there on what they believed Queensland should do in respect of representation. Those people were glad to see the committee come to see them. They were pleased to have the opportunity to engage in the electoral process. This evening, I am disappointed that this government would consider introducing this amendment into this parliament without the proper consultative process. I call on the members opposite to give the people of Queensland the opportunity to be able to have their say with respect to this amendment.

I want to raise an issue relating to local government. I hope that the mover of these amendments will step forward and suggest what is going to happen in regard to local government. Does this amendment affect local government? Is the government going to leave one vote, one value for local government? Just recently, local government elections were held. The community was engaged in that process—and it was pleased to engage in it. In most of the local government areas across Queensland the majority of the candidates were elected on the basis of voting for just one person. Yes, some candidates saw some electoral advantage to be gained in working with others, doing deals and trying to get preferences, but in the main the majority of those candidates used the ‘vote 1’ principle as their preferred method.

I ask the Attorney-General whether she has consulted with the LGAQ with respect to this amendment. Will the Attorney-General go to all the local governments across Queensland and seek their view on this amendment? That is why I suggest that this amendment needs to go through the committee process. It is extremely important that that process be followed.

I also want to touch on the good governance process of this amendment. The Labor Party espouses plenty of views about transparency and consultation but, in terms of this amendment, there has been none. It is very important that this government goes back to the people of Queensland and puts this amendment through the committee process to be certain that it is getting the view it needs rather than just adopting a process in this parliament that is going to perhaps suit Labor at the next election.

Whether that situation plays out, who knows. But I suggest that it may backfire. Given that this amendment is such a monumental change to the voting system in Queensland, it could backfire on Labor. I am sure that the media reports in and around this amendment will typify what I am saying tonight and what the LNP is saying. I urge this parliament to vote against these amendments and make certain that they are not delivered in Queensland.

Mr SORENSEN: What a desperate move from a government in its death throes! To move an amendment such as this, it is really desperate. When the LNP members were in government the Labor opposition said to us, ‘You won’t be there next time.’ I can tell the members opposite that they will not be there next time. We will be back in government next time. I can prove that by the stupidity of this amendment.

Imagine what Peter Beattie would be thinking at this moment. He must be thinking, ‘What a bunch of clowns over there.’ On this piece of paper Anna Bligh says, ‘Just vote 1.’ What has changed since then? It is even written on green paper.

Mr Costigan: There’s an omen in that.

Mr SORENSEN: There is an omen in that; that is for sure. This amendment is really about the Greens vote. The member for Mount Coot-tha received 32 per cent.

Mr Costigan: Spectacular.

Mr SORENSEN: Spectacular. He has to rely on the Greens votes to make it across the line. What about the member South Brisbane? She is on 42 per cent. She would have been the one who recommended to vote 1.

It really gets up my nose having Bjelke-Petersen in the Hervey Bay electorate telling people to put the LNP last. Yet those members opposite have to take preferences from Clive Palmer and John Bjelke-Petersen to get across the line in some seats. I think that is a really good one! I still think it is funny that those guys opposite have to rely on Clive Palmer to win. I wonder what the deal was between Clive Palmer and those guys opposite. I really do. What was the deal done with One Nation to get those guys opposite across the line? The members opposite stand up in this place and bag Bjelke-Petersen, but they were willing to take his preferences at the last election.

This is just a desperate government with some desperate ideas. It is ridiculous to move an amendment such as this. It is unbelievable and the people will regard it that way as well.

Mr BOOTHMAN: I rise to make a short contribution and to express my disapproval with the amendment that the Attorney-General has moved here tonight. My electorate of Albert in the northern Gold Coast, along with the electorate of the member for Coomera, encompasses one of the fastest growing regions in Australia. The member for Coomera and I get around our electorates. We work our electorates. We get out there to see the vast majority of our residents. We have the ability to do that, because our electorates are quite small. I compare that situation to the electorate of Dalrymple. The chances of the member for Dalrymple going around to see each and every member of his constituency is almost impossible, if not impossible.

This legislation gives members the chance to consult with their constituents. I consulted heavily with people associated with RSL clubs and school P&Cs about electoral reform. I listened to their input. That allowed those people to say, 'This is what we think. This is what we believe.' For the government to come in here tonight and pull a swifty at the eleventh hour is absolutely, utterly disgraceful. Labor is just worried about its primary vote dropping and it wants to ensure that it gets every preference possible.

Mr Costigan: An insurance policy.

Mr BOOTHMAN: I take that interjection from the member for Whitsunday. Let us give our residents the choice to vote just for the person they know. They would not have a clue who the other individuals are on the how-to-vote cards. Why can we not give people the choice to vote for the person they know, the person they like, the person who has worked hard for them? I make the plea to this House to not take that right away for them. People want to just vote for one person or, if they so choose, to tick every box. I ask the members opposite to not take away that option.

Mr LAST: Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to the debate tonight. 'We are a government that listens. We are a government that consults.' How many times have we heard that in this place from those on the opposite side of the House? Yet tonight we have evidence of exactly the opposite. When the chips are down people revert to form. That is exactly what we have seen here tonight from the Labor Party. They have reverted to what they do best: deception, backs to the wall, a do-whatever-it-takes attitude to retain power, to retain their positions on that side of the House. This may well go down as the 18 minutes that sunk the government because if there is one thing that Queenslanders do not like it is being hoodwinked, being taken for granted and not being consulted.

Queenslanders are a proud bunch who take a particular interest in their politics. That is why the federal government has said already that Queensland is a key state in the upcoming federal election. We have a voting system that has served us well and to change this system with no consultation, without going around this vast state and listening to all our community groups and our residents, is nothing but a slap in the face for all Queenslanders.

What we have seen here tonight is a desperate attempt by a party that will do anything to retain power. We have a voting system that has served us well, a voting system that the public are comfortable with, a voting system that we should be retaining. This amendment seeks to change all that.

We are going through an electoral redistribution at the moment which will very likely change the entire state in terms of electoral boundaries. That in itself is causing a lot of discussion, a lot of anxiety, in particular in rural and regional areas and in areas such as the Burdekin where I am from. I oppose this amendment as proposed by the government and ask all members to vote it down.

Mr BENNETT: I was reflecting during the debate that it is ironic that everyone on the government side will have to change their maiden speeches and their stump speeches. Everyone spoke about how ramming legislation through was evil. Those opposite all stood up and gave us a thrashing about how the Labor Party was going to be different. They painted themselves into a corner. I say to those members opposite, when they are looking at their maiden and stump speeches, that they lied to the people of Queensland. Remember the last sitting week of parliament when the government rammed through vegetation management as an urgent bill and remember tonight and how disgraceful this will make us look in the eyes of Queenslanders.

We know that OPV is a simplification of the system that does increase participation. We have a good system which is a proven success and only requires a voter to vote for their first preference. I remind the House of the EARC process. Here we are tonight with a government, that promises so much and has delivered so little, taking that process apart. Queensland had the fourth highest informal vote and under the OPV system we have a good formal vote, with percentages of 1.9 per cent. Compare

that to Victoria, which has a full preferential system, of five per cent. Clearly we have statistics that do not support the government's attempt tonight to ram through a stealthy amendment that will cause us all grief.

We must maintain the option that voters can express who they want to vote for. I concur with the member for Albert: why are we forcing Queenslanders to vote for everyone, including those candidates they do not know or they may not want to vote for? There are many practical examples of an OPV system, including removing the need to decide the preferences distribution, lessening the need for electoral staff, not needing to re-educate our voters, making it easier for scrutineering and counting and saving voters' time. I think Queenslanders will respect the fact that we have a good system in place. They will not respect a disingenuous attempt to rewrite history here tonight.

If we are going to talk about electoral reform, at least give Queenslanders a chance to have their say in a full committee process. Even if those opposite want to do that in a shorter period, they should at least do the right thing and give Queenslanders a chance to debate this legislation. At least let us review all previous scrutineering that has gone on. There are many examples, Senate inquiries and other inquiries, about how this should be done. What is being proposed here tonight is not a good example for Queenslanders.

Mr WEIR: I rise to make a contribution to the debate tonight and oppose this amendment. There has been no chance for consultation, as has been reiterated by many of the members on this side of the chamber. This government has been long and loud about its inclusiveness, accountability and integrity, but I am afraid this amendment shows no sign of that. We have just had a major change to the voting system in this state: we have just gone to four-year terms. I was part of the Finance and Administration Committee that investigated that. People are very interested in their democracy. They take their vote very seriously. With optional preferential voting they have a right to exercise that right, whether they wish to vote 1 or fill out the whole card. That was reiterated all the way through the four-year term investigation.

A previous speaker in the debate made a comment about people not talking about extra politicians and that they are not really interested in the debate, but I can tell members that out my way they are. They take democracy very seriously. It is an issue that is raised with me on a nonstop basis. They are very interested in where the boundaries will be and what electorate they will be in. They value their vote very highly.

The council elections that we have just had have also been mentioned. If this was an issue there was an opportunity to exercise it in amongst the council elections. I did not hear any comment from the members opposite that this was under investigation or there was any thought about it whatsoever. I think after the council elections they may have started to discuss this issue because when one looks at the Brisbane City Council elections it is very apparent that the Greens vote is growing and the Labor vote is in danger. One good way to fix that is obviously to harness that Greens vote. This can be seen as nothing more than trying to do that.

This amendment has not been explained to this House, let alone to the voters of Queensland. We heard a brief one-minute explanation of why this needed to be moved tonight. That did nothing to convince me. The people of Queensland were not involved in that discussion. It is their vote. It needs to be raised with them. They need to have a chance to discuss it amongst themselves with their local members. The media always has a role to play. We have a committee system that could investigate it.

(Time expired)

Ms BATES: This is the most disingenuous act of corruption and bastardry that I have ever witnessed in this parliament in the almost eight years since I have been a member. Let us call this amendment exactly what it is: fear. It is so that the member for South Brisbane can get herself re-elected. It is so that the member for South Brisbane is still around after the next election. It is so the member for South Brisbane can stick around long enough to kill off a popular puppy of a premier. The member for South Brisbane cannot be the premier without a seat.

The Greens are frightening the Labor Party to death. All the reports in the media must be terrifying to the member for Ashgrove and all the members on the other side of this chamber who could not win on primary votes. Now more than ever they need those preferences from their Greens mates that they have done deals with to get themselves a front row seat and continue the smell of green leather up their nostrils.

Let us talk about my electorate of Mudgeeraba. For the last three elections Labor has not even been able to get close on a primary vote. Labor cannot get close to the primary vote even with Greens preferences. Labor could not get close to winning even in 2009 when the then Labor member, to get preferences, lied to the Family First party about how she voted in Peter Beattie's 'liar, liar' bill. People in Mudgeeraba are not stupid. People in Mudgeeraba will work out how desperate the Labor Party is to cling to the power that they won with the only one policy they had at the election—puppy farms.

We all know that the member for South Brisbane's only puppy policy is to dispatch the current Premier. We all know that the member for Woodridge has also not given up on his quest to be the Premier. In 2009 Labor could only muster 39 per cent of the vote. Then they turned around and lied to the electors in Mudgeeraba and sold off our assets. In 2012 people in Mudgeeraba were waiting with brickbats for Anna Bligh and the grand total of Labor's primary vote was 17.73 per cent in the electorate. In 2015 we had put the 'put the LNP last—number every square' clarion call. How did that work in Mudgeeraba? Labor polled a grand total of 26.66 per cent of the vote. That was all they could muster and that was with the PUP preferences against the LNP. It was with the Greens preferences against the LNP and it was with no preference deal with Family First and the LNP.

This amendment is another desperate move by the Labor government, which is hanging on to power by their fingernails. The people of Queensland will see through them. I will make sure that everyone in my electorate knows that it is the same old Labor that brought in the 'liar, liar' bill, sold our assets and now are so desperate that they would move this amendment with no consultation with anyone.

Sitting suspended from 6.30 pm to 7.30 pm.



Mr SEENEY (Callide—LNP) (7.30 pm): I move—

That the debate be now adjourned.

Division: Question put—That the debate be now adjourned.

AYES, 42:

LNP, 41—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, 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.

INDEPENDENT, 1—Pyne.

NOES, 44:

ALP, 41—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, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

INDEPENDENT, 1—Gordon.

Pair: Stewart, Boothman.

Resolved in the negative.



Mrs D'ATH (7.37 pm): I will be brief in my response to the debate on this amendment. I simply say that the comments made about credibility, disingenuousness and hypocrisy fit perfectly on that side. The bill that we are debating tonight was brought into the House on Tuesday by those opposite, without any consultation or advance notice whatsoever. They immediately put forward an urgency motion and sought that it be debated. In that urgency motion, they demanded that the bill be debated this afternoon. Yet here we are, 4½ hours after we started the debate, and they wanted to adjourn it. That is unbelievable.

I have heard the comments about the explanatory notes. I do note that under 'Consultation' the explanatory notes state, 'There has been no formal consultation on the Bill'. I also note that the explanatory notes I am reading from are to the Electoral (Improving Representation) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016, which was introduced by Ian Walker, the member for Mansfield. The amendment that the member is about to move also states that there has been no formal consultation on the amendments.

Members opposite say that they have not had the chance to consult their constituents on our amendments, but can they truly say that they have consulted their constituents before they introduced this bill on Tuesday morning? The bill is very different to what they introduced into this parliament last year. At that time, they suggested a committee be established to consider new seats, up to a certain number. Now they say, 'We want an absolute number of four new seats.' That is very different to what was in their first bill. To say there has been consultation on this is an absolute farce.

Let us have some honesty in this chamber. The fact is that we are debating and dealing with this now because those on the other side chose to introduce this bill. I ask that the chamber support the amendments I put forward.

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

AYES, 45:

ALP, 41—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, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 41:

LNP, 41—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, 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.

Pair: Stewart, Boothman.

Resolved in the affirmative.



Mr SPRINGBORG: Just prior to the vote on the amendments the Attorney-General made a number of assertions which were quite clearly incorrect. It was those assertions which led us to not support this in the first place. The Attorney-General sought to indicate that the substantive bill before the House had not been open to consultation in one form or another. The Attorney-General was extremely selective in what she said.

As we know, the bill before the House, to which there has just been amendments passed, was before a committee of this parliament either in its original form, as the Attorney-General said, or in the form of the Katter's Australian Party bill and indicated that there should be 93 seats in the Legislative Assembly. Both bills, whether it be the one that was introduced by the LNP or the one that was introduced by KAP, went through the parliamentary committee process. What we are debating tonight is a hybrid. All of the issues have been considered. The issue around 93 seats went through a parliamentary committee process. There was also proper deliberation around independent redistribution commissioners.

The reason we voted against the provisions that have just been inserted in this legislation is quite clear. I go back to what I said before the dinner break. Tony Fitzgerald made a recommendation that there should be optional preferential voting in Queensland. He similarly indicated that there should be a process where there is a seven-yearly review of the number of seats in the Queensland parliament.

There has been absolutely no committee deliberation whatsoever around the provision, which has just been supported by this parliament, that so profoundly shifts the framework of the Fitzgerald process and recommendations. That is, of course, optional preferential voting in Queensland. The reason the LNP cannot support this provision is that it has not been subject to proper deliberation unlike the two previous bills that form the hybrid genesis of what we are debating tonight.

This is an extraordinary thing for the government to have done. We attempted to adjourn the debate so that this matter could be referred to the appropriate committee of the parliament for report back on 31 July. Unfortunately, that process has been denied. Therefore, the LNP is unable to support this provision to reintroduce compulsory preferential voting without proper reference to a parliamentary committee and all Queenslanders having a chance to have their say.

Clause 6, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 7, as read, agreed to.

Clause 8—



Mr WALKER (7.46 pm): I move the following amendments—

1 Clause 8 (Amendment of s 6 (Establishment of Electoral Commission of Queensland etc.))

Page 7, lines 13 to 16—

omit, insert—

- (b) the Minister has given each party leader—
 - (i) written notice of the proposed appointment of the person; and
 - (ii) at least 14 days to consider whether to support the person's appointment; and
- (c) the person's appointment is supported—
 - (i) by each party leader; or
 - (ii) if a party leader does not support the appointment—by resolution of the Legislative Assembly.

2 Clause 8 (Amendment of s 6 (Establishment of Electoral Commission of Queensland etc.))

Page 7, after line 16—

insert—

- (8) If a person's appointment as the chairperson or a nonjudicial appointee is supported by resolution of the Legislative Assembly, subsection (7)(a)(ii) and (b) need not be complied with for the appointment.
- (9) In this section—
party leader means a member of the Legislative Assembly recognised as the leader of a political party represented in the Assembly.

I table the explanatory notes to my amendments.

Tabled paper: Electoral (Improving Representation) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016, explanatory notes to Mr Ian Walker's amendments [\[574\]](#).

These amendments are those that I mentioned in the second reading debate earlier tonight. They provide the mechanism for a deadlock should there be a deadlock in the appointment of the commissioners—that being that the issue is referred to this House should the party leaders not be able to agree on the appointment.

Mrs D'ATH: We will be voting against the amendments and clause 8 as amended and opposing clauses 9 and 10 as we do not support the changes proposed for the Electoral Redistribution Commission. They have thrown in this process. There has been no consideration as to where the process is currently at.

I heard the member for Mansfield say earlier that this is simply leading to a two-day delay. That is not accurate. It is not the case if this bill passes as it is, with clause 8 as amended and clauses 9 and 10 in place, that I can immediately put in place the new structure because the bill still has to be assented to.

I have to go through a process of identifying the additional appointees, putting them in writing to the leaders of all the political parties and giving them at least 14 days under the legislation to consider the appointments. If any one of them does not support them I then have to wait for parliament to come back and then put a motion to the House. The normal process would be that I would consult. I have actually forwarded—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, you will all have an opportunity to speak if you wish to. I wish to hear the Attorney-General.

Mrs D'ATH: I had already sent the names of our nominees for the Electoral Redistribution Commission to the opposition. If they support those names the Electoral Redistribution Commission—

Mr Bleijie: Two days ago.

Mrs D'ATH: Before they introduced this bill. If they support those appointees I can then draft the executive minute and immediately forward it to the Governor for approval and get the redistribution underway. If this amendment is passed it will absolutely lead to delays that will put in jeopardy the redistribution for this term.

Opposition members interjected.

Mrs D'ATH: Those who are yelling out saying, 'The election is not due till next year,' are very naive in what the redistribution process is. The redistribution process requires opening of submissions, collecting all of those submissions, considering them, putting out draft boundaries for further consideration, for further responses, and then putting out a further draft. It generally takes at least six to nine months.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, unless you are going to make reasonable interjections that can be heard—we can be here all night, so if you want to say something, wait until the Attorney-General has finished and then I will give you the call.

Mrs D'ATH: This process can take at least six to nine months. It is delayed already because of the local government election and the referendum. It is important that we get the Redistribution Commission in place so they can get out there and start consulting as soon as possible. These amendments will not allow that to happen. It requires me to wait for the bill to be assented so then I can act. I can write to the parties with the nominees, wait for their response for at least 14 days and then wait for the next sitting day if they do not like any of my nominees. That can lead to significant delays. That is not good for this state. It is not good for this state if that redistribution does not happen in this term.

Also, we have not heard the argument why this is justified in the first place. For a party that says they pride themselves on removing red tape, they have put in so many different levels to delay the process it is not funny, and they have not sought to justify that at all. For that reason, we will be opposing these amendments and we will be opposing clauses 8, 9 and 10 as they are in the bill.

Mr SPRINGBORG: It is quite wrong for the Attorney-General to claim that she or others have not heard why this is justified. Indeed, when a number of months ago the appropriately constituted parliamentary committee considered the original bill, which had exactly the same provisions as this, they considered and reported on this. This has been considered over several weeks and months by a parliamentary committee and it has also been considered by this parliament. The arguments then as reported on by that parliamentary committee are absolutely identical today because the provisions are absolutely identical. It is very unfortunate that the Attorney cannot read or understand that.

With regard to the Attorney-General's promise of consultation, the shadow Attorney-General rose in this place a couple of months ago and asked this Attorney-General would she consult on the current provisions with regard to the appointment of redistribution commissioners. It took this Attorney-General two months to come back to us on Tuesday of this week. The delay is on the part of the Attorney-General. It is on the part of no-one else.

If these amendments were to pass tonight, they are fair amendments because the parliament is supreme and the parliament has the opportunity to be able to break that deadlock. In a situation where agreement would not be able to be reached—the government would consult with the party leaders to start with, including the leader of KAP—they would come into the parliament and the parliament would decide. Surely it does not take that long to assent to a bill once passed. This parliament meets again in just over two weeks time. There is plenty of time for consultation. The Attorney-General has already compiled a list of potential redistribution commissioners, some of whom would have been circulated. There is ample time for consideration around this.

A failure to do this just goes to show that this government wants to treat this parliament with cavalier disregard and is not prepared to accept that this parliament is able to vote in an intelligible way to break a deadlock. If we cannot reach agreement over the next couple of weeks, we are back in this place towards the end of the second week of May. The redistribution has already been delayed because of the circumstances of the local government election and also matters of tidying up after the referendum. The redistribution is due to be completed by the end of this year. The election is due in early 2018, unless they know something else over there. There is plenty of time before this parliament resumes for this parliament to be respected and operate properly to be able to break that particular deadlock. It respects every member of this parliament and not just an internecine behind-closed-doors process that may suit the Attorney-General.

Mr NICHOLLS: This is yet another example of an Attorney-General who is not able to deliver for the people of Queensland. Her argument essentially against this is, 'It is all too hard. It will take too long. I cannot organise myself in order to be able to get nominees in place. I cannot organise to get them to the Leader of the Opposition. I cannot organise to resolve it in a sensible fashion.' She wants to vote it down simply because this is a disorganised Attorney-General. She cannot in any way, shape or form with all the resources of the department, with all the lawyers lined up behind her, with all the names of people who are out there who prequalify, arrange for that to happen in a timely fashion.

What she would prefer in fact is to have a deadlock. She would prefer to have a deadlock rather than get it resolved. She would prefer to play political games than to have a way forward that actually puts it to this House in an open, transparent and clear way. It calls for a resolution of this House in the way we resolve deadlocks in a committee, and no-one has ever complained about that. If you have a deadlock in a committee, you bring it back in here and you have a vote. That is too hard for this Attorney-General. It is too hard for her to be able to get the names that are necessary together, to get them across to the opposition, whoever that might be, and then to resolve it.

This argument is a bit like the schoolkid who says, 'I have not had enough time to get my assignment in. Can I have a couple of extra days, please?' That is the level of argument that the Attorney-General is putting forward to this House today as to why these amendments should not proceed. It is clearly a case that we need a mechanism to resolve a deadlock. It is clearly a case that there is justification for the two extra commissioners. There is no clear case that the Attorney-General has put forward to oppose these amendments, much as there was no clear case or the case she put forward for the previous amendment was completely spurious.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Coomera, did you want to speak to this? You did make comments, I understand, while the Attorney-General was speaking? Do you want the call?

Mr CRANDON: I am sorry, Mr Speaker. I did not hear you then.

Mr SPEAKER: If you do not want to speak, that is fine.

Mr WALKER: In responding to the Attorney's comments, there is nothing complex, bureaucratic or difficult about this provision. It does two things: it allows all parties in this parliament to approve the election redistribution commissioners and it provides a timely time frame, 14 days, within which they are to come to agreement. If not, the matter is referred to this House. It is hardly bureaucratic or lengthy. The point made by the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Clayfield is quite a simple one. The process which she promised would start consultation some months ago in an answer to a question from me in this parliament only started on Tuesday of this week. We have not lost any time. The idea that she cannot organise herself, give us some fresh names and keep this process going is an illusory one. It is an attempt to get away from a situation in which there is full transparency in the appointment of redistribution commissioners and to get away from the adding of skills to that team that are necessary if we are to do this redistribution in a proper and professional way for the people of Queensland. The provisions and the amendments that I have moved allow that to occur and should be supported.

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

AYES, 44:

LNP, 41—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, 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—Pyne.

NOES, 42:

ALP, 41—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, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 1—Gordon.

Pair: Stewart, Boothman.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Non-government amendments (Mr Walker) agreed to.

Division: Question put—That clause 8, as amended, be agreed to.

AYES, 43:

LNP, 41—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, 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, 43:

ALP, 41—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, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

Pair: Stewart, Boothman.

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

Mr SPEAKER: The reason I cast my vote with the noes is that of the record of the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Commission's inability to resolve important decisions since the election.

Resolved in the negative.

Clause 8, as amended, negatived.

Clauses 9 and 10—

Division: Question put—That clauses 9 and 10 stand part of the bill.

AYES, 43:

LNP, 41—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, 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, 43:

ALP, 41—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, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

Pair: Stewart, Boothman.

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

Resolved in the negative.

Clauses 9 and 10 negatived.

Clauses 11 and 12, as read, agreed to.

Clause 13—



Mrs D'ATH (8.07 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mrs D'ATH: I move the following amendment—

3 After clause 13

Page 9, after line 12—

insert—

13A Amendment of s 102 (Supply of ballot papers and electoral rolls)

Section 102(3), second dot point—

omit, insert—

- Indicate your preference for all the other candidates by numbering the other squares in your preferred order.

13B Amendment of s 122 (How electors must vote)

(1) Section 122(1)(b)—

omit, insert—

(b) otherwise—subsections (2) and (3).

(2) Section 122(2) and (3)—

omit, insert—

(2) An elector must vote by writing on a ballot paper—

(a) the number 1 in the square opposite the name of the candidate for whom the elector votes as the elector's first preference; and

(b) the numbers 2, 3 and so on in the squares opposite the names of all the other candidates to indicate the order of the elector's preferences for them.

(3) The numbers mentioned in subsection (2)(b) must be consecutive numbers, without the repetition of a number.

13C Amendment of s 123 (Formal and informal ballot papers)

- (1) Section 123(1)(a), 'intended preference or'—
omit.
- (2) Section 123(2)—
omit, insert—
 - (2) A ballot paper is taken to contain writing or marks that indicate the voter's intended order of preferences, even though the square opposite the name of 1 of the candidates has been left blank, if—
 - (a) the voter has written the numbers 1, 2, 3 and so on in all the squares opposite the candidates' names except for the blank square; and
 - (b) the numbers mentioned in paragraph (a) are consecutive numbers, without the repetition of a number.
 - (2A) A ballot paper mentioned in subsection (2) is taken to indicate that the candidate whose name is opposite the blank square is the voter's last preference.

13D Amendment of s 128 (Official counting of votes)

- (1) Section 128(7)(b) and (9)(b), 'that is not exhausted'—
omit.
- (2) Section 128(11), from 'transferring' to 'exhausted'—
omit, insert—
transferring a ballot paper to a continuing candidate

13E Amendment of s 183 (Lodging how-to-vote cards)

- Section 183—
insert—
- (3A) The reference in subsection (3)(b) to voting under this Act includes voting in the way required under section 122.

Amendment No. 3 introduces new provisions 13A, 13B, 13C, 13D and 13E. These are provisions that provide for compulsory preferential voting.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 13, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 14 to 20, as read, agreed to.

Third Reading



Mr WALKER (Mansfield—LNP) (8.09 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



Mr WALKER (Mansfield—LNP) (8.09 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.

MOTION

Suspension of Sessional Orders



Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (8.10 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That, notwithstanding anything contained in the sessional orders, the member for Toowoomba South be permitted to make a statement not exceeding 10 minutes.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.



Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the member to make a speech, I am pleased to acknowledge this evening in the gallery the Hon. Tom McVeigh, former member for Darling Downs and later the member for Groom, and his wife, Mrs Sandra McVeigh, who have joined us as the House farewells the member for Toowoomba South.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S STATEMENT

Valedictory



Dr McVEIGH (Toowoomba South—LNP) (8.11 pm): I acknowledge my wife, Anita, and my daughters Marita and Tessa. Mr Speaker, I do thank you because I rise in this chamber this evening for what will be my final speech as a member of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland. As members would be aware following a public statement last week, I will resign as the member for Toowoomba South effective 29 April 2016 in line with advice regarding process from the Clerk of the Parliament. This has been a difficult decision to reach. It flows on from my preselection as the LNP candidate for the federal seat of Groom at the upcoming federal election—a selection that I sought at the urging of many community leaders across the Toowoomba and Darling Downs region that makes up that electorate. It has been a tough decision, especially given that it means I now leave this place and under our democratic system a by-election will be called by the Premier in due course. I have made it crystal clear that should my bid for Groom be unsuccessful that would mark the end of my political career.

I am most appreciative of the public and private statements of congratulations and good wishes that I have received from members of both sides of this House, including the Premier, the opposition leader and crossbenchers, but I stress that the dynamic nature of local, state and federal politics in recent years confirms that no one of us should take anything for granted in politics and I certainly recognise the challenge before me. Having said all that, at the end of the day our role in this place is not about us as individuals; it is about the electorates, the communities that we have the privilege to represent. We are all here at the beckoning of those communities. We are all gifted with the opportunity to be here by those communities—whether we are members of a political party or Independent—and none of us should ever forget that reality.

As I outlined in my maiden speech, Toowoomba South is where my roots are and it is incumbent on me, therefore, to outline key issues within the electorate for the benefit of the House—issues that my successor, whoever that might be, I trust will continue to champion. Before I do that, let me firstly reflect on some experiences over the last four years. Among the greatest honours of my life has been to serve as the minister for agriculture, fisheries and forestry in the 54th Parliament. I learnt very quickly that if a government is to operate at its best it should not interfere with industry; it should get the settings right to encourage industry development, innovation and sound commercial activity. It was inspiring to work with industry leaders on issues as diverse as drought support and international trade development—which is essential for the future of our food and fibre industries—and I am a strong proponent of Northern Australian development where Western Australia, the Northern Territory and Queensland have so much to achieve if they work together.

I believe it is imperative that politicians immerse themselves in industry and community issues, particularly in regional areas. It is not good enough for us to say that there is little we can do until such a time as communities find unanimously supported solutions to their challenges. Getting in and rolling up your sleeves to participate and contribute to the debate is not without political risk, but as the late, great Graeme Acton of beef industry fame here in Queensland said to me very clearly, there are times when communities and/or industries cannot resolve issues in their own right and political representatives need to have the guts to step up and provide leadership.

In my shadow portfolio of science, information technology and innovation, I have been only too prepared to challenge government in areas such as information system failures that risk government procurement efficiency, identity security and potentially even child safety. At the same time though, I have been prepared to acknowledge government with support where appropriate and where warranted, and it has certainly been appropriate to work alongside the minister on issues of innovation and industry support that all of us, irrespective of our political persuasion, recognise as important for Queensland. In this regard, it is also appropriate to recognise the statements from both our Premier and the Prime Minister about the new economy that our country is embracing.

I also wish to make mention of the Education, Tourism and Small Business Committee that I had the privilege to be the deputy chair of in this 55th Parliament. This committee dealt with the all-important issue of education, the key industry of tourism, the economic powerhouse of small business in our state

as well as the Commonwealth Games. The linkages between such issues and in my case regional Queensland, agriculture, science and innovation cannot be ignored, and I urge the House to continue to leverage our shared expertise and perspective through the committee system.

In my maiden speech, I spoke of Toowoomba South as having significant features and issues within our own boundaries and yet a sense of shared responsibility for the broader region, given our catchment of Southern Queensland and Northern New South Wales. We have over 20 schools, 28 faith communities, 14 aged-care facilities, 16 shopping centres, 19 sporting complexes, one of Queensland's largest livestock selling centres, the iconic Picnic Point on the edge of the range and the East and West creeks that were the scene of flooding devastation in our city in 2011. I explained that Toowoomba was ready to play its part in rebuilding the Queensland economy and that we are willing to share the burden of challenges with the rest of the state but that we must not be left with more than our fair share of the costs.

Over four years later, I am proud to advise that we have achieved much in Toowoomba: the final funding agreement for the \$1.6 billion second range crossing; \$45 million inner-city ring-road construction incorporating significant flood mitigation; Warrego Highway works; significant road construction underpinning the new Toowoomba Enterprise Hub west of our city; significant capital works in schools throughout the city; and sporting and recreation facilities that I have been very proud to support. While the resource sector has scaled back, I am very thrilled about the export potential through our new airport.

I would like to acknowledge the community leaders, including our Mayor Paul Antonio, my good friend and our Indigenous elder, Uncle Darby McCarthy, and our various faith leaders. I acknowledge my electorate staff, including Rae Copeland, Daurae Fulton and Lacey McGuire, as well as my party supporters, particularly Cynthia Hardy, Roseanne Munns, Mike Curtin and others.

I thank you, Mr Speaker, the Clerk of the Parliament and most particularly the staff in this chamber and throughout the entire parliamentary precinct. I do not wish to linger on political observations in this speech but suffice to say I am concerned for the future and lack of policies in some places. Those issues are now over to you, the rest of the members of this House. I encourage you to continue—all of you—robust, respectful and challenging debate that will drive the best outcomes for our state.

As I did in my maiden speech, I again affirm my allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, particularly given that it is her 90th birthday. During my maiden speech I stood here as the minister for agriculture, fisheries and forestry. I take my seat after this valedictory as a shadow minister for science, information technology and innovation. Both roles have been an absolute honour, but the main privilege has been to be the member for Toowoomba South.

In closing, I ask you to grant me one last personal indulgence. I wish to put on record my admiration and thanks to my mother, Mary, to my father, Tom, who is in the chamber here tonight, and my parents-in-law, Cel and the late Kevin Phillips. Like all of us here, I most especially recognise the sacrifice and support of those closest to us, in my case, my children, Meghan, Kevin, Bridget, Annabelle and our two youngest, who are here tonight as I said, Marita and Tessa, and above all else, my best friend and my rock, my wife, Anita.

Mr SPEAKER: I apologise that I did not acknowledge your wife and your two daughters Tessa and Marita earlier.

RACING INTEGRITY BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 1355, on motion of Mr Byrne—

That the bill be now read a second time.



Mr WEIR (Condamine—LNP) (8.21 pm): I rise today to make a contribution to the Racing Integrity Bill 2015. My family has had a long association with the thoroughbred racing industry, with my grandfather being an owner trainer in the Oakey and Toowoomba districts and one of my uncles, John Coonan, a bookmaker for many years regularly attending race meetings in Toowoomba and the local area. My uncle Des Weir owned and raced horses trained by the late great Jim Atkins. As a child I

would attend the local race meetings sharing in the highs and lows that come with racing. I learnt to have a great appreciation for the racing industry, something that I still have to this day, unlike the Labor Party opposite. When the Palaszczuk government was elected the racing industry was filled with a sense of dread as the last time they held office they cut 240 country race meetings. Those fears were well founded.


The *Four Corners* program gave this Labor government the excuse to once again launch an attack on the racing industry. The program highlighted acts of cruelty in the form of live baiting in the greyhound racing industry within Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria. The actions of those involved needed to be addressed and stamped out. I think all in this House would agree. New South Wales and Victoria have taken measures to address the practices of cruelty in the greyhound industry. The Queensland Labor government, on the other hand, saw the opportunity to take a hatchet to the racing industry as a whole across all racing codes. There was a gross overreaction in Queensland not seen in the southern states, with the sacking of the entire board and a commission of inquiry established. This reaction was a particular concern in the seat of Condamine, which is home to one of the largest thoroughbred breeding industries in the state with well-known studs that are recognised and respected right down the eastern seaboard.

At the recent Gold Coast yearling sales, yearlings from the Condamine electorate grossed \$2.5 million. These studs are significant employers of local people from farriers to jockeys to veterinarian services to feed suppliers to strappers not to mention the approximate 70 trainers who operate in the Condamine electorate. The flow-on benefits to the wider community are also important with accommodation and food service providers, local business owners and fuel stations profiting from the racing industry.

Thoroughbred racing industry participants were extremely disappointed at the lack of consultation during the formation of this bill. This point was raised with the member for Currumbin and shadow racing minister, Jann Stuckey, during a roundtable discussion in Toowoomba. Given that the thoroughbred racing industry makes up approximately 80 per cent of the entire racing industry and no integrity issues were uncovered during the inquiry, the bill has been a massive disappointment to those involved in the industry. Considering the importance of thoroughbred racing to the Queensland economy, it would have been logical to include some input from representatives of the industry in discussions. Sadly, no meaningful consultation took place.

Condamine is home to racecourses at Oakey, Clifton, Bell and Dalby. The annual Dalby Picnic Races will be held next weekend, with over 3,000 expected to attend from all over Queensland. This event is over 100 years old and the Dalby Plough Inn Cup will be holding its 157th meeting later this year. The racing industry is a vital part of the economy in the electorate of Condamine. Racing in Condamine cannot afford to lose any of the current race dates or racing participants. However, the uncertainty that this Labor government has foisted upon the industry has once again made the country racing industry very worried.

Condamine has a long and proud history in the racing industry. There is a bronze statue in the centre of the Oakey township of the mighty Bernborough, who began his illustrious racing career in Oakey before becoming a racing legend forever etched in the racing history books. The racing community of Condamine and Queensland need certainty around their industry and this bill does nothing to appease people's fears. I will be opposing this bill.

 **Ms HOWARD** (Ipswich—ALP) (8.26 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Racing Integrity Bill 2015. Shortly after the Palaszczuk government was elected by the people of Queensland in January last year a scandal broke out in the greyhound racing industry, a scandal which required immediate attention, a scandal about the horrendous and inhumane practice of live baiting.

This government takes the issue of animal welfare very seriously. As an animal lover and supporter of animal rights, I was pleased to see the government act swiftly to establish the Queensland Greyhound Racing Industry Commission of Inquiry. I was also comforted by the speed with which the Queensland Police Service took action against those who were flouting the law and inflicting pain and suffering on animals in the name of their sport. The Queensland Police Service and RSPCA's joint Greyhound Racing Inquiry Task Force undertook considerable investigations under the relevant animal welfare legislation into all allegations of mistreatment. Those alleged to have taken part in acts of animal cruelty were thoroughly investigated and I understand many were brought before the courts. My own electorate of Ipswich was not immune to these acts of cruelty. In February this year one trainer pleaded

guilty before the Ipswich Magistrates Court to 15 counts of animal cruelty. This man was featured in the ABC *Four Corners* program last year, which turned a spotlight on the unimaginable activities in the greyhound racing industry.

Like many in Queensland, I was appalled by what I saw but I was also buoyed by the public's response to these outrageous acts. I was buoyed by the fact that this government did not stand by and ignore what had obviously been happening in the industry for years. We acted immediately to investigate the practices of the industry and to see what could be done to remedy transgressions. Naturally, I was also pleased to read the recommendations of the commission of inquiry when its report was handed down in June last year. These significant recommendations lay the foundation for the future structure and management of the industry after self-regulation clearly failed to prevent animal cruelty. This government took decisive action. We immediately accepted all recommendations and introduced the bill currently before the House in December last year. I commend the previous minister for racing and the current Minister for Racing for their staunch support to ensure this industry lifts its game. I also commend both ministers and the committee for the work undertaken to ensure community and industry consultation was extensive and inclusive. My standing down as chair of the committee was just prior to the referral of this bill. I would like to take this opportunity to commend the member for Logan, who stepped in as acting chair and executed the role extremely well.

This bill forms part of the broader racing industry reforms being introduced by this government across the spectrum of the industry. I understand the main focus of this bill before the House is the implementation of recommendations 1 to 3 of the commission of inquiry's report. The new frameworks proposed by the bill are necessary for the ongoing protection of animals involved in racing. We have a responsibility as sports lovers to ensure that any animals used for the purposes of our entertainment are treated fairly and humanely.

We all know there are many, many hundreds of people working in the racing industry for whom this bill is unnecessary—many, many hundreds of good people out there who love their animals and have worked hard to maintain the integrity of their sport. One thing that both *Four Corners* and the commission of inquiry found was that despite the good efforts of a number of people there are some bad operators out there, and existing animal welfare laws did nothing to prevent these people from performing horrible acts for commercial interests. Once enacted, the Racing Integrity Bill will provide certainty to participants in the industry about their requirements. It will also restore public confidence in the racing industry.

In response to the findings that self-regulation did not work in this industry, the bill will establish the Queensland Racing Integrity Commission, a separate independent authority to Racing Queensland, which will oversee integrity and animal welfare. The QRIC will have its own powers and functions separate from any government department, and this level of independence is crucial to ensure that animal welfare is removed from the business operations of the racing industry. It is evident that a conflict can occur when compliance relating to the integrity of animal welfare and commercial interests are combined. The newly created commission will eliminate any potential conflict between commercial interests and the interests of animals. The standards, which will be set by the QRIC, are for the good management of the code of racing in the context of welfare and integrity. In the case of welfare, these standards will address certain risks associated with racing and ensure that an acceptable level of safety is provided for animals racing throughout Queensland.

It is envisaged that over time the QRIC will make standards for integrity and welfare matters. Naturally, to do this the commission will need to work with Racing Queensland and venues and individual clubs, vets and anyone involved in the racing industry to ensure these standards are sustainable and practical. I am also assured that some of the reforms being introduced will be reviewed after 12 months to assess their impact on animal welfare. This is good news for the industry. This review means that the government has not only consulted on the development of the reforms but is prepared to listen to the industry after 12 months of implementation. This review is good public policy.

By taking these actions the government will restore public confidence in the racing industry. We have ensured that high standards of animal welfare are at the top of our agenda. We listened to the public outcry last year and we took action. This bill forms part of the broader racing industry reforms being introduced by this government across the spectrum of the industry. This government is not only committed to maintaining public confidence in the racing industry in Queensland but it is also committed to the thousands of jobs and careers the racing industry provides.

In my own electorate of Ipswich the Ipswich Turf Club provides employment opportunities for my constituents in hospitality, racing and gaming, groundskeeping and event management. I recently met with the chairman of the Ipswich Turf Club board, Wayne Patch, and the CEO, Brett Kitching, to listen to some of their concerns and to talk about the work they are doing in their industry and for the community. They have some great plans for their club and the future of racing in Ipswich. The Ipswich Turf Club is the predominant midweek race club in Queensland and this year its signature event, the Ipswich Cup, celebrates its 150th year. We are looking forward to welcoming the member for Gladstone's horse Honey Toast, and hopefully some of my colleagues will be in attendance as well. This is a great milestone for a country race club. They worked hard to build this race meet up to be one of the best in regional Queensland. I commend them for their efforts, and I look forward to attending the cup race day on 18 June. There will be other significant events to commemorate the 150th birthday.

This government is determined to ensure that racing in Queensland has the confidence of the public and has integrity in terms of the management and welfare of all animals. For these reasons I am proud to support the Racing Integrity Bill 2015.



Mr CRAMP (Gaven—LNP) (8.33 pm): I rise tonight to speak on the Racing Integrity Bill 2015. The objectives of this bill are to establish a new Queensland Racing Integrity Commission responsible for the management of animal welfare and integrity matters within the racing industry; amend the Racing Act 2002 to reform the structure of the Queensland All Codes Racing Industry Board, including renaming the board as the Racing Queensland Board and dissolve the three individual racing code boards, the Racing Animal Welfare Integrity Board and the Racing Disciplinary Board; and amend the Animal Care and Protection Act 2001 to provide improved information-sharing capacity and broaden authorised officers' powers to investigate and respond to animal welfare matters and breaches of the act that relate to the racing industry.

Integrity in any industry, especially in sport and racing, should always be encouraged and improved upon wherever possible. There is also no doubt that cruelty to animals should never be accepted, and those who perpetrate such actions should be prosecuted to the full extent of the law. What is not acceptable is the way that this Labor government has hijacked an issue involving the disgusting actions of some terrible individuals in the greyhound racing industry and utilised that as some sort of feeble excuse to rip apart every racing code in Queensland. Yes, the cruelty that we saw via the internet and media outlets was disgusting and unacceptable, and without a doubt the persons responsible for those actions should be removed from the racing industry and prosecuted. The greyhound industry is in total agreement with that, but countless honest, hardworking and responsible participants in each of the three racing codes—thoroughbreds, harness and greyhounds—certainly did not deserve to have this Labor government tar them with the same brush and have their livelihoods ripped apart. I am not simply talking about dog or horse owners: I am speaking about the stablehands, the staff at racing venues including hospitality workers, cleaners and gardeners, and of course the thousands of workers in associated industries throughout Queensland who rely on a flourishing and successful racing industry.

On an initial view of this issue you could simply assume that this is another knee-jerk reaction that can destroy an entire industry—something that Labor seems to be good at—like when its federal counterparts destroyed the live cattle export trade overnight. Unfortunately, this is not the case. With the smoke and mirrors tactics that this Labor government are utilising on this issue, you can only conclude that Labor would have used any excuse to rip apart this industry. In fact, since this whole sham of an exercise commenced Labor have done nothing but stumbled and fumbled from one mistake and cover-up to the next, regardless of which inept minister had the portfolio.

In June 2015 the previous Labor minister for racing, Minister Byrne, stated there were dramatic cost blowouts in racing; however, he could not produce any real figures used to determine these alleged cost blowouts. With dramatic losses and no money in the kitty, how could Labor still afford to pay an interim chair a fee which is suggested to be around \$20,000 per week? Now the current minister says that she has a few million set aside for the extra costs of the integrity commission. Despite being asked numerous times to provide the costs of the new integrity commission Minister Grace failed to do so until last night, when it was revealed that it will cost in excess of \$24 million. There is still no real idea on what the new model looks like.

For the past 12 months I have had the good fortune to speak with numerous participants from each of the three codes. Over and over again I heard that the shadow minister for racing, the member for Currumbin, is the only one listening to their concerns and that only the LNP holds the future of racing in Queensland in true regard. I have also been told that Labor has systematically destroyed the

patience, goodwill and reputation of racing in Queensland. During this time the LNP has spoken with, and listened to, trainers, breeders, bookmakers and jockeys to hear their concerns over a spate of bad decisions and sloppy governance since Labor took the reins of Queensland racing.


Queensland's racing industry has suffered one controversy after another under Labor, with serious questions hanging over Minister Grace regarding the appointment of board members to Racing Queensland. As rightly noted by the shadow minister, the member for Currumbin, the Palaszczuk Labor government has stripped Queensland racing of a functioning board and funding for race meets and prize money, leaving everyone from jockeys to bookies fearing for their future. I have to take this opportunity to say how impressed I was listening to former leading jockey and now trainer Chris Munce speak at one of the round tables of the dangers and dedication of jockeys around Queensland, many of whom make very little from this sport they love but they do it regardless. Thanks to Labor they are now cutting their payments and they will earn even less, making them the lowest paid jockeys in Australia.

You may ask why I would take such an interest in this particular issue. I noted before the countless industries that rely on a healthy racing industry across all three codes in Queensland, and the Gaven electorate is no exception. With some fantastic horse studs in the beautiful hinterland area of the electorate, Labor's decimation of the Queensland racing industry will no doubt have an effect on many of the constituents in my area. I do not doubt that my concerns will be shared by many others, at least on this side of the chamber, for the racing and associated industries in their respective electorates.

The industry, from Coolangatta to Cooktown and out west, has raised concerns about the proposed structure of the new board in that it lacks proper racing representation. It seems that its fears have been realised already with the interim board announcements. There are very serious questions hanging over the minister's hand-picked appointments of board members to Racing Queensland. After the first chairperson of the board was forced to resign, we now have fresh claims of nepotism regarding the minister's business relationship with the new chair. How is it that the Labor government can question the integrity and accountability of all racing codes when Labor's own integrity is on shaky ground? A darker cloud now hangs over appointing members to the Queensland Racing board.

The parliamentary committee could not agree that this bill should be passed. Neither does the LNP think it should be passed. The Agriculture and Environment Committee report is scathing in its comments about a lack of industry consultation and a lack of costs for the new integrity commission, stating it breached the Legislative Standards Act. This display of Labor arrogance and disregard for the law reveals further that those opposite do not care how much damage they inflict on this proud industry; they intend to bring it to its knees.

The racing industry deserves to be properly listened to and consulted with, as right now most of the industry does not believe a single word this government, this minister or the previous minister says. After 14 months of turmoil under Labor, this is the last thing the industry needs. At no stage has Labor had a valid plan for racing, but it certainly has an agenda. That is why this bill should be voted down.

 **Mr POWER** (Logan—ALP) (8.41 pm): It seems that those opposite know the cost of everything but the value of nothing when it comes to racing, especially the integrity of racing. I am a grandson of Jack Power, always known as 'Tot', who unusually trained both greyhounds and horses at the same time. One of my earliest memories as a three- or four-year-old is of being scared by the thoroughbreds and standing in the shed to reach up and pat the backs of the dogs as they milled around me. The one physical heirloom I have from my grandfather is a small silver plate that he won in a race with a dog called The Shearer.

All of us in this House value the racing industry. We on this side have looked at the evidence. We have taken a conservative approach: integrity first for the security of the industry. I hope that those involved in the racing industry, even those who appeared before the committee with a contrary opinion, respect the fact that we wish to ensure the long-term security and longevity of the industry.

I will speak only briefly tonight as the hour is late. I wish that I did not have to address the speech made earlier by the member for Currumbin, but with regret I have to note that I was accused—unfairly, I think—of 'intimidating well-meaning witnesses'. I do not believe that this is in the least bit accurate. Frankly, I am disappointed by the actions of the member for Currumbin. I will not dignify them by going through them detail by detail. Suffice it to say, they are untrue and I ask that they be withdrawn.

When we make outlandish accusations in this place, we diminish the very value of those words. I remain extremely disappointed in the speech made by the member for Currumbin and utterly refute the content of both the personal attacks and the position of the bill, but I will not dignify it further. I commend the bill to the House.



Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (8.43 pm): I have great news for the racing industry apprentices on the other side of this House, particularly for the newly minted minister, who has been gladhanding around all the tracks across Queensland as best she can—smiling, telling me and other people how much she knows about betting, backing Honey Toast and Prince of Penzance because of the sisterhood and all of these other matters. The great news is that not one thoroughbred has been implicated in the live-baiting fiasco. They have not chased one little black pig, one possum or one chook.

The bottom line is: this bill before the House is the result of the greyhound industry and its disgusting behaviour in relation to live baiting, which all members in this House would say is totally unacceptable. What did the Labor Party do? With a very small minority—I think a couple of thousand participants in the greyhound industry—they took a sledgehammer to smash a walnut in terms of bashing up on the thoroughbred industry. As the minister may or may not know, the thoroughbred industry makes up about 80 per cent of the racing industry in Queensland. It boasts some 30,000 participants. In years gone by it has been served by such luminary racing ministers as Gibbs, Schwarten, Lawlor and Rose. I had forgotten that brilliant light of the racing industry that was Merri Rose! I am particularly aware that the member for Rockhampton was pleased to leave the industry, because there are more politics in the racing industry than will ever be seen in this House. I can assure the minister that, in spite of them smiling and so on, they draw their knives to make sure the minister keeps going in the right direction.

What we have here is a government determined to bash up on the thoroughbred industry for a small bit of bad behaviour by the greyhound industry. This legislation seeks to create for the racing industry a board comprising seven members, four of whom have no idea about racing—this is brilliant stuff—and one each from the other codes, that is, two minor codes and the thoroughbred code. Tonight I speak from the thoroughbred industry's perspective because I do have a reasonable knowledge and a long, 50-year involvement in the industry. The clever Labor Party people seek to put in place a board of which 14 per cent are knowledgeable in the thoroughbred industry. That is really a genius move by the minister. A code that makes up 80 per cent of the racing industry gets 14 per cent of the representation. It sounds like a great old Labor Party stack to me in terms of setting a future direction.

It was the greyhound racing industry that caused this major problem such that we had to sack all the boards of thoroughbreds and start again. There was a cost to industry of a squillion dollars by putting in place this consultant who was going to be paid \$20,000 a week or whatever. There was a guy who was in charge—the steward of the greyhound industry—to stop this live-baiting fiasco. He was supposed to make sure greyhounds were run in a proper manner, not offensive to the greater public. I acknowledge that the member for Rockhampton has just come into the chamber; it is lovely to see him. The steward in charge of greyhounds—the steward is the 'policeman', for the benefit of the apprentices on the other side of the House—was supposed to hold the greyhound industry to account in terms of its behaviour. That 'policeman' was a fellow called Jamie Dart. Because the greyhound industry was so disgusting and so warped, we promoted him to be the head of integrity for all of the codes. There is logic there, but the minister will have to explain it to me in her speech in reply to the debate. In other words, the guy who was in charge of protecting the greyhound industry from that disgusting behaviour was promoted to oversee all codes—thoroughbreds, trotting and greyhounds—because of his successful work in policing the greyhound industry! This is the government that we are supposed to believe likes the thoroughbred industry.

What is even worse, they are moving along in this particular bill to say, 'We are sending all these tests over to the department of agriculture. We will keep it separate from the racing industry.' The minister would know how difficult it is to get any results out of another government department on time, without cost and so on. The worst thing in government is dealing between government departments. No-one who has been a minister would deny that.

Ms Grace: It is coming back, Ray.


Mr STEVENS: That is not what is in the explanatory notes. That will be moved again. I am glad the minister has taken my advice on that matter. She must have pre-empted what I was going to say.

Besides that, the minister has decided that it does not matter what it costs: the wonderful Treasurer will fund the whole thing and it will not cost the racing industry a dime. That is not going to last because governments—and it has been proven over many years—have a mentality that says that the racing industry is a rich man's sport and it should support itself. Unfortunately, that is the bad Labor view that it has taken for many years when it is a sport, a passion and a hobby for many Queenslanders. I can assure you that we actually lose money on supporting our sport! The government is happy to put millions and millions into the Broncos in stadiums, millions into netball and millions into all other matters surrounding sport.

This is a sport followed by many participants directly getting paid—and we acknowledge that it might be around the 30,000 figure—but there are literally hundreds of thousands of everyday punters and everyday people out there following the racing industry and they are sick and tired of the Labor Party coming in and either mucking it up itself or paying a guy like Bob Bentley to muck it up for it. With regard to racing integrity, step 1 on the Bob Bentley trail was that we got him back again, and those opposite said that politically it was wonderful for them. I thank the good Labor Party for that, but I can assure them that wherever I go—and I have been to the trots, dogs and racing—they absolutely hated the former chairman of Queensland Racing that Mr Schwarten flicked everything over to in Mr Bob Bentley, and that was a major part of the vote that transferred to the LNP in winning the 2012 election. Mr Bentley obviously moved off, but they have replaced him with a couple of ministers who believe that they might know something about racing. I do not know what the previous minister felt he knew about racing, but I am sure he was glad to see a new minister get hold of the chalice.

The fact is that this government ignores all the time that this is the lifeblood for country and regional communities. It is their social interaction. In some cases it is the only time they meet up. At Oak Park for instance, they take their two weeks holidays and that is their outing for the year. I can assure members that what we will get with only that 14 per cent representation will be demands on the thoroughbred industry that will put country racing out of business and back again in the dark old Bentley days. Under the LNP we were going forward and country racing was booming. When the minister goes around those country areas, she just has to ask people how they feel about country racing. I can tell the minister the people to talk to because I know them all well. They might smile at the minister and tell her whatever she knows, but it was going very well. Country people were enjoying it, regional people were enjoying it and there was a philosophy that racing in Queensland could again compete nationally against a cashed-up Victoria and a cashed-up New South Wales and we were going in the right direction.

What is this government doing? It is putting the brakes on that and smashing it to pieces with the biggest sledgehammer it could find and putting in place all of these odd-bod stupid committees contained in this ridiculous legislation we have to vote on here tonight and saying, 'We don't like racing people.' I will tell members how much those opposite do not even like racing, and Terry Mackenroth could give them some great advice: this year the Melbourne Cup—and Terry Mackenroth tried it once—is a parliamentary sitting date. That is how ignorant those opposite are—that is, that all members cannot share Melbourne Cup day with their communities because we will be in the House because those opposite do not care about racing.

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (8.53 pm): I rise to speak against the Racing Integrity Bill. I want to follow on from the member for Mermaid Beach and say how true it is in the difference of governments to understand who likes racing and who does not like racing. In terms of Melbourne Cup day for country racing, is there a better race day than the Kumbia race day on Melbourne Cup day? When we were in government the entire cabinet went to Kumbia on Melbourne Cup day and it was a fabulous day. The reason it was so fabulous was because we as the LNP government reinstated country racing codes after the debacle that was the Labor government. Instead, we now have a Labor government in Queensland that has put a parliamentary sitting day on the one sacred day for country racing—Melbourne Cup. I say this to the Kumbia Race Club: unfortunately I will not be able to attend the races as I always do when I sponsor a table or sponsor a prize. I will obviously still be doing that sponsoring, but it is just ridiculous that I will not be able to attend.

This bill was reviewed by the Agriculture and Environment Committee and the members of that committee could not agree that this bill should be passed. At this juncture I want to congratulate and thank the shadow minister for racing, the member for Currumbin, for her hard work all around the state in alerting this issue to the people of Queensland. Through this bill Labor wants to establish a new Racing Integrity Commission, dissolving all of the existing arrangements and separating the integrity functions of Racing Queensland from commercial operations into a new separate body. The estimated cost is said to be somewhere between \$16 million and \$20 million per year. However, these costs have not been clarified. The committee noted that this breached section 23 of the Legislative Standards Act and the fact that the explanatory notes do not provide an assessment of the costs to government of implementing this bill is completely unacceptable.

An opposition member: It's a breach.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: It is a breach; I take that interjection. The bill also proposes to implement a new seven-member board, with only three industry members and four independent members. This deliberately shifts the power of the board away from the people who know about the industry, the people who are passionate about the industry. Over the past 18 months I have been watching this issue with

massive interest. I have seen the three codes be completely attacked off the back of the greyhound scandal. On 29 February in a Radio 4TAB interview the racing minister of Queensland attacked all three codes by accusing them of having serious integrity issues. She said—

You will now have an integrity commissioner if this bill becomes law, of the absolute highest quality you could ever imagine driving the integrity in an industry that is facing very big integrity issues. Not just in greyhounds, but I get the weekly reports and there's integrity issues across the three codes, and our message is very clear. We will be having a very good look at integrity in the racing industry ...

I am happy to table the remainder of that quote from the radio because it is clear that it sets out that the minister is attacking all three codes.

Tabled paper: Extract of transcript of Radio 4TAB interview on 29 February 2016 [575].

Ms Grace: I'm stating a fact.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I take the interjection from the minister, who is saying that there are issues of integrity, for example, in the thoroughbred industry, and that is why we are here tonight so passionate about this industry. I have loved country racing. It is one of the main issues that I campaigned on in 2011 and 2012. When I took on the role as local member one of my priorities was to support the rebuilding of country racing and it was wonderful to feel that positivity and excitement back in the sector. My electorate has so many country race meetings. I have already talked about Kumbia. Kilcoy has the great Anzac Day meet on this Sunday. Esk has its meet on 7 May. The Nanango and Burrandowan Picnic Races are on the same day as the Crows Nest show which is the following Saturday. These are all run by dedicated volunteers who do a superb job. I should also mention the two little race clubs that are Bell and Wondai, because the Wondai Digger Club has its race meeting on this coming Monday.

Sadly, since the Labor government was elected all I have seen is the return of concern, angst and worry amongst this wonderful industry. We have seen an industry that feels so worried about its future that it has had to form a new group—the Queensland Racing Unity Group. This group has held countless meetings and rallies and it is fighting tooth and nail to save its industry. The group is ably led by Mr Ian McCauley and Mr Con Searle, both constituents of the Nanango electorate. I am proud to have such dedicated, committed and passionate people representing the concerns of the racing sector and I want to publicly congratulate them for how hard they and their group have worked to establish the Queensland Racing Unity Group to bring together the industry to fight various attacks by this government.

The member for Mermaid Beach in his speech talked about the politics in the racing industry. Over Christmas that group whom I just talked about held their rally at Doomben. That rally was incredible. All three codes were at that rally. It was wonderful to see the unity of those codes in rallying against these changes that this Labor government is planning to introduce. One of the flyers that this group sent out states, 'Why does the Queensland government hate the racing industry?' This group has used the strong word 'hate' because that reflects how strongly it feels. They have asked us not to support this bill, because it was drafted without any consultation with the greyhound, harness or thoroughbred racing sectors. They have asked us not to support this bill, because it gives extraordinary policing powers to the proposed commission's own laws with individuals and entities subject to adverse findings denied access to common law. They have asked us not to support this bill, because the cost of the commission's functions is to be funded mainly by the racing industry. They have asked us not to support this bill, because it removes racing participants from the operational control over their own industry.

I have also received correspondence from the Somerset Regional Council, which specifically wrote to me about this bill. The Somerset Regional Council felt so strongly that this bill must be voted down that it spoke about it at its general meeting on 10 February. Councillor Bob Whalley noted the following—

As a councillor with a keen interest in growing our economy which in turn strengthens the social fabric of our Somerset region, I feel compelled to speak out.

Our region is home to thousands of horses, standard bred pacers, thoroughbred gallopers and greyhound dogs whose owners and trainers, service providers, feed suppliers and local farmers will be directly affected by the merit, or lack of merit, of the Queensland Racing Integrity Bill.

The Bill in its present form must be defeated. The Bill provides for a lopsided seven member board and an independent chairman who do not have any industry experience! Legislation does not allow for the separation of the three codes, but if this Bill is passed it will kill off separation altogether, and this will have dire consequences for all racing codes, in turn affecting the region enormously.


The proposers of the Bill are very mischievous in their approach, saying a vote against the Bill is a vote against integrity, but the devil is in the detail. We all want integrity for each code, but this Bill needs to be amended, revised or thrown out! The present proposal is fundamentally wrong and will be detrimental to the codes and the lion's share of the stakeholders do not want it!

Governments are elected to represent the people, consult—

and we have seen in the House tonight that this government does not do that—

and make the fairest decision possible in the interest of the people involved. I ask, is the Palaszczuk government really listening and representing the best interests of the racing codes? I think not!

I do not think that anyone can sum up this legislation better than Councillor Bob Whalley. The racing industry does not deserve this sort of treatment. This bill is not the result of consultation with the industry. This bill has shattered the confidence of the racing industry and must not be allowed to be passed.

 **Mr BROWN** (Capalaba—ALP) (9.03 pm): It is appropriate that I follow the member for Nanango, because in the dying days of the Bligh government I went to the Nanango races. The member for Beaudesert said that it was completely destroyed. I went to Nanango and drove past the street stalls in the bus. I went to the Nanango races and saw that it was alive and well. On that day I even got the chance to meet the member for Southern Downs. We had an interesting conversation about Campbell Newman. I will not detail his thoughts but, obviously, it all came to fruition. Those races were alive and well.

We should not be fighting about racing. No side should own racing. Both sides of parliament enjoy it. Both sides of parliament support it. We should be coming together and supporting this bill.

Many in this place may not know, but my electorate is home to the Southern Hemisphere's longest straight greyhound track, hosted by the Capalaba Greyhound Racing Club. It is a real bucket list place for punters. I recommend to everyone that they go there one Saturday. The club has gone through some tough years. Recently, it was wiped out by two floods. But the club has recovered and rebuilt and also has established new and better management and financial control processes.


Bob and Leanne are doing a great job in getting this Capalaba institution back on its feet and building its sustainability and resilience. Bob and Leanne have had their battles, and not just against the elements. I know their club well and I know that one of the things that they prioritise is the welfare of the animals that race at their club.

The Racing Integrity Bill 2015 will establish a new Queensland Racing Integrity Commission for the management of animal welfare and the integrity matters within the racing industry. That commission will ensure that the wrongdoers in the industry are identified early and dealt with in a just way. It will mean that the Capalaba Greyhound Racing Club will be part of a cleaner industry and that it will avoid unfair negative perceptions that were the results of the actions of others outside of its control.

Over the past 24 months the Capalaba Greyhound Racing Club has had its battles—not just with the elements and getting financial and management matters under control but Bob and Leanne have expressed to me their feeling of frustration and anger in their dealings with Racing Queensland. I am confident that this bill will provide a proper avenue for complaint resolution that is more accessible so that clubs such as the Capalaba Greyhound Racing Club will more realistically be able to avail itself of that process. Previously, clubs like the Capalaba Greyhound Racing Club felt that they had no other avenue beyond Racing Queensland other than costly and lengthy court and legal processes.

The proposal for a new power for officers to investigate and respond to animal welfare matters in the industry has caused some concerns for greyhound trainers and owners, particularly the new entry and inspection powers. However, it is apparent that these powers balance the need to respond to community concerns with the need to protect the individual rights of owners and trainers in this industry. The community rightly expects the highest standards of care and welfare for animals involved in racing and I am confident that this bill strikes the right balance.

The new management provisions in the bill are based on the recommendations of the commission of inquiry and will restore public confidence in the industry and ensure the continued viability of clubs such as the Capalaba Greyhound Racing Club. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Ms LEAHY** (Warrego—LNP) (9.07 pm): I rise to speak to the Racing Integrity Bill 2015. Before I go into detail about this bill, I want to commend and thank the shadow minister for racing, Jann Stuckey, for her work with the racing industry and for travelling the state to listen to the industry and the stakeholders. The racing industry is one of the most important industries in Queensland. It is a major employer across the state.

I note in Lawrie Facer's submission to the Agriculture and Environment Committee he stated the following—

The Queensland racing industry is the third or fourth largest employer in the state. It is not unreasonable to estimate that it provides direct and indirect employment to 50 000 people.

That is why I thought the government would have a strong desire to present credible and concise reforms that address fully the issues that provide confidence and integrity to the industry and country racing across the state. In previous years the racing industry has been subject to a succession of inquiries. However, under the LNP government, we invested in the industry, we increased the number of race days, particularly in my electorate, we increased the prize money and we helped grow the industry and the industry's confidence. This bill is not a solution for or an investment in the industry; it is a disaster and it further reduces the confidence in the industry.

It is disappointing that the government has not done a better job on the formulation of this legislation, given that it had a year to develop it and consult with the industry about it. I note in the amendments that there has been some consultation with the industry, but there are no details as to who has been consulted. I would really appreciate it if the minister could outline who she has consulted, because it is not detailed in the explanatory notes.

Recently I received a letter in relation to this bill from the Mount Garnet Amateur Turf Club, a non-TAB country racing club, which is very similar to the clubs in my electorate such as Tara, Warra, Jandowae, St George, Mitchell, Injune, Augathella, Morven, Cunnamulla, Charleville, Roma, Chinchilla, Miles, Flinton and Noorama where I recently attended their 50 years of racing celebration at their annual race meeting. There is something interesting about the Noorama races—they actually race anticlockwise. It is the only place in my electorate where this happens and it is because there are a number of horses that actually come up from New South Wales to that race meeting. It is unusual to find that in Queensland.

Mr Perrett: Gympie.

Ms LEAHY: I take the interjection from the member for Gympie. Apparently it happens in Gympie.

Mr Perrett: Occasionally.

Ms LEAHY: It might depend on whether it is the first race or the fifth race. Clare Cupitt, the secretary of the Mount Garnet turf club, in her letter to me said—

The proposed changes to country racing as outlined in the Racing Integrity Bill and the Tracking to Sustainability Plan would mean an end to the club and the financial support that it brings to the community

The clubs in my electorate tell me they share Clare's concerns. Most country clubs operate on a volunteer basis. They do the cooking for the day to provide the food, they clean the toilets—unfortunately, quite a number of them have toilet issues; one day we actually found a mobile phone in the pipework that caused some issues for the plumbing—they work the bar, they mow the grass, they man the gate, they run the fashions on the field, they renovate the jockey rooms and facilities and many, many other activities associated with running a country race day. Ms Cupitt advises that country race club volunteers are disgusted with the gross incompetence and disregard with which the thoroughbred code is currently being treated.

The live-baiting scandal in the greyhound racing industry has had widespread repercussions for all racing codes. Rather than dealing with the issue decisively in that code, thoroughbred and harness racing feel they have been dragged into the matter and have been marred by this incident. The result from this scandal is now the Racing Integrity Bill which came about, unfortunately in the beginning, with little or no consultation with the industry and it is an inconsiderate and uninformed view of thoroughbred racing and country racing in particular. I acknowledge that the government in its amendments has advised of some consultation but it would be interesting to see those details.

The move of country racing from Racing Queensland to Treasury is also detrimental as it has reduced the contact that country racing has with the other racing codes and the input of professionals with racing experience. Without a strong country racing sector where does the government expect that the racing industry is to source its up-and-coming jockeys, trainers and future class 1 winners? Thoroughbred racing is the social backbone of Queensland and country racing is its lifeblood. Country racing is where a colourful trainer by the name of Peter Moody started out—in my electorate. He went on to go to Ascot to meet the Queen. On that note I would like to wish Her Majesty a happy 90th birthday. Peter Moody grew up in Charleville and he went to every country race meeting that he could in South-West Queensland. Country racing is where he started and look at the affection that his horse generated for thoroughbred racing throughout the country. It was country racing that helped him


with the grounding and experience and I have no doubt it was the background that helped him to develop that horse to become a household name, Black Caviar. I do not ever underestimate the input that country racing has to thoroughbred racing in this state or, for that matter, in this country.

I now turn to some of the comments in the Agriculture and Environment Committee report on this bill that were very, I think you could say, scathing of this legislation. I acknowledge that there has been some consultation. However, I am disappointed to read in the committee report that the Department of National Parks, Sport and Racing did not consult with the community, industry stakeholders or the public in relation to the provisions of the bill. As a result the racing industry participants such as the turf club, the animal owners, the jockeys, the breeders, the strappers, the trainers and the bodies representing them were excluded from the bill's earlier development. The department chose instead to rely on the consultation processes conducted as part of the commission of inquiry into greyhounds. That inquiry focused on the greyhound racing industry, not the entire racing industry, and did not consider the form or substance of the legislation proposed in the bill.

The government did not do its homework well on the bill and the department did not do its job well. The ministers should have insisted that they carry out adequate and comprehensive consultation with the industry. I encourage further consultation on this bill to ensure the Racing Integrity Bill is beneficial to the racing industry and there is opportunity for all to be involved, from the country strapper to the club's CEO. Without more consultation the bill cannot be relied upon to give good outcomes for the thousands of people who are employed in this wonderful industry across the state.

The lack of consultation at the early stages goes hand in hand with the lack of earlier costings on the bill. I acknowledge that the minister did outline some costings. Section 23 of the Legislative Standards Act 1992 asked for the estimated cost to government of implementing the bill to be in the explanatory notes. I agree with the shadow minister Jann Stuckey that the costs should be revealed at an early stage so there can be proper scrutiny of those costings. The government cannot on one hand say there is a massive deficit and that it has been badly handled and on the other hand not provide the costings for the Integrity Commission. The cost to implement the bill is a key issue for the racing industry.

I feel that I should conclude with an appeal which is echoed by racing clubs in my electorate and across the state and those who are passionate about the racing industry. Clare Cupitt's appeal and that of others is to all members of this parliament that it is our responsibility to do what is in the best interests of the people and the state. It is imperative that the racing industry bill before this parliament does not pass in its current or amended form. If it does it spells disaster for the entire industry.

 **Mr WATTS** (Toowoomba North—LNP) (9.16 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Racing Integrity Bill. I will not be supporting this bill. The bill is another example of using the word integrity as a poor excuse for consultation leading to poor legislation. Before I move to what is contained in the bill I want to talk a little bit about what the racing industry means to the community in Toowoomba and the surrounding Darling Downs. Last week we had our biggest race day of the year, the Weetwood.

Mr Costigan: Always a big day!

Mr WATTS: It is a wonderful day for the community. Everybody comes out and catches up with their mates. The lead-up to it is really good for small business, whether you are a milliner, a fashion shop owner, a taxidriver, a restaurateur or a cafe owner. Even a politician can have a good time at the Weetwood. It is a great day out. As far as small business goes, it creates a lot of turnover. It is a big event. We should be encouraging events like this and making sure that they are efficiently run and that the industry is able to put them on with the help and assistance of Racing Queensland. The Toowoomba Turf Club gets help and assistance from Racing Queensland. It was a shame this year not to have Pat O'Shea around the track. He is someone who is a bit of a legend in Toowoomba and will be sadly missed in the racing industry.

I would like to quote a couple of people who gave evidence to the committee as it was considering this ill-thought-through and rushed bill. I would like to quote Mr Bob Frappell who is the chairman of the Toowoomba Turf Club. These are his words, not mine—

We are dumbfounded. Why is this government doing this to us? Is there anyone in elected government who knows anything about the thoroughbred industry?

He goes on to say, 'You want to destroy what we have worked so hard and passionately to achieve.' That is what he thinks. There is someone here who knows something about racing because his horse won the Weetwood. There is someone on the government side who knows something about it and I would like to congratulate him.

The reality is that a little bit of consultation would have been really helpful. The shadow minister, Jann Stuckey, came up and we held a roundtable meeting at which everybody had the chance to speak. The people in that room represented hundreds of years of experience in the racing industry. We talked about what Labor was proposing to do with the industry through this bill. Hardly anybody there thought it was a good idea; in fact, nobody thought it was a good idea.

Mr Costigan: Funny that.

Mr WATTS: I take the interjection, but it is not funny really. We are talking about people's livelihoods. When giving evidence, Bob Frappell also said—

So far, what has the government achieved? One, you have removed all the experienced administrators. Two, you have announced within eight hours that racing is broke. Three, you installed a liquidator with a massive conflict of interest who takes advice from an operations manager with no thoroughbred experience who came from the poker machine industry. Both are overseen by a Supreme Court judge who admits that he knows nothing about racing.

Mr Byrne: He knows about integrity, though.

Mr WATTS: Members opposite use the word 'integrity' a lot, but I do not see much of it. However, I thank the member for Rockhampton for his interjection. It is easy to say the word; how about we apply some?

Bob Frappell went on—

As people know, horses from the Darling Downs are being taken over the border to New South Wales, where the prize money is better. That takes money away from all the local small business owners. People are looking at putting their horses with New South Wales trainers, because they can get more money on the tracks over the border than they can get at a fantastic regional centre such as Toowoomba. Toowoomba is facing the biggest cuts of any track in the state, yet it has the biggest training facility. It makes no sense.

Before government members carry on interjecting, I will quote a few numbers. The Toowoomba Turf Club has 484 members, 24 full-time staff, over 150 race-day staff, with 94 registered thoroughbred trainers who directly employ another 20 people. The club has 125 years of history on the Darling Downs and boasts some of the most experienced racing industry people as its members. Despite that, before this bill was drawn up nobody came and talked to them.

Mr Basil Nolan, the President of the Thoroughbred Breeders Queensland Association, also gave evidence to the committee. To highlight the negative impact an ill-prepared bill that has been drafted without extensive consultation can have on the industry, I quote Mr Nolan, who stated—

A huge range of other industries rely on thoroughbred breeding as a main source of income: veterinarians, veterinary suppliers, farriers, feed merchants, farmers, machinery and equipment suppliers, transport, both stock and feed horses, stablehands, jockeys, race clubs, TABs—and they are just the main category. The racing industry also makes an enormous contribution to a diverse range of other employers through its social aspect: media and advertising, airlines, hotels, accommodation, taxis, caterers, restaurants and builders. It generates millions of dollars annually through tourism thanks to major events such as the Winter Racing Carnival, Magic Millions and numerous country cups held statewide.

Obviously, he is talking about what we do in Toowoomba. We are talking about hundreds of jobs in my area that potentially will be in jeopardy. For example, just around the corner from the racetrack, small businesses at the Whyalla Plaza will be affected. If no-one is going to the track to train their horses as they have all gone to New South Wales, bakers and newsagents and cafes in the shopping centre will be affected.


We all know that integrity is important in the racing industry, but it should not be done in the ham-fisted way that this bill proposes. Mr Robert McAuley OAM, the chairman of the Queensland Racing Unity Group, stated—

The bill is a confusing mix of integrity structure and its powers and racing operation structure and its powers. The integrity powers are wide and far-reaching. The commission is empowered to make its own laws, to police those laws, to determine guilt under those laws and to impose penalties under those laws. The pathway for review of adverse actions by the commission and upheld by QCAT to the court is unclear. It is confusing that special provisions have been made in the case of seize or forfeit an animal or other thing to go directly to the court. My members are confused about how this operates.

I hope that he can get some explanations. It is interesting that the government wishes to set up an integrity body that has all those powers while, at the same time, weakening the VLAD laws. In Queensland it will be easier to ride around on a Harley and cause problems as part of a criminal gang than it will be to train and race a horse. Under this bill, houses can be searched and cars can be stopped. Extraordinary powers are going to be given to people who are supposedly enforcing integrity, but those powers are not available for any other agency in the state. The government is looking to take those powers away from the police and the CCC, but will hand them to a horseracing integrity commission. It is unbelievable that the government would consider that to be fair and reasonable.

I am not saying that there is not a good place for integrity; there is. However, let us face it: Queensland racing is supposed to support clubs such as Toowoomba; not devastate them. We had to watch the Weetwood on a third-party big screen, because Racing Queensland could not work out how to unlock its own racing screens to hire them out to the clubs that they were bought for. There are tens of thousands of dollars worth of assets sitting in Brisbane somewhere, and in Toowoomba we had to hire equipment from a third party.

This bill has been rushed. What it proposes will be devastating for the industry, which will cost jobs and cause great discomfort to people in the industry. As we go through that disaster, members have to understand that there will be a couple of years feed-in with all of the mess. The effects will not be felt right now, but in three years time there will be no horses to run around the track, because nobody will have trained any as the prize money is so bad.

 **Mr COSTIGAN** (Whitsunday—LNP) (9.26 pm): Tonight I am delighted to rise to make a contribution in the debate on the Racing Integrity Bill 2015. I am particularly pleased to follow my good friend and colleague the member for Toowoomba North after another successful Weetwood race day at Clifford Park. I am sure that the spirit of the late great Pat O'Shea was there at Clifford Park for that landmark race day on the calendar of lovers of horseracing—the gallops, the nags, call it what you will—in the great city of Toowoomba.

As other members on this side of the House have articulated already in the debate tonight, we have more than some reservations in relation to the costings in the Racing Integrity Bill. Where will the \$26 million go? There is no doubt that in racing there are people who are doing it tough and they continue to do it tough under successive Labor governments. They will tell anyone who will listen that in this state of Queensland, over successive Labor administrations, racing has gone backwards. It pains me to hear the member for Toowoomba North telling the horror story of people who are passionate about the industry leaving Queensland and going across the border to New South Wales. Clearly, due to the tyranny of distance, that is not an option for the people whom I represent in the electorate of Whitsunday and, indeed, the people of Central, North and Far North Queensland.

Like many members in this chamber, I love going to the races, whether it is at Ferguson Park in Gladstone, Keppel Park in Yeppoon, Callaghan Park in Rocky, Pioneer Park in Emerald, Ooralea in Mackay, Ben Bolt Park in Bowen—home of racing in the Whitsundays—Cluden Park in Townsville or Cannon Park in Cairns. I have been to them all and more. I love going to the races and seeing people from all walks of life dress up and enjoy themselves. That is particularly so with our friends from west of the Great Divide, who are struggling in times of drought. It may be the one day on the calendar when they can let down their hair and put all their trials and tribulations to the side. Perhaps for a short time they can forget about the dramas, the financial hardship, the heartache and the mental health issues that they confront, day in and day out, because racing brings people together, particularly in regional and rural Queensland.

I dare say racing is in the blood. My Uncle Brahma can remember going to the last race meeting at Eungella, in the land of the clouds, at the top of the Pioneer Valley.

Mr Rickuss: A great spot.

Mr COSTIGAN: It is a great spot, particularly at the Chalet on a lazy Sunday afternoon—not that I have many of them lately. Whilst the demise of the Nebo jockey club where my family had been for about a century prior to 1970 is a long time ago, we have seen a number of race clubs across regional and rural Queensland bite the dust while Labor has occupied the treasury benches on George Street.

In the hinterland of the area that I represent, the Bowen River club, the club at Collinsville and the Mackenzie River club have all gone. It is a crying shame. People that I speak to, whether it is at Ooralea, the home of the Mackay Turf Club, or Ben Bolt Park, the home of the Bowen Turf Club, lament the good old days of country racing where there was decent prize money and a supportive government.

Ms Leahy: More than one race meeting a year.

Mr COSTIGAN: As the member for Warrego said right on cue, there was more than one race meeting a year, figuratively speaking and sometimes literally speaking.

When it comes to one race meeting a year I think of a club like Mount Garnet. I have not had the privilege of going to the Mount Garnet races, but Claire Cupid is a great promoter of racing there. She calls it as she sees it. What has been a recurring theme from this side of the chamber is that there has been no consultation in relation to the Racing Integrity Bill. It is symptomatic of this Palaszczuk Labor government. Claire Cupid rightly says that she fears for the future of the Mount Garnet Amateur Turf Club. I am sure her counterparts at the Laura Amateur Turf Club in the cape would have a similar view.

John Piccone from the Cairns Jockey Club and my good friend Cameron Riches from the Gordonvale Turf Club in the electorate of Mulgrave—

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr COSTIGAN: I take the interjection from the minister of the Crown responsible for this portfolio. Meeting with Mr Piccone—

Mrs Stuckey interjected.

Ms Grace interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order! If the shadow minister and the minister wish to have a conversation could they please have it outside.

Mr COSTIGAN: Meeting with Mr Piccone as a representative of the Cairns Jockey Club is one thing, but they want more than just a meeting. He and his colleagues want more than just a meeting. They want a fair go.

Lou Kinsey and his colleagues at the Mackay Turf Club are not getting a fair go with race meetings. They are sick of Racing Queensland and its dictatorial approach under the Palaszczuk Labor government. They want to have the opportunity to race when they can make a dollar and not race in front of two men and a dog in the middle of the week.

Speaking of dogs, no-one in their right mind would condone what happened with the live-baiting fiasco. No-one in this chamber or out in the community would condone that. It seems that fiasco, that shocking situation, is having widespread implications across all codes. When I think of all codes I think of when Rocky, Mackay and Townsville had great harness racing days—whether it was at Willows, now the home of the Cowboys, 1300Smiles Stadium or elsewhere. I remember being there. I remember being at the Callaghan Park paceway. I can remember being at Ooralea for the trots. I can remember going to the dishlickers in Townsville, Rocky and Mackay. In a previous life I used to report on greyhound racing at the Townsville showgrounds for News Corporation's *Townsville Bulletin* many moons ago.

I am passionate about all the codes. I do not think all three codes are getting a fair go. If one goes to New South Wales one can see the trots at Wagga and country race meetings. They care about racing. They care about the gallops, the trots and the dogs. Quite frankly, under successive Labor governments all three codes have gone to the dogs.

I can remember working alongside David Hamilton, the racing writer, on the *Townsville Bulletin* many moons ago. He used to go to race meetings in exotic places, I used to think. I see the member for Mount Isa in the chamber. Hamo used to rave about going to Sedan Dip. He used to rave about going to Ewan and the real Corfield Cup and Stamford.

Mr Knuth: Been there.

Mr COSTIGAN: I hear the interjection of the member for Dalrymple. I have no doubt he has been there. There is plenty of common ground there. I think that is pretty obvious.

We talk about the four independent directors. No-one is questioning the integrity of these people. That is not in question here. To have people who have a feel for racing and bush racing is important. Just because someone has a lot of fancy letters after their name and has done this and that in their life it does not mean they have a passion for racing. One cannot buy passion; it comes from the heart.

I am concerned for the strappers, the trainers and the breeders—all stakeholders—particularly in our regional and rural communities. We heard from the member for Warrego about Peter Moody who is from humble beginnings in Western Queensland. I think about the poor old jockeys. I think of people like Snowy Unwin at Callaghan Park and Lyall Appo and Johnny Cairns—some great hoots in the bush over many years. I used to love seeing and interviewing these people. I admired them. I believe that George Moore from Mackay, the greatest jockey the world has ever seen, would be turning in his grave if he could see what has happened to country racing under successive Labor governments—particularly at the Mackay Turf Club where they are just not getting a fair go under Queensland Racing. They are not getting a fair go.

Mr Byrne interjected.

Mr COSTIGAN: I hear from the former minister that he was there, but what did he do? We could write it on the back of a matchbox.

This is a flawed piece of legislation. I will not be supporting it. It is an insult to the industry. There has been no consultation. It is disgraceful. That is the end of it.



Hon. WS BYRNE (Rockhampton—ALP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services) (9.37 pm): I have managed to catch as much of this debate since it commenced with the speech from the member for Currumbin yesterday. I can honestly say that I have probably met single-cell organisms with higher IQs than some of those opposite. Their contributions are an attempt to rewrite history after 12 months of pretending that the Newman government never existed.

Let us go through a few facts. I was sworn in as the racing minister the very day that *Four Corners* aired its story. I went upstairs to my ministerial office and there was a DLO sitting there minding the fort with a pile of in briefs. The DLO said, 'Minister, we understand that there is going to be something on TV about greyhounds this evening. Perhaps you might like to watch it. It might be interesting.' I said, 'That will be great. I might learn something about the racing industry—or at least greyhounds.' Lo and behold, 20 or 30 minutes into that show and any person with any nous would have recognised that there was a substantial problem.

There has been the most limited recognition of any legacy of those opposite in the three years leading up to the point when this government was sworn into office. There was no recognition of the legacy that they left and the trail of destruction in the racing industry after three years. What happened? They came to power. We have heard members opposite talking about Bob Bentley. They came into government and brought in the chainsaw. They spent millions and millions of taxpayer dollars on an inquiry—an inquiry that was a witch-hunt to destroy the supposed legacy of previous Labor governments.

What did that mature? Millions and millions of dollars spent, not one prosecution. Despite their best efforts, despite the efforts to kick it upstairs and find this guilt that had supposedly infected Labor administrations, they found nothing—zero, millions wasted. While that was going on, in the background there were a number of reports done during their time, reports that indicated quite clearly the issues confronting the industry. What happened? Not a thing. They had inquiries and recommendations and here is one of them. The Newman government missed a real opportunity. There were certainly no smoking guns. There were 15 recommendations. Here is one of the recommendations—

Executive government review the suitability and efficacy of the present model of—
the racing board—

as a statutory authority assisted by the three codes boards, and the position of the Integrity Commissioner, to meet the needs and best interests of the three codes of racing and the stakeholders in the racing industry in Queensland but not before the second anniversary of commencement, that is, after 1 May 2015.

What they were saying even from their own inquiry was that you have a serious problem with your structure. You have a serious problem with the integrity commissioner, which is basically a ceremonial position. What happened? Not a thing. They sat back and let it roll along. They put their mates into running the board and they allowed the board to run rampant. Every piece that came out in *Four Corners* sheets home to those opposite. It had nothing to do with the Labor Party. It had to do with the absolute turbulence and destruction brought on the racing industry and its integrity function by those opposite in their previous lives. There has been no recognition of that here this evening—none whatsoever. What happens? We come to power. We are sworn in and we have the greyhound inquiry.

There was commentary in the speech yesterday from the member for Currumbin about the process, about the things that were said. I doubt that she has read MacSporran's report. I doubt that she has read *Tracking towards sustainability*. I doubt that she has read the comments from the Queensland Audit Office about the veracity of the audit material provided by KPMG. It is impossible to have a sensible discussion with those opposite when you look at the speech given by the member for Currumbin earlier on in this debate. It was absolutely ridiculous. It was a personal attack and full of complaints—not a skerrick of substance or fact to support it.

There were two things that happened in this process: one was the integrity function. This government set up a systems audit. After about a month of that systems audit operating, it became clear—and representations were made to me by the commissioner, Mr MacSporran—that he was not receiving the level of cooperation necessary to complete his task within the time frame. What is a minister going to do when it is clear that there is a lack of cooperation coming from those who were positioned by the Liberal National Party, a failure to cooperate with the systems audit? Given the background that only a few weeks before we had had *Four Corners*—and the imperative associated with that should have been obvious to any fool—we had a lack of cooperation. It was quite clear to me that in order to send a very clear message to those involved we needed the powers of an inquiry. We needed inquiry powers to be able to access information, to demand information, to talk to people, to insist on evidence being given because that was what was necessary.

The member for Currumbin stands up and talks about the brilliance of the previous administration's construct in the three years they were in government. The *Four Corners* inquiry validated the success of that—a complete and utter failure. We had a commission of inquiry. We went through a process. There was an enormous amount of material investigated, put before the inquiry and Mr MacSporran made certain recommendations. The member for Currumbin has stood up and said that it was a very small part of the greyhound industry. These are direct quotes from the inquiry report—

... it would be naïve in the extreme, to conclude that the practice is not widespread.

...

The practice of live baiting could not be engaged in without the acquiescence of many, who although not directly involved, chose to ignore the cruelty and turned a blind eye.

...

... the system of self-regulation ... has failed ...


The system of self-regulation has failed. Have I heard anyone over there make any reference to that? That is what the inquiry said, and I have heard no criticism of Mr MacSporran or the thoroughness with which he undertook his task. The inquiry said that Racing Queensland was 'compromised' by a conflict of interest and that the 'current operational model is flawed'. That is the basic language in that report. There has been no acknowledgement over there: 'It was all fine when we left it—no problems.' It is hear no evil, see no evil, speak no evil.

We put in place administrators. Mr MacSporran's strong recommendation was the removal of the boards. The language used to suggest that there was no inference or reference of volume given to that is false, and he confirmed that to us privately once he had reported to us. His strong recommendation was the removal of the boards and to put in place his recommended model, which the Premier, to her great credit, acted on very decisively and very early. At that point we then put administrators in. That is when the second crisis, not related to in this bill, was revealed—the financials of Racing Queensland. Again, that is a legacy that sheets home to those opposite, that bunch of rocket scientists across the chamber who understand the industry.

The Queensland Audit Office was sitting inside that LNP board structure and raising red flags left, right and centre, 'This is not good. We are going in a bad direction.' But the board was sailing on, raising prize money, giving more incentives, doing everything they could without the slightest idea of what the financial implications would be. I challenge the opposition with this: go and read the commission of inquiry report, go and read *Tracking towards sustainability*, go and read the comments made by the Queensland Audit Office and start contributing to this discussion from a basis of fact and evidence.

The government has acted at every point in order to give confidence. We have underwritten the industry for an extended period from when we appointed administrators and we intend to underwrite the industry essentially for another two years at least, with a declining scale after that. That gives the industry the appropriate opportunity to scale and structure itself to meet commercial demands. That is why the focus of the new board has to be a commercial operation. They still do not get it. They still do not get it that there is a conflict of interest between commercial operations and integrity functions. Those opposite should be celebrating the quality of the new integrity commissioner for racing. You could not get a better person and a better qualified person to do that job.

The final point I will make before I conclude is that the new minister has done fantastic work to move this bill to where it is. The government has acted in a timely, appropriate and at times forceful way to get us to where we are, to rebuild a new structure in a very short time. The effort that went into that from the department and everyone else involved was sensational. I support this bill, and shame on those opposite for not using one skerrick of fact.

 **Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (9.47 pm): It is extraordinary to hear the police minister talk about legacy when we think about Labor's legacy of failed public administration—the payroll debacle, the fake Tahitian prince episode, the Jayant Patel saga and Labor's own Triple P program. I rise tonight to make a contribution to the Racing Integrity Bill 2015. I oppose this legislation due to the fact that this bill has had no genuine stakeholder input.

Mr Costigan: You got that right.

Dr ROWAN: I take the interjection from the member for Whitsunday. If the Racing Integrity Bill 2015 is passed and adopted here in Queensland, industry participants will have a governance structure and legislative framework which is ill-advised, with policy matters and other vital decisions relating to

the integrity of the industry being made by individuals with inadequate knowledge. Ministers of the Palaszczuk Labor government have been warned many times by individuals and organisations within Queensland's racing industry of the dire consequences of failing to listen and consult.

It is also important to note that the Queensland parliament's Agriculture and Environment Committee could not agree that the bill be passed. The Agriculture and Environment Committee made a total of eight recommendations, as well as seeking three points of clarification. The Racing Integrity Bill 2015 will substantially alter the way in which Queensland's racing industry is administered and in doing so will deliver a poorer outcome for all concerned. The Racing Integrity Bill proposes to completely separate the commercial and integrity arms of Queensland's racing industry. This would put Queensland at variance with most of the significant racing and sporting administration models in Australasia.

The estimated cost of this proposal is said to be between \$16 million to \$20 million per year, and the great concern is that the industry will bear the brunt of these costs—costs, quite clearly, that the industry cannot bear. The Agriculture and Environment Committee received 148 submissions. Again, one point that nearly all of those submissions made was that there has been a failure to provide sufficient consultation to the many affected racing enthusiasts, industry participants and relevant stakeholders in Queensland. The Toowoomba Turf Club chairman, Mr Bob Frappell, claims, 'The powers in the state government's proposed Racing Integrity Bill are so excessive that they make Queensland's controversial antibiotic laws look like a set of school rules.' That is his quote.

It is the general belief throughout the industry that the government has reacted haphazardly to the greyhound live-baiting scandal to the detriment of the thoroughbred and harness racing industries. Like a lot of people in our community, including many fellow parliamentarians, I was appalled by the images of animal cruelty which we all saw via various media outlets. Such animal cruelty is an outrageous blight on a humane and caring society. However, an important point to make and mention at this point is that the live-baiting issue has been a national problem, yet other Australian states have not penalised the other racing codes.

The commission of inquiry and its report occurred at a time when the live-baiting practices of the greyhound industry were at the forefront of the minds of both the general public as well as the racing industry in general. Any review of racing should take into consideration the needs of the thoroughbred industry and not rely only upon the greyhound racing industry. LNP members on this side of the House are strongly opposed to the proposed structure of the all-codes board. To say that a board which will be dealing with millions of dollars will only need three of the seven members to have any racing experience is beyond belief. It is hard to understand—because the racing industry is so specialised—that there could be no need for board members to have knowledge of the costs and problems that are associated within the industry and therefore potentially lack any strategic plans to advance the industry forward. Board members most certainly do need to have, I believe, racing industry experience combined with a strong business and marketing knowledge business base.


The state government has stated that a substantial blow-out in the vicinity of \$28 million has occurred in the management of this industry, and it is due to this figure that they are cutting both prize money and race meetings to help plug the gap. However, on the other hand, the Palaszczuk Labor government wants the industry to fund the integrity commission.

The racing minister and member for Brisbane Central, Grace Grace, has steadfastly refused to clarify the costs related to Labor's proposals. Likely costs for government of implementing the Racing Integrity Bill 2015 including relevant staffing must be provided. As a former medical superintendent with the right of private practice, and having worked in a number of rural communities in Queensland in places like Mungindi and Oakey and having attended country race meets at places like Roma and other communities, I know just how important those types of events are to the community not only from a social perspective in that it brings people together and people have a very enjoyable day. It also brings many people from out of town who contribute to the local economy and support many small businesses in town, whether that be the local newsagent, the local publican or the local bakery.

Mr Costigan: Motels.

Dr ROWAN: I take the interjection from the member for Whitsunday. All of those things are vitally important for those communities from an economic perspective and for the sustainable social fabric of those Queensland communities. I conclude as I commenced: I oppose this bill primarily because of the total lack of information on the costings and the complete lack of appropriate and genuine consultation with the racing industry.

I am sure it will please the other side of the House to know that I am a constitutional monarchist. Today is Queen Elizabeth II's 90th birthday. Given that she very much enjoys racing, I would like to finish by acknowledging the Queen's dignified reign as well as her loyal and dedicated service to many worthy causes not only in the United Kingdom but also in many countries around the world. I wish her and her family an enjoyable day as they celebrate this milestone. I acknowledge the contributions that she has made around the world through many endeavours, including as the head of the Commonwealth.

 **Mr WHITING** (Murrumba—ALP) (9.54 pm): I rise tonight in support of the Racing Integrity Bill. This bill is crucial to this critical industry because, as we have heard the member for Rockhampton say, self-regulation has failed. As we have heard in this debate, we can see that failure—and I think the minister outlined this quite well—in three examples of self-regulation in the MacSporran report, and these three stood out clearly for me as well. Firstly, the 2014 wagering deal delivered an extra \$17 million in funding yet not one cent went into initiatives that increase protections for these animals. There is more money in the industry but not a cent is invested into the welfare of the horses and dogs that generate the wealth of the industry. What was revealed on *Four Corners* about the fate of so many greyhounds shows what folly it is to ignore the welfare of these animals.

Secondly, the chairman of stewards for the three codes had no role description outlining their responsibility. Even though they had a salary of over \$300,000 there was no job description that every other worker must have. It is concerning to me to learn that someone in this executive role is not required to meet an executive standard expected elsewhere. Three, the conflict of interest stood out for me as well.

Racing Queensland has oversight of the commercial aspect of the industry. It is in charge of generating more income and lowering costs. It is also looking after the financial wellbeing of stakeholders, yet it was also tasked with the integrity oversight role. It needed to look after the welfare of the animals. It had to take to task those members who were breaching regulations or norms of decency. It had to pull into line stakeholders who were crossing the line as they strived to generate extra income.

That is a model that we have seen throughout this state and throughout this nation that has been proven to work only in very unusual or special circumstances. These are some of the reasons why I think we very much need this act. With no oversight or regulation and a conflict of interest hampering Racing Queensland, we risk a failure of public confidence in this pivotal industry that employs nearly 30,000 Queenslanders. It is an industry where trust and confidence in the overseeing bodies is of utmost importance. Without that confidence, people do not wager, they do not participate and they do not bother to reinvest. You get people drifting away and a frittering away of employment opportunities.

We can help restore that confidence by creating the QRIC. There are a number of initiatives in this bill that I think make the QRIC a much needed saviour for this industry. It will be an independent body entirely responsible for integrity and animal welfare in the sport. It will be an entirely separate entity. That is the way to ensure confidence in this fine industry of Queensland racing. I note that it will also be responsible for the police task force. It will have the power to investigate, prosecute and stamp out those practices that we saw in the media that brought shame on Queensland racing.

QRIC will be the employer of the stewards, not Racing Queensland. I think that is a big plus for increasing the independence of, and therefore confidence in, the industry. QRIC will have to make strategic and operational plans the first time and they will have to report quarterly. All this adds up to effective, efficient oversight of this crucial industry.

In the debate we heard a few comments about cost. The member for Broadwater talked about it, and the member for Moggill said tonight that the industry cannot bear the cost. If they listened to what the minister has said, they would know that the racing industry will not be required to provide additional funding to establish the QRIC. The racing industry, the minister said, will not be out of pocket.

Ms Grace: In fact, they are going to save money.

Mr WHITING: Exactly right; the minister set out how they would save money. The minister was also very direct in laying out the costs in her speech last night. I refer to the *Hansard*, where she said—

\$1 million for accommodation and basic utilities; \$1.2 million for information technology; \$1.5 million for staff migrating to public service award rates; \$1.2 million for corporate management positions ... \$1.75 million for corporate services staff ... \$0.4 million to cover the costs of the police task force going forward. ... \$1.5 million for corporate operating costs ...

There were many more there but it was a very specific outline of the costs. I would certainly tell members on the other side that they should take a good look at that because I think the minister has done a tremendous job.

We have also heard a constant theme throughout the debate that we on this side are not looking after country racing. Let me be specific on this. This bill does not relate to the allocation of race dates. These will continue to be decided by Racing Queensland. Let me stress that there will be no cuts to the country racing package—no cuts. In fact we have delivered a \$21 million country racing support package that will build the capacity of country racing and support it.

Mr Costigan interjected.

Mr WHITING: The member for Whitsunday can go and visit those many and varied racecourses. The package will run for at least two years. The remaining purses will remain untouched, yet the opposition has been ignoring this. What we have seen is another scare campaign. Scare campaigns are all they have to offer to the people of Queensland. They are telling Queenslanders that family electrical businesses will be put out of business and they are terrifying them, when there is not even a proposal on the table. They are telling families with children with an ECDP that they will lose their programs under this government in 2020, when in fact they would have lost them in 2017 under the LNP. Now we have this scare campaign over country racing.

The member for Currumbin intimated that we wanted to 'cripple the industry'. The reality, as the member for Rockhampton said, is that the LNP caused this problem. Let us look at the financial record that happened under their watch. Queensland Racing losses were as follows: \$4.5 million in 2012-13; \$3.9 million in 2013-14; and \$1 million in 2014-15. There were no cash reserves for Queensland Racing. The government had to stump up \$32 million to cover their losses. If that is their record, how can they say that they can look after country racing? They cannot do this. All they can do is run scare campaigns and run around peddling fabrications. I believe mightily in this bill and I commend it to the House.



Mr PERRETT (Gympie—LNP) (10.02 pm): I rise to speak on the Racing Integrity Bill 2015. This bill is flawed. It is really about a political campaign by the Labor Party to create problems in the regions. It had its genesis in the live-baiting excesses of the greyhound industry. However, in a heavy-handed way, the government has jumped in to damage the reputation of all the racing industry with the same level of suspicion. It will introduce a bureaucratic board to oversee all three codes, with little input from those who know the industry—a board which will probably compromise a union official and some hangers-on circling around ministerial offices. If this was about cleaning up or providing better governance, there would not be so many recommendations asking the minister to either answer or clarify what was intended. There are a lot of proposals with very little evidence to support why they are needed.

I speak as someone who represents a regional community which has a strong culture in support of local racing. Gympie is also home to many horse based activities, including campdrafts, rodeos, pony clubs, riding for the disabled, a school based equestrian program and Hope Reins, a program which connects horses with people who are experiencing difficulties.

Gympie has a vibrant racing culture. It provides economic activity in the racing and horse management industry, it draws visitors and tourists on special days and it promotes an uplifting atmosphere in the town which comes together for these events. The Gympie Turf Club has been conducting race meetings in Gympie for well over 100 years. The first meetings were held during the gold rush days of the late 1860s. Today it hosts nine race days a year, with iconic meetings including the Nolan Gympie Muster Cup and the Nationwide Civil Gympie Cup. As mentioned earlier by the member for Warrego, one of those race days is on the first Tuesday in November and it actually features camels. While the thoroughbreds run clockwise, there is an odd camel that believes they should run anticlockwise.

Mr Costigan: Two humps or one?


Mr PERRETT: Only one. The Turf Club operates from a high-class facility which it shares with the Gympie show society. Racing is one of Queensland's iconic industries and an important part of the social fabric of many country communities. It employs around 30,000 people, supports more than 130 mostly community based clubs and venues across the state, and embodies enormous social value. This is especially true in regional and country areas. As the saying goes, the best races are in country places.

Country racing is the lifeblood of racing in Queensland. It is a breeding ground for our racing champions, where horses and jockeys get a start with the support of regional racing clubs, trainers, owners and supporters. We know that racing provides a vital social outlet for many regional Queenslanders. It supports jobs and provides cash flow for community groups, vets, produce stores and saddlers.

This flawed bill will have a wideranging effect on how racing is run in Queensland, and some sections of the racing industry have major concerns over the implications of this bill. It extends the powers of authorised officers by mirroring those powers given to authorised officers and inspectors under the Animal Care and Protection Act 2001, the ACPA, in relation to powers of entry, seizure and the issuing of an animal welfare direction. It inserts new information-sharing powers with the ACPA which are mirrored in the proposed Racing Integrity Act. It has created serious concerns within the three codes of thoroughbred, harness and greyhound racing about the proposed seven-person board's capacity to govern them.

It is concerning that an inquiry that started out as a result of animal cruelty has created a need to seek amendments to broaden the commission's function to include the promotion of animal welfare, the prevention of animal cruelty and the provision of training to the racing industry. It creates serious concerns about the establishment of a new Racing Integrity Commission, which dissolves the existing arrangements and separates the integrity functions of Racing Queensland into a new separate body.

The proposed racing industry integrity commission is projected to be a highly expensive operation with staff, accommodation and associated bureaucracy involving multimillions of dollars in expenditure. It is concerning that, in times of economic restraint, it is estimated to cost between \$16 million and \$20 million per year, whereas current integrity arrangements are estimated to cost approximately \$8 million per year. It is concerning that the cost to implement the proposed bill remains unanswered by the department even after several attempts by the committee to seek clarification of this important issue, with the department deflecting the issue back to the minister. It is seriously concerning that the committee investigating the bill raised concerns and flagged many possible amendments on every recommendation. This can leave no doubt that the bill is flawed and it should not be passed.

 **Mr KNUTH** (Dalrymple—KAP) (10.07 pm): I rise to speak on the Racing Integrity Bill. I believe racing integrity is very important. It is asserted that the Racing Integrity Bill 2015 will do the following: form the Queensland Racing Integrity Commission, safeguard the welfare of animals, improve public confidence in the racing industry, improve compliance monitoring, provide an ability to carry out disciplinary actions against licensees, provide proactive management and identification of issues, and educate the industry.

I cannot really speak about the industry in the cities as much as country racing. I really believe they are completely different. In the past, many clubs had so many cuts and had been punished so much that basically there is nowhere else to cut now. The implications of this bill for country racing are completely different to the city. The country racing clubs will not get what they hoped they would actually get out of the legislation. The sad part about it is that they are looking for a board but not a board that does not understand rural and regional Queensland.

The presentations by the minister and government members show that they are talking the talk. When I talk to the people out there in the bush, they are telling me that there is not one person who supports this and that they are very concerned. It is very difficult in some sense to hear what they are saying out there. Even though it sounds good and appears to have good intentions, the reality for the people in the bush is that the country racing industry feels that this is damnation to them.

There is no doubt about it; as rural and regional Queensland representatives, we would have to take this position. In the past we saw what Bentley did. I remember when Charters Towers lost three meetings. Pentland lost one. Mingela was closed down. Jericho lost its meeting. Capella lost its meetings and, as I said before, got camels. I can see that under this bill they could lose camels, and likewise, Richmond. Georgetown lost three meetings. It is getting harder and harder. Trainers are travelling further and further. There are fewer jockeys. I probably cannot put the words together at this moment, but we need something there that brings about confidence in the country racing industry, the racing industry and the thoroughbred racing industry. It is concerning that the live-baiting inquiry has dragged the thoroughbred industry into it.

These race meetings are the lifeblood of the community. Yes, there is an intention in this bill to go out there and do some good things and bring about integrity of the industry. However, the government needs to look at rural and regional Queensland. For instance, when Bentley introduced the

requirement for these country race clubs to have an inside barrier, they would have been looking at \$30,000 to \$35,000. Where are they going to find \$35,000? It was virtually impossible. This was someone who had nothing to do with country race meetings and was making decisions on country racing. This is our concern: there is the appointment of a board that would not have a clue. We really need to get back to basics.

Ian McCauley is the Chairman of the Queensland Racing Unity Group. At the committee hearing he said—

The bill should be withdrawn on these grounds ...


...

One possible process that the Minister for Racing could consider is to lead an open conference where invited knowledgeable people representing racing industries from other states could describe their integrity and government structures and comment on their strengths and weaknesses. The conference could break into workshops, maybe led by the Office of Racing, that could come forward with recommendations for the future structure of integrity and operations appropriate to Queensland. Any ensuring legislation will likely have bipartisan support as well as support from the industry participants ...

A process such as this will take some time. In the meantime an interim government structure could be established under the current Racing Act. The government has already demonstrated that it has the power to make such interim arrangements. QRUG members believe that this opportunity for an industry-wide review is fundamental to securing a satisfactory, long-term future for the administration of racing in this state.

In summary, QRUG strongly suggests that the government recalls this bill, appoints a temporary board and begins a deliberative and inclusive process that leads to a Queensland Racing structure that has industry and bipartisan political support.

I believe that Ian McCauley has a very good point. What he is relating here in only a small way is what the people in my electorate, in rural and regional Queensland and in country racing are saying. They have deep concerns about this bill.

 **Mr KATTER** (Mount Isa—KAP) (10.13 pm): I rise to make a contribution on the Racing Integrity Bill. The first point I would like to make—and I think the most significant—is the make-up of the board. The drive behind this is to have people outside of those fields to spread the fields of expertise. It makes me consider how other industries effect this in other ways. I recall a conversation I had with someone in the trucking industry. We were discussing the adverse decisions and conditions in the industry as they had grown or manifested over the years. I said, 'How do you think this has come about?' He said that he used to go to the trucking industry forums and they used to be full of blokes in Jackie Howe singlets; they were drivers. He said that 90 per cent were drivers and 10 per cent were white-collar executives. He said the problem now is that Toll IPEC white-collar executives make up 90 per cent and 10 per cent are drivers. I think that is what we are getting at here; there are too many people who are distanced from the industry and it is having an impact.

It has been said before that the genesis of all of this is the greyhound racing commission. Some of those earlier comments that tarred the entire industry were very unfair, because I personally know of some very responsible participants in that industry. Quite rightly, it is very important to crack down on those sorts of practices. Those responsible participants in that industry are very grateful for that clean-out. I still struggle to see why this is needed in the racing industry. I get that the government wants to alleviate any risks in the racing industry. However, if they are going to go to such an extent and undermine the structure of an industry and take such a huge punt on restructuring it, they would want to be sure that that is the right option. I am not convinced that those options were considered in formulating this bill. I am also not convinced that the people were pulled along the way with it.

I do not claim to know the industry inside out, but I certainly have a lot of friends in my electorate in the racing industry. The feedback I have received is that they are vehemently opposed to what is happening here. They very much want to be part of a change or an improvement in the industry, but they would like to start from scratch. Perhaps there are one or two operators out there who need to be jerked into gear every now and again. That is important. I am not trying to devalue that drive or that impetus to pick that up in the industry. We can overreach with these things and the inadvertent effects of that can be dire. Quite rightly—and I am going to pick on the country areas—usually when rules are made for the aggregate and for the populous areas, all too often we can lose the particular characteristics and idiosyncrasies of country races or western areas. They just get lost at a board level and we can lose that connection, particularly if there are not enough people with experience in that industry. I think that is the risk here. One of the pertinent points that was made in the hearings was likening the formulation of the board to cross codes in football, for example, putting together a Rugby League, Rugby Union and AFL board to run all those separate codes. Sure, there are some similarities, but it would not make sense if we herd them like that. I think that is akin to what is happening here.

In terms of the composition of the industry, we could say about 75 per cent of the industry, give or take, is thoroughbred and the balance comprises the others such as harness racing and greyhounds. There really should be stronger representation of the thoroughbreds on that board to reflect the fact that they are such a strong part of the entire industry—and that is if they are thrown together.

It also brought to light that there are opportunities for change and improvements here. The Victorian model was mentioned as one that could be looked at for Queensland to copy. I am told that we have gone closer to the Tasmanian model for whatever reason, but it is certainly not seen as the industry leader. I am told that Victoria is the industry leader, and that is the one we should be copying. A good thing about this is that QRUG has been formed, and it has brought some unity into the industry which has been a long time coming, and that has been really helpful. There is a good opportunity here to engage with the industry, and there is a strong call from them to take a different direction. Communication and having that endorsement on the ground is so vital to trust going forward from this point onwards. If you do not take people with you from the start, they are going to be fighting you all the rest of the way from now on.


I would like to make another point about the composition of the board and the types of people you can attract. The turn of phrase that you hear escapes me now, but I had a good chat with one of the new executives out in Mount Isa. It was a pleasant day at the races, but littered throughout the conversation was, 'These things need to fund themselves,' and 'There are opportunities for expansion, but they could be doing greater things.' That sounds great, but to be honest there are no great opportunities. The races are what they are in Mount Isa, and I am not sure there are many better opportunities. The truth is that Mount Isa was one of the wealthiest pound-for-pound per capita places because of the TAB funds that came through there. For a good 20 or 30 years they were ripping money out of there from the miners who supported the industry very well, and I do not think it is too much to ask for a little bit of support in those areas. I know that we are not talking about funding sustainability here, but it is related. People on the board keep talking about commerciality, but they are too commercially focused and they are going to miss the finer points.

If you look at the race takings and other income associated with the Birdsville races it may not look so great, but if you look at their business case I think it is worth \$5 million in economic activity to the town of Birdsville, and 50 or 100 people live there. That is an extreme example, but it is the same thing all through country racing. The economic activity surrounding this creates a great business case for the industry, so we need to ensure that it is supported. I am not sure that is always captured by people who do not have that strong background in the industry. If the board is not fully made up of industry participants, they have to be a strong contingent or otherwise it will miss the point. I cannot give you a plethora of examples of how that will play out, but in the fullness of time you will see that it lacks experience, credibility and good judgement, and things are going to slip through the cracks. I think that is why you are having problems with the industry right now, because they intuitively know that will happen with that type of structure.

Regarding integrity, I am happy to see that followed up. You hear the odd bad story, but by and large there are no big problems out there with the industry. It is a very rare event to hear of anything like that in the industry. I find it very difficult to comprehend that something which was confined to greyhounds was seen as a big threat to the horseracing industry. There could have been ways to look at strengthening the systems we already have. There are already tools and mechanisms there that we should have explored which may have been more cost effective. It is hard to say without seeing something in front of me, but I am sure that is a pathway I would have preferred.

This is really important to the future of racing, and I will go back to the example again. If you have too many people who are disconnected from the industry, they might have the best intentions and they might get to a few race meetings around the place, but if you do not have that background and that lifelong experience in the industry it is very, very hard to take these things in the right direction. I think there is a strong risk of that with this bill, and I think that is why you have seen such opposition from the industry and the people I mix with. I am very close to some of those people. The Ballard name is synonymous with racing in the Longreach area. The Huddy family in Mount Isa have had two Melbourne Cup starters in the last five years, and they are still racing horses in Mount Isa. We have some iconic people out there. They do not want to cause trouble and they do not want to be politically motivated, but these people are genuine industry participants. They care about the welfare of horses as much, if not more, than anyone in this room. They are the sort of people you really want to listen to and take direction from, and they are the sort of people who do not want this bill to go through the way it is.

Changes have to be made. We have to go back to the drawing board and talk to these people. That is how good sustainable development happens. If you bring this in now, they are going to be fighting for the next five or 10 years to turn it all around. I can assure you that when you have too many people who are opposed to this trying to sell it to them is not going to work because these people know. You have to listen to them and use them to help form the way forward. We have run a big risk by departing from that now, and I truly hope that tonight the House does not support this and that we go back to the drawing board.

 **Mr LAST** (Burdekin—LNP) (10.26 pm): I rise to speak in opposition to the Racing Integrity Bill 2015. This bill proposes to establish a new Racing Integrity Commission which dissolves the existing arrangements and separates the integrity functions of Racing Queensland from the commercial operation into a new separate body.

There is no question that racing codes all across Queensland are in chaos. My family have been involved in the racing industry for 50 years—indeed, we still own racehorses—and the feedback I am receiving from the racing industry is negative, negative, negative. The lack of confidence from owners and trainers out there in my electorate is alarming. It even extends to our local committees, who are now questioning the future of the industry in these country areas. The establishment of an integrity commission will add yet another layer of bureaucracy to an industry which is already on its knees. I acknowledge that the greyhound industry needed to be cleaned up, but to lump the harness and thoroughbred racing codes in with greyhounds is unfair and inappropriate.

I find it ironic that we are talking about a Racing Integrity Bill, and yet the integrity of the process in bringing this bill before the House is highly questionable, particularly given the lack of consultation in preparing this bill. I could not agree more with the comment in the report which said—

Consultation with the racing industry, community organisations and individuals should have been an intrinsic and routine part of the policy and legislative development process for the Racing Integrity Bill.

Country racing is the lifeblood of the Burdekin electorate, and indeed it is the lifeblood of other electorates across Queensland and this great country of ours. My electorate of Burdekin has three tracks: Cluden Park in Townsville, which has just had major upgrades completed thanks to the previous LNP government's commitment and investment in racing in Queensland; Ben Bolt Park in Bowen; and the Burdekin Race Club's track in Home Hill. All three tracks not only significantly contribute to the racing industry but are major contributors to our local economies. The Burdekin certainly comes alive each May for Growers Race Day, which last year attracted a crowd in excess of 4,000 people. Everyone is currently gearing up for this year's event, which is scheduled in a few weeks time on 21 May.


We also have a passionate group of locals who are interested in bringing greyhound racing to the Burdekin, and there is no doubt that the uncertainty which currently exists within that industry is not helping their cause. I certainly hope they receive the appropriate support from this government and the industry to bring it to fruition.

These country race meetings are so much more than simply horseracing. They are an annual get-together that brings together communities. They are social events, fundraisers and networking opportunities. More importantly, they bring much needed money to these communities. Bowen in particular has experienced a significant downturn, and the loss of even one race meeting from this town would have devastating consequences. We used to have owners, trainers and of course the associated strappers and jockeys training out of the Burdekin and Bowen, contributing much needed employment and revenues for these communities. They may not have been big on numbers, but they were an important part of the community.

I note that, apart from not agreeing that this bill should be passed, the committee also shared my concerns, those of my colleagues and those in the racing industry that there have been no costings provided.

The bill also proposes to implement a new seven-member board, with three industry members—one from each code—and four independent members. This has been seen as a deliberate shift of board power away from industry participants. We have already witnessed the controversy entwined with the minister's interim board appointments, and there has been considerable industry opposition to the changes in the bill from those in the thoroughbred, harness and greyhound codes. There cannot be a one-size-fits-all approach to the differing codes. If you want to establish and maintain a successful racing industry, the best people to have on the board are those with industry experience. As they say, you need to have some skin in the game.

This bill before the House is deficient and obviously needs a lot more work before it meets the needs of our racing codes in Queensland. It was rushed and ill-conceived, and I cannot support it in its current form.

 **Hon. G GRACE** (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (10.30 pm), in reply: I start by thanking everyone for their contributions to this debate. In particular, I acknowledge the speech made by the former minister for racing, the current Minister for Police. I know that he spent a lot of time pulling all of this together. I thank him for his contribution this evening. I thank all of my colleagues on this side of the House, who understand what it is we are trying to achieve with this Racing Integrity Bill.

This bill really is about securing the stability and future of racing. One thing I want to make clear is that this government is not prepared to sit back and do nothing after we had a very comprehensive inquiry and accepted the recommendations of that inquiry. We are now enacting the recommendations that this government accepted.

I have heard a lot this evening about the lack of consultation. The amendments included in this bill followed the MacSporran inquiry. That was an inquiry held with extensive consultation. The government then took the inquiry's recommendations and decided to implement the first three of them.

The intention was to commence a review of all three racing codes. It was not limited to greyhound industry issues; it also focused on all three racing codes. Anyone suggesting that Alan MacSporran QC, a very learned man, would make recommendations without thoroughly looking into the issues he was tasked with addressing is mistaken about the calibre of the person who headed this inquiry. To suggest that he made these recommendations blindly, without fully considering all of the information, is completely wrong and misleading.

I met with Mr MacSporran. The previous minister met with Mr MacSporran. I can tell the House that he landed very firmly on his recommendations and considered them extremely thoroughly, in the honourable manner in which he operates. For those opposite to suggest that recommendations were made on a whim or that he did not consider them fully is completely wrong and misleading the House.

Mr MacSporran found that the model of self-regulation in the racing industry had contributed to the lack of action on greyhound live baiting and other greyhound racing issues. The report also found that the self-regulation model created risks for animal welfare in other codes of racing. He found that; he did not make it up. Those opposite should read the MacSporran report, as the Minister for Police said. Mr MacSporran found that a restructuring would reduce these risks across all codes—an all-codes board that currently exists and that also existed under the previous government. Those opposite did not have separate codes; they all existed in the all-codes industry board.

Recommendations 1 to 3 of the MacSporran report stated that a new statutory authority should be established, a new board structure put in place and enhanced powers provided to authorised officers to ensure greater integrity and animal welfare in the Queensland racing industry. He did not make those recommendations lightly; he made them because that is what he found in his investigations. For those opposite to come in here and say that he stepped outside his terms of reference or that he did not consider the whole industry is to propose a fabrication and indicates that they have not read the report.

The recommendations made by Mr MacSporran were not limited to greyhound racing but applied to all sectors with a view to improving public confidence in the racing industry through improving integrity and animal welfare. If we do not increase the wagering in this industry there will be continuing problems. The way you increase the wagering is to get back public confidence so that we can grow and prosper this industry.

There was also a lot of comment about my releasing or not releasing the costs. I released the costs when I cemented the funds available for QRIC through our CBRC process. We are fully funding the additional costs of QRIC across the forward estimates. As I have been continually saying in this House and outside, the industry will not incur any additional costs. In fact, it will make savings on what it would have normally spent in the area of animal welfare and integrity. I have put figures before the House. They were read out by the member for Murrumba. They are on the transcript. They have been tabled in the response to the committee. All of the costings are completely consistent with previous statements that the establishment of the new QRIC will not cost the racing industry one extra cent. In order to maintain integrity and animal welfare in this industry, the government has provided the money up-front for that to occur.

We have an outstanding commissioner designate heading QRIC, a person of the calibre of Ross Barnett. I say to the industry: if you are doing nothing wrong, you have nothing to fear. However, if you persist in animal cruelty or in abusing the integrity of this industry, you will be caught and you will be dealt with. Public confidence in this industry needs to be maintained in order for it to grow.

In terms of the issue raised by the member for Currumbin relating to bookmakers, the changes actually bring about less red tape. They do not increase it. The changes mean that bookmakers will now need only one approval in one place instead of two approvals in two different places. They actually streamline the process. They make things a lot easier for them. In fact, everything else remains exactly the same. I thought that was a good thing for bookmakers. They are unfortunately reducing in numbers. Hopefully this will be an incentive for some to embark on that wonderful career.

In relation to search powers, the bill does provide to QRIC's authorised officers powers similar to those given to RSPCA inspectors. MacSporran found that Racing Queensland did not have the powers to properly investigate these animal cruelty and integrity issues. Also, there was confusion about who had responsibility to regulate this industry. We are putting all of that aside. They will have equal powers with set responsibilities in relation to ensuring the integrity of animals in this industry. It is simple and clear. It is not over the top. It is not overreach. It is just a parallel power that gives both the ability to look into the issue of animal cruelty and into integrity issues and to collect and share information where they suspect that an offence is being committed.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hart): Order! Members, there is a lot of background noise. If you want to have a conversation please take it outside. I am trying to listen to the minister.

Ms GRACE: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. Obviously this will allow the taking of appropriate disciplinary action in relation to suspected offences with regard to animal cruelty. I listened to clubs and venues and I think it is appropriate that Racing Queensland maintains control of those clubs and venues, and this issue is the subject of amendments as mentioned by the member for Currumbin. We have moved those clubs back into the administration of Racing Queensland—I think that is the right thing to do—from QRIC and it is something that the industry has told me that it wanted and I am very happy to accommodate that. I apologise that there are a lot of amendments because of that, but I want to get it right. With regard to concerns about disciplinary actions taken, as I have said, they will be reverting back to Racing Queensland and there are a few amendments in that area. There are a lot of issues about the composition of the board. I want to say one thing about this: MacSporran landed very solidly on this. I questioned him extensively about it. I also say this: I do not know that I have met too many people in this industry who have been happy with previous boards. I honestly do not know too many that have not at some stage had complaints about every single previous racing board, whether they had experience, whether they had knowledge of the industry or whether they did not. Even the member for Dalrymple said that country racing people were concerned about all of the cuts that had happened previously. This is an issue that has been going on for a long time.

Mr Stevens: Your mob—Bentley.

Ms GRACE: I take the interjection from the member for Mermaid Beach. No-one has been happy with the previous board. I rest my case. What Mr MacSporran is saying is that you need to take away that direct interest and you need to bring about some skill sets of people who will be able to work together to improve racing, and that is what we on this side of the House want to see. I am passionate about ensuring that that is what it delivers. There were issues in relation to a regional person, and they went through a comprehensive selection panel. The member for Buderim is incorrect: everybody who was recently appointed to the board went through a very intensive selection panel that was open and transparent.

An honourable member interjected.

Ms GRACE: Yes, that is right. He went through that process. Peter Arnison, the Director of Energex and the former governor, was on the panel. Kerry Newton, the Managing Director of Directors Australia, was on the panel. Jim O'Sullivan—your part-time commissioner—was on the panel. They went through an extensive selection process in relation to who was to be put on the board and that person was recommended to be on the board to represent the regional thoroughbred area as well as the thoroughbred industry. It was very disappointing to me that certain facts came to light. I took swift action—and I make no apologies for it—and it was most unfortunate, but Mr Rundle did the right thing because he understood. I think that that is enough said about that issue. When it comes to implementing that recommendation, as I said, 'independent' means that they have not been directly involved in the industry for two years. Mr Steve Wilson has had a background in the thoroughbred industry at some point. It is not a huge background but he has an understanding of it, so suggesting that the independent

members are going to have no idea of the racing industry is incorrect and I have already demonstrated that with the independent chair—a high-calibre Queenslander who has all of the skills necessary to bring the racing industry forward and who is enthusiastic, passionate and very much looking forward to taking on the role.

I agree that it is important that we look after country racing, and the government has put its hand in its pocket when it comes to country racing. All of—

Mrs Stuckey: Two years!

Ms GRACE: No, it is not just two years. It is \$21 million over the forward estimates and we are guaranteeing at least the funding of their prize money for two years, but we go beyond that as well. It is not just the two years. By that time we hope that when Eagle Farm comes online we build the wagering revenue and then hopefully we can get the racing industry back on its feet and that it not only increases the funds available for country racing, because I want the board to work very closely with it, but also prospers. I agree with the member for Mount Isa that there may not be an avenue for every single country race club to do something, but there are many that are looking forward to doing so and there have been many propositions put forward to me that they would like to advance in country racing and I look forward to the board working with them to advance those ideas.

I agree: it may not be the whole lot, but at least we can have a look. However, we are guaranteeing that section for four years with \$21 million. We are also underwriting the industry this year to the tune of \$32 million. The member for Nanango got up in this House and said that we hate country racing. Yes, we hate it so much we are funding it to the tune of \$32 million this year, there is \$21 million for country racing and now \$36 million to bring about proper integrity in this industry. It is ridiculous and does not make any sense and I totally refute anything in relation to that. Country racing will be protected, but once again let us not confuse tracking towards sustainability in terms of this \$32 million loss made by the racing industry. Under the previous minister they increased the prize money to levels that were unsustainable—

Mrs Stuckey: Not true!

Ms GRACE: Go and read the audit report; I take the interjection from the member for Currumbin. She obviously knows nothing about business and knows nothing about figures, because anyone who comes into this House—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hart): Order, members! Order! There will be no interjections across the chamber.

Ms GRACE: Anyone who comes into this House and accuses someone who owns shares in a publicly listed company of holding a private direct personal financial relationship just shows that they know nothing about business, because that would be the same as saying that anyone who owns Woolworths shares has a direct personal financial relationship with the chair of Woolworths, and that is absolutely ridiculous. I want to put this on the record very clearly: there is no business relationship between myself and Steve Wilson. There never has been and there never will be in the future. I have no letter from the Integrity Commissioner to table because there is no conflict and there is no business relationship. It is a fabrication, it is completely misleading and it is a disgrace to suggest so. I do not even want to talk any further on that issue because I do not want to justify the indignity of what is being said by responding to it.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: If you can pause there for a second, Minister, there are too many interjections across the chamber. I would ask anybody who wants to have a conversation to go outside. There is too much noise.

Ms GRACE: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I also want to address the issue in relation to the standards that will be set. Members opposite have raised concerns about the role of the standards under the proposed Racing Integrity Act and their potential effects on country racing clubs. These issues were raised. We have addressed them and there will be no requirement in this bill for standards made by QRIC to be a one-size-fits-all solution. QRIC will be working cooperatively with the industry to develop standards that are not only effective but also practical for clubs to implement with respect to a number of issues.

A number of allegations have also been raised in relation to one board being a bad idea. That is the structure that has been in place for many years now. It did not change under the previous government and MacSporran suggested that that is the way that it should work best. There were

allegations made that the Labor government is destroying the racing industry. I heard some members opposite wax lyrical about the LNP being the friend of the racing industry. That is not what I have been told. With friends like the LNP, as has been often said, who needs enemies? The LNP courted the industry with false promises, knowing full well that those promises could not be fulfilled. The LNP hiked prize money to a level that could not be sustained. We have seen funds depleted—and these are not my figures but the figures of the Auditor-General—and black holes that have needed to be filled by a Labor government. This Labor government knows full well what it needs to do. The careless way in which the LNP does business—its play now, pay later attitude—was destroying the racing industry. This government will not stand by and let that happen. Once again, we will clean up their mess.

I think it is very important that we get the relationship between the industry and the board right. As I have said, we can throw mud in this place, but I believe that those who have been appointed to the board are of a fine calibre. I look forward to appointing the remaining four representatives to the racing board when this bill is passed. I look forward to them getting to work and consulting extensively, giving me a five-year forward plan and giving me a clear picture of how the budget will work for the next five years so that we can get this industry up and running and do the best that we can for racing in Queensland, because that is what we want.

The existing legislation has provided for the control bodies to govern and oversight all aspects of the industry—from commercial matters to integrity and animal welfare. However, as I have said, this has not worked. The bill will provide for a new governance structure for the racing industry that will provide for better integrity and animal welfare.

Let me put it as simply as I possibly can: country racing will be looked after. There is \$21 million for country racing. The board will work with country racing over the next four years to develop country racing so that it can grow and be prosperous. MacSporran landed fairly solidly on QRIC, which will have a separate integrity regime. That regime can concentrate on animal cruelty, animal welfare and integrity in the industry in a regulated environment, and that is where it should be. Racing Queensland, with an expanded board, will then have the ability to concentrate on the business of racing and concentrate on making Queensland the prime racing state in this nation. Racing Queensland will concentrate on helping country racing. It will concentrate on the wagering issues. It will concentrate on bringing Eagle Farm online and making sure that Queensland's love affair with that racecourse continues. I want Racing Queensland to concentrate on issues such as country racing tourism. I want Racing Queensland to concentrate on issues such as racing tourism in Queensland. I want Racing Queensland to look at ways in which it can make Queensland racing the best it possibly can. Racing Queensland cannot do that if its attention is diverted at the same time to integrity issues.

The members opposite have mentioned a lot of names in this place. I have met a lot of people. My last response is to the member for Warrego. My diaries are public. The member can see how many meetings I have had with the industry, how many meetings I have had with race clubs and how many meetings I have had with turf clubs—and there are quite a few. I suggest that the member have a look at them, because they are just too numerous to mention in this House. I have had extensive consultation. I think even the member for Currumbin would say that I have been meeting with as many people in the industry as I can.

Mrs Stuckey: And so have I and you could acknowledge that.

Ms GRACE: I acknowledge that the member for Currumbin has done so equally. However, her meetings have been about misinformation. My meetings have been about making sure that the industry prospers.

I look forward to the bill being passed. I plead with the Katter party to support this bill. If they want to advance country racing, we need Racing Queensland to concentrate on doing exactly that. Racing Queensland will not have its eye on integrity; its eye will be on advancing racing not only throughout the eastern side of Queensland but also in the country areas and QRIC can get on with the job of integrity in the industry.

Mrs Stuckey: There was no consultation.

Ms GRACE: I take the injection from the member for Currumbin, who keeps peddling false views about there being no consultation. There has been extensive consultation on this bill. The committee consulted with the department. We had an inquiry. Racing Queensland was consulted. I have consulted extensively. We continue to consult extensively. This bill is good for Racing Queensland and I commend the bill to the House.

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

AYES, 43:

ALP, 41—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, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 43:

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

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

Pair: Rowan, Stewart.

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

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1 to 9—



Ms GRACE (11.03 pm): I seek leave to move amendments en bloc.

Leave granted.

Ms GRACE: I move the following amendments—

1 Clause 3 (Main purposes of Act and their achievement)

Page 22, line 20—

omit.

2 Clause 7 (Establishment and status)

Page 23, lines 20 to 23—

omit, insert—

- (2) The commission consists of the commissioner, each deputy commissioner and the staff of the commission.
- (3) The staff are to be employed under the *Public Service Act 2008*.
- (4) However, race day stewards are employed under this Act and not the *Public Service Act 2008*.

Amendments agreed to.

Clauses 1 to 9, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 10—



Ms GRACE (11.04 pm): I move the following amendments—

3 Clause 10 (Functions)

Page 24, line 17, ' , clubs, participants and venues'—

omit, insert—

and participants

4 Clause 10 (Functions)

Page 24, line 22, 'license'—

omit, insert—

licence

5 Clause 10 (Functions)

Page 25, lines 26 to 28—

omit, insert—

- (l) to promote compliance and integrity, and to promote animal welfare and prevent animal cruelty, by educating, providing information for, and working with, participants;

6 Clause 10 (Functions)

Page 25, line 30, ' , clubs'—

omit.

Mrs STUCKEY: Amendment 5, which amends clause 10, has to make it explicit that it is a function of the commission to provide education to participants in relation to promoting compliance and integrity, also promoting animal welfare and the prevention of animal cruelty. I did have a discussion with the minister's staff in a briefing on this, but it is really important to understand exactly what skills are required, what training is going to be done and exactly how that will be undertaken and by whom. We are talking about integrity here and I think there has been some concern in the industry that there may be people undertaking these roles who are not as qualified as they could be.

Ms GRACE: Basically what the bill will do is include that so it gives the commission the ability to provide education to all of its participants, particularly those that they licence—greyhound, harness and racing. It will promote compliance and integrity and also promote animal welfare and prevention of animal cruelty. The aim was to accept that recommendation of the committee to work with Training Queensland, a registered training organisation, and they will work together to develop the competency packages, the delivery of that training to those licenced participants and ensuring that QRIC is involved in that education and training with them. We think that as regulator it would be best for them to be involved in the training and best for Racing Queensland, through its registered training organisation, to deliver that training.

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 10, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 11 and 12, as read, agreed to.

Clause 13—



Ms GRACE (11.07 pm): I move the following amendment—

7 Clause 13 (Ministerial directions)

Page 27, after line 22—

insert—

(aa) a decision of the commission made under the rules of racing for a code of racing;

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 13, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 14, as read, negatived.

Clause 15, as read, negatived.

Clause 16, as read, agreed to.

Clause 17—



Ms GRACE (11.09 pm): I move the following amendments—

9 Clause 17 (Deputy Racing Integrity Commissioners)

Page 29, line 18, 'are to be 2 or more'—

omit, insert—

is to be 1 or 2

10 Clause 17 (Deputy Racing Integrity Commissioners)

Page 29, lines 24 and 25—

omit, insert—

(b) if 2 deputy commissioners are to be appointed, a deputy commissioner who is to be called the **2nd deputy commissioner**.

Mrs STUCKEY: Amendment 9, which relates to clause 17, provides for the appointment by Governor in Council of one or two deputy commissioners rather than two or more. The provision allows the Governor in Council flexibility to appoint one or two deputy commissioners as it deems appropriate. As honourable members can see, we have a bit of a dog's breakfast with this bill. We have some 137 amendments for a bill that has taken over a year to bring before the House and now here we are discussing integrity and a bill that had a minimum of two deputy commissioners in it and now those opposite are trying to undo that.

I would ask the minister to explain why they have gone from having a minimum of two, with one being called the first deputy commissioner and the second being called the second deputy commissioner, to reducing that? How was that decision brought about and what will be that role?

Ms GRACE: I thank the member for Currumbin. The reason for this is that once we appointed Ross Barnett designate QRIC commissioner there was a discussion around how the model would work and the transfer of staff. I think the member for Currumbin, through my ministerial office, was briefed by

Designate Commissioner Ross Barnett and it became clear that in order to contain costs so that we do not have a cost blowout, rather than saying it needed to be two or more, it would give the commissioner flexibility to appoint either one deputy or two.

When he looked at the structure, he felt that one deputy would be sufficient at this point in time, but obviously we have allowed flexibility so that, if there is a need for a second deputy, that can be done under this legislation. We think that going forward the appropriate structure is one commissioner and, at the most, two deputies. At this time, Commissioner Designate Ross Barnett is looking at one deputy commissioner and a senior investigator. When we settle this down and he has had a better look at it, that may change to two deputies. When we looked at the transfer of the staff, the structure and the model, we decided that one or two deputies would be sufficient to run QRIC.

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 17, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 18 to 55—



Ms GRACE (11.12 pm): I seek leave to move the following amendments en bloc.

Leave granted.

Ms GRACE: I move the following amendments—

11 Clause 18 (Persons eligible to be commissioner or deputy commissioner)

Page 30, line 17, 'office'—

omit, insert—

officer

12 Clause 20 (Functions of deputy commissioner)

Page 31, line 13, after '2nd deputy commissioner'—

insert—

, if 2 deputy commissioners are appointed

13 Clause 21 (Powers of commissioner and deputy commissioners)

Page 31, line 20, 'commissioners'—

omit, insert—

commissioner

14 Clause 21 (Powers of commissioner and deputy commissioners)

Page 31, lines 21 to 26—

omit, insert—

- (1) The commissioner and a deputy commissioner have the powers necessary for performing the commissioner's or deputy commissioner's functions.
- (2) The commissioner and a deputy commissioner also have the other powers given to the commissioner and a deputy commissioner under this Act or another Act.

15 Clause 25 (Acting commissioner)

Page 33, lines 11 to 13—

omit, insert—

- (b) there is not a deputy commissioner who is able to perform the functions of the commissioner's office.

16 Clause 27 (Preservation of rights of commissioner and deputy commissioners)

Page 34, line 9—

omit, insert—

commissioner

Amendments agreed to.

Clauses 18 to 55, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 56—



Mrs STUCKEY (11.13 pm): Clause 56 requires the control bodies to mainly fund the Queensland Racing Integrity Commission in performing its duties and allows the chief executive to invoice a control body for this purpose. The cost of the Queensland Racing Integrity Commission has been a genuine bone of contention for many people. As members have heard, while the industry was not consulted and was not able to have direct input into the development of this bill, the cost implications that may be borne by, in particular, our regional racing clubs are considered to be quite significant. As honourable members may have heard, after trying to extract the cost of this commission from the previous minister and the current minister, it was only last night that costs were revealed.

I had resorted to asking a question on notice, question on notice No. 444. The answer came back only on Friday. It states—

... the Department of National Parks, Sport and Racing was requested to build a model that would assist in calculating a notional attribution of centrally funded costs to determine the overall budget for the integrity regime.

That does not give much comfort. Why was a lot of this work not done before? The minister has stated many times that the cost will not be more than the existing regime, yet, again, I refer to question on notice No. 444. The figures that the minister trotted out last night are not convincing. She has Racing Queensland bearing a cost of \$14.75 million, the department \$1.2 million and government—and we presume Treasury—\$8.9 million plus CPI. That totals \$24.85 million for the cost of an integrity commission. That does not sit well with the industry. What guarantee is the minister able to give that the industry will not be forced to bear those costs, because it actually looks very much like they could be invoiced without much warning?

Ms GRACE: This allows the commission to receive the funds that it would cost Racing Queensland to run integrity, as per the budget that has been tabled in the House, that is, the costs it would normally have incurred, which is a figure of \$14.75 million. This provision allows them to receive the funds from Racing Queensland. In order for that to occur, this particular section is required in the act.

Division: Question put—That clause 56 stand part of the bill.

Mr SPEAKER: Ring the bells for one minute.

AYES, 43:

ALP, 41—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, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 43:

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

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

Pair: Stewart, Rowan.

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

Resolved in the affirmative.

Mr POWELL: I rise to a point of order, Mr Speaker. My count is that there are only 40 on the Labor side.

Mr WHITING: I rise to a point of order, Mr Speaker. I did not notice that the minister was not present. My apologies.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: We will have another count. No-one has left the chamber.

Division: Question put—That clause 56 stand part of the bill.

AYES, 42:

ALP, 40—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 43:

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

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

Pair: Stewart, Rowan.

Resolved in the negative.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I rise to a point of order, Mr Speaker. The division we just had was a one-minute division. I was surprised that it would have been a one-minute division. I ask that you reconsider whether it is appropriate to recount the division.

Mr HART: I rise to a point of order, Mr Speaker. You called one-minute divisions. I clearly heard that.

Mr SPEAKER: I did say that the bells were to ring for one minute.

Mr STEVENS: I rise to a point of order, Mr Speaker. The Leader of the House was questioning the veracity of calling a one-minute division, as I understand it. The fact of the matter is that the Speaker of the House called a one-minute division and it stands.

Mr SPEAKER: I did call a one-minute division. We will move on. We will deal with that matter later. We will look at the video footage if need be.

Clause 56, as read, negatived.

Clauses 57 to 70—



Ms GRACE (11.24 pm): I seek leave to move the following amendments en bloc.

Leave granted.

Ms GRACE: I move the following amendments—

17 After clause 57

Page 49, after line 4—

insert—

57A Commission may charge fees for its services

- (1) The commission may charge fees for services it provides as part of the performance of its functions.
- (2) A fee charged by the commission for its service, including matters relating to licensing, must reflect the reasonable cost to the commission of providing the service.
- (3) Despite subsection (1), the commission must not charge a fee for a service provided under this Act or the Racing Act to the Minister or the chief executive.

18 Chapter 3, heading (Commission's functions in relation to codes of racing and licensed clubs)

Page 49, line 7—

omit.

19 Clause 58 (Purposes of chapter)

Page 49, lines 9 to 25 and page 50, lines 1 and 2—

omit, insert—

58 Purpose of chapter

- (1) The main purpose of this chapter is to provide for the way the commission may perform its functions in relation to each code of racing.
- (2) Generally, the commission performs its functions by making standards for each code of racing, particularly about the licensing scheme for controlling activities relating to animals and participants and about the way in which races are to be held for the code of racing.
- (3) The standards ensure there is guidance for persons involved in the code of racing and transparent decision-making relating to matters dealt with by the standards.

20 Clause 61 (Availability of standards)

Page 51, line 14, after 'chief executive'—

insert—

and each control body

21 Chapter 3, part 2, division 2, heading (Standards about licensing schemes)

Page 52, line 1, 'about'—

omit, insert—

for

22 Clause 65 (Developing standards for a licensing scheme)

Page 52, lines 12 and 13—

omit, insert—

65 Standards for licensing schemes for codes of racing

- (1) The commission must make a standard for a licensing scheme for each code of racing.
- (2) In developing the standard for a licensing scheme for a code

23 Clause 66 (Standards for a licensing scheme—mandatory matters)

Page 53, lines 11 to 14—

omit, insert—

- (h) how and when the suitability of licensed animals and participants will be audited to decide if a licensed animal or participant continues to be suitable to be licensed;

24 Clause 66 (Standards for a licensing scheme—mandatory matters)

Page 54, lines 8 to 22—

omit, insert—

- (p) serving notices on licence holders;
- (q) the fees payable to the commission, including fees payable in relation to licensing for each code of racing.
- (2) The standard for a licensing scheme must also provide that, after auditing a licensed animal or participant, if the commission is not satisfied it is suitable to continue to be licensed, the commission must take disciplinary action relating to the licence.

25 Clause 68 (Application for licence)

Page 55, lines 13 and 14, ‘, club, participant or venue’—

omit, insert—

or participant

26 Clause 68 (Application for licence)

Page 55, lines 25 to 32 and page 56, lines 1 to 12—

*omit.***27 Clause 68 (Application for licence)**

Page 56, line 14, ‘, other than a licence for a club,’—

*omit.***28 Clause 70 (Same animal, participant or venue may be licensed for multiple codes of racing)**

Page 57, lines 2 to 6—

*omit, insert—***70 Same animal or participant may be licensed for multiple codes of racing**

This Act does not prevent an animal or participant licensed for a code of racing being licensed for another code of racing.

29 Chapter 3, part 3, heading (Disciplinary action taken against licensed clubs)

Page 57, lines 7 and 8—

omit.

Amendments agreed to.

Clauses 57 to 70, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 71, as read, negatived.

Clause 72, as read, negatived.

Clause 73, as read, negatived.

Clause 74, as read, negatived.

Clause 75, as read, negatived.

Clause 76, as read, negatived.

Clause 77, as read, negatived.

Omission of heading—



Ms GRACE (11.27 pm): I move the following amendment—

29B Chapter 3, part 4, heading (Other provisions applying to licensed clubs)

Page 62, lines 1 and 2—

omit.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 78, as read, negatived.

Clause 79, as read, negatived.

Clauses 80 to 87, as read, agreed to.

Clause 88—



Ms GRACE (11.28 pm): I move the following amendment—

30 Clause 88 (Applicant for racing bookmaker's licence to hold eligibility certificate)

Page 71, lines 10 to 13—

omit, insert—

Division 1 Applications for racing bookmaker's licences

88 Applications

An application for a racing bookmaker's licence may be made only by an adult or a corporation.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 88, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 89—

Ms GRACE (11.29 pm): I move the following amendment—

31 Clause 89 (What corporate licence must include)

Page 71, lines 14 to 28—

omit, insert—

89 Requirements about applications

- (1) An application for a racing bookmaker's licence must be made to the commission in the approved form.
- (2) The application must be accompanied by—
 - (a) the application fee prescribed by regulation; and
 - (b) if the applicant is an individual—a consent, in the approved form, signed by the individual for the following—
 - (i) the individual's fingerprints to be taken for the commission;
 - (ii) information about the individual to be obtained by the commission;
 - (iii) the individual's background to be investigated by the commission; and
 - (c) if the applicant is a corporation—a consent, in the approved form, signed by each person the applicant considers is a business associate or an executive associate of the corporation for each of the following—
 - (i) if the associate is an individual—the associate's fingerprints to be taken for the commission;
 - (ii) information about the associate to be obtained by the commission;
 - (iii) the associate's background to be investigated by the commission; and
 - (d) if the applicant is a corporation—the corporation's agreement to obtain a consent of the type mentioned in paragraph (c) for a person whom the commission reasonably believes to be a business associate or an executive associate of the corporation but whose consent does not accompany the application.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 89, as amended, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Ms GRACE (11.30 pm): I move the following amendment—

32 After clause 89 (What corporate licence must include)

Page 71, after line 28—

insert—

89A Further information or documents to support application

- (1) The commission may, by notice given to the applicant, require the applicant to give the commission, within the reasonable period of at least 28 days stated in the notice, further information or a document the commission reasonably requires to decide the application.
- (2) When making the requirement, the commission must warn the applicant that the application will not be considered further until the requirement is complied with, unless the person has a reasonable excuse for the failure to comply.

Division 2 Suitability of applicants and associates

89B Suitability of applicants for racing bookmaker's licence

- (1) This section applies to the commission in deciding whether an applicant for a racing bookmaker's licence is a suitable person to hold a racing bookmaker's licence.
- (2) The commission may have regard to all of the following matters—
 - (a) the applicant's character or business reputation;

- (b) the applicant's current financial position and financial background;
- (c) if the applicant has a business association with another entity—
 - (i) the other entity's character or business reputation; and
 - (ii) the other entity's current financial position and financial background;
- (d) if the applicant is a corporation—the persons who have a substantial holding in the applicant, or in a corporation that is a holding company of the applicant.

Note—

See also section 89G(2) which provides that an applicant for a racing bookmaker's licence is not a suitable person to hold a racing bookmaker's licence if the applicant, or a business associate or an executive associate of the applicant, is an identified participant in a criminal organisation.

89C Suitability of business and executive associates

- (1) This section applies to the commission in deciding whether a business associate or an executive associate of an applicant for a racing bookmaker's licence is a suitable person to be associated with the applicant.
- (2) The commission may have regard to all of the following matters—
 - (a) the associate's character or business reputation;
 - (b) the associate's current financial position and financial background;
 - (c) if the associate has a business association with another entity—
 - (i) the other entity's character or business reputation; and
 - (ii) the other entity's current financial position and financial background;
 - (d) if the associate is a corporation—the persons who have a substantial holding in the associate, or in a corporation that is a holding company of the associate.

89D Other matters about suitability

Sections 89B and 89C do not limit the matters the commission may have regard to in deciding matters to which the sections relate.

Division 3 Dealing with applications

89E Taking fingerprints

- (1) On receipt of the application, and compliance by the applicant with this part in relation to the application, the commission must—
 - (a) for an application by an individual—cause the fingerprints to be taken of the applicant; and
 - (b) for an application by a corporation—cause the fingerprints to be taken of each of the business associates and executive associates of the applicant, who is an individual.
- (2) The commission may also cause the fingerprints to be taken of an individual who has consented, as mentioned in section 89(2)(d), to the individual's fingerprints being taken.
- (3) However, if the commission is satisfied an individual's fingerprints are already held by the commission, the commission need not cause the individual's fingerprints to be taken under this section.

89F Consideration of application

- (1) The commission must consider the application and either grant or refuse to grant the application.
- (2) However, the commission is not required to decide the application if—
 - (a) the commission has given a person a notice under section 89A or 89K relating to the application requiring the person to give the commission information or a document as stated in the section; and
 - (b) the person has failed, without reasonable excuse, to comply with the requirement within the period stated in the notice.

89G Conditions for granting application

- (1) The commission may grant the application only if the commission is satisfied—
 - (a) the applicant is a suitable person to hold a racing bookmaker's licence; and
 - (b) each business associate and executive associate of the applicant is a suitable person to be associated with the applicant.
- (2) An applicant is not a suitable person to hold a racing bookmaker's licence if—
 - (a) the applicant is an identified participant in a criminal organisation; or
 - (b) a business associate or an executive associate of the applicant is—
 - (i) if the associate is an individual—an identified participant in a criminal organisation; or
 - (ii) if the associate is a corporation—a criminal organisation; or
 - (c) the applicant is an unsuitable corporation.

89H Investigation of suitability of persons

- (1) The commission may investigate the applicant to help the commission decide whether the applicant is a suitable person to be a licence holder.
- (2) The commission may investigate a business associate or an executive associate of the applicant to help the commission decide whether the associate is a suitable person to be associated with the applicant.

89I Information about whether persons are identified participants in criminal organisations

- (1) The commission must ask the police commissioner if the applicant—
 - (a) is an identified participant in a criminal organisation; or
 - (b) has a business associate or an executive associate who is—
 - (i) if the associate is an individual—an identified participant in a criminal organisation; or
 - (ii) if the associate is a corporation—a criminal organisation or an unsuitable corporation; or
 - (c) if the applicant is a corporation—is an unsuitable corporation.
- (2) The police commissioner must give the commission the information requested under subsection (1).
- (3) The commission may use the advice given by the police commissioner only for deciding the application.

89J Criminal history reports for investigations

- (1) If the commission, in investigating a person under section 89H, asks the police commissioner for a written report on the person's criminal history, the police commissioner must give the report to the commission.
- (2) The report is to contain—
 - (a) the person's criminal history; and
 - (b) a brief description of the circumstances of a conviction mentioned in the person's criminal history.
- (3) However, the duty imposed on the police commissioner applies only to information in the police commissioner's possession or to which the police commissioner has access.

89K Requirement of associate to give information or document for investigation

- (1) In investigating a business associate or an executive associate of an applicant, the commission may, by notice given to the associate, require the associate to give the commission, within the reasonable period of at least 28 days stated in the notice, information or a document the commission reasonably believes is relevant to the investigation.
- (2) When making the requirement, the commission must—
 - (a) warn the associate that the application for the racing bookmaker's licence will not be considered further until the requirement is complied with; and
 - (b) give the applicant a copy of the notice.

89L Decision on application

- (1) If the commission grants an application for a racing bookmaker's licence, the commission must give the applicant the licence.
- (2) If the commission refuses to grant an application for a racing bookmaker's licence, the commission must give the applicant an information notice about the decision.
- (3) The *Acts Interpretation Act 1954*, section 27B, does not apply to the information notice to the extent to which the decision is the result of advice given by the police commissioner to the commission under section 89I.

89M Form of racing bookmaker's licence

A racing bookmaker's licence is to be in the approved form.

89N What corporate licence must include

- (1) A racing bookmaker's licence for a corporation must state the name of each executive officer of the corporation who may carry on bookmaking for the corporation under the licence.
- (2) The commission must not, under subsection (1), state an executive officer's name in the licence unless the executive officer—
 - (a) has been investigated by the commission and found suitable to be associated with the licence holder; and
 - (b) is a person whom the commission reasonably believes has the experience and knowledge necessary to properly carry on bookmaking for the corporation under the licence.

89O Period for which racing bookmaker's licence has effect

A racing bookmaker's licence continues to have effect until the earlier of the following happens—

- (a) the licence is cancelled under section 89ZA;
- (b) a surrender of the licence takes effect under section 89ZF.

Division 4 Investigations of racing bookmakers and associates**89P Audit program**

- (1) The commission may approve an audit program for investigating racing bookmakers, and the business associates and executive associates of racing bookmakers.
- (2) The commission is responsible for ensuring that investigations of racing bookmakers, and the business associates and executive associates of racing bookmakers, are conducted under the audit program.

89Q Investigations into suitability of licence holder

- (1) The commission may investigate a licence holder to find out whether the licence holder is a suitable person to hold, or to continue to hold, a racing bookmaker's licence.
- (2) Subject to subsection (3), the commission may investigate the licence holder under this section only if—
 - (a) the commission reasonably suspects the licence holder is not, or is no longer, a suitable person to hold a racing bookmaker's licence; or
 - (b) the investigation is made under an audit program approved by the commission.
- (3) The commission may, at any time, ask the police commissioner whether the licence holder—
 - (a) is an identified participant in a criminal organisation; or
 - (b) has a business associate or an executive associate who is—
 - (i) if the associate is an individual—an identified participant in a criminal organisation; or
 - (ii) if the associate is a corporation—a criminal organisation or an unsuitable corporation; or
 - (c) if the licence holder is a corporation—is an unsuitable corporation.
- (4) The police commissioner must give the commission the information requested under subsection (3).
- (5) The commission may use the advice given by the police commissioner only for deciding whether the racing bookmaker's licence should be cancelled.

89R Investigation into suitability of associate of licence holder

- (1) The commission may investigate a business associate or an executive associate of a licence holder to decide whether the associate is a suitable person to be, or to continue to be, associated with the licence holder's operations.
- (2) Subject to subsection (3), the commission may investigate a business associate or an executive associate of a licence holder under this section only if—
 - (a) the commission reasonably suspects the associate is not, or is no longer, a suitable person to be associated with a licence holder's operations; or
 - (b) the investigation is part of an investigation under this division of the licence holder in relation to whom the associate is a business associate or an executive associate; or
 - (c) the investigation is made under an audit program approved by the commission; or
 - (d) the associate became a business associate or an executive associate of the licence holder after the issue of the racing bookmaker's licence to the licence holder; or
 - (e) the associate has not been investigated previously under an audit program mentioned in paragraph (c).
- (3) The commission may, at any time, ask the police commissioner whether a business associate or an executive associate of a licence holder—
 - (a) is an identified participant in a criminal organisation; or
 - (b) has a business associate or an executive associate who is—
 - (i) if the associate is an individual—an identified participant in a criminal organisation; or
 - (ii) if the associate is a corporation—a criminal organisation or an unsuitable corporation; or
 - (c) if the business associate or an executive associate is a corporation—is an unsuitable corporation.
- (4) The police commissioner must give the commission the information requested under subsection (3).
- (5) The commission may use the advice given by the police commissioner only for deciding whether the racing bookmaker's licence should be cancelled.

89S Criminal history report for investigation

- (1) If the commission in investigating a person under section 89Q, 89R or 89ZE(2) asks the police commissioner for a written report on the person's criminal history, the commissioner must give the report to the commission.

- (2) The report is to contain—
 - (a) the person's criminal history; and
 - (b) a brief description of the circumstances of a conviction mentioned in the person's criminal history.
- (3) However, the duty imposed on the police commissioner applies only to information in the commissioner's possession or to which the commissioner has access.

89T Requirement to give information or document for investigation

- (1) In investigating a licence holder, or a business associate or an executive associate of a licence holder, the commission may, by notice given to the person, require the person to give the commission information or a document the commission reasonably believes is relevant to the investigation.
- (2) The notice must state a reasonable period of at least 28 days within which the person must comply with the requirement.
- (3) When making the requirement, the commission must warn the person it is an offence to fail to comply with the requirement, unless the person has a reasonable excuse.

89U Failure to give information or document for investigation

- (1) A person of whom a requirement is made under section 89T must comply with the requirement, unless the person has a reasonable excuse.
Maximum penalty—200 penalty units.
- (2) If the person is an individual, it is a reasonable excuse for the person not to comply with the requirement if complying with the requirement might tend to incriminate the person.
- (3) The person does not commit an offence against this section if the information or document sought by the commission is not in fact relevant to the investigation.

Division 5 Cancellation of racing bookmaker's licences

89V Grounds for cancellation

- (1) A ground for cancelling a racing bookmaker's licence exists if the licence holder—
 - (a) is not a suitable person to hold a racing bookmaker's licence; or
 - (b) is convicted for an offence against—
 - (i) this Act or the Racing Act; or
 - (ii) a law of another State, that is prescribed by regulation as a law about racing or betting; or
 - (c) is convicted of an indictable offence against another Act or law; or
 - (d) contravenes a provision of this Act, whether or not a penalty is provided for the provision; or
 - (e) is affected by bankruptcy action; or
 - (f) has a business associate or an executive associate who is—
 - (i) if the associate is an individual—an identified participant in a criminal organisation; or
 - (ii) if the associate is a corporation—a criminal organisation.
- (2) Also, a ground for cancelling a racing bookmaker's licence exists if—
 - (a) the racing bookmaker's licence was granted because of a materially false or misleading representation or declaration; or
 - (b) a business associate or an executive associate of the licence holder is not a suitable person to be associated with a licence holder.

89W Immediate cancellation of racing bookmaker's licence

- (1) The commission must cancel a licence holder's racing bookmaker's licence if the commission is advised by the police commissioner that the licence holder is—
 - (a) an identified participant in a criminal organisation; or
 - (b) an unsuitable corporation.
- (2) Immediately after cancelling the racing bookmaker's licence, the commission must give the licence holder an information notice about the decision to cancel the licence.
- (3) The decision takes effect on the day the information notice is given to the licence holder.
- (4) The information notice must include—
 - (a) a direction to the licence holder to return the racing bookmaker's licence to the commission within 14 days after the cancellation; and
 - (b) a warning to the licence holder that, without a reasonable excuse, it is an offence to fail to comply with the direction.
- (5) The *Acts Interpretation Act 1954*, section 27B, does not apply to the information notice.

89X Show cause notice

- (1) The commission must give a licence holder a notice (a **show cause notice**) if the commission reasonably believes—
 - (a) a ground exists to cancel the licence holder's racing bookmaker's licence; and
 - (b) the act, omission or other thing forming the ground is of a serious and fundamental nature; and
 - (c) the public interest may be affected in an adverse and material way.
- (2) The show cause notice must state the following—
 - (a) the action (the **proposed action**) the commission proposes taking under this division;
 - (b) the grounds for the proposed action;
 - (c) an outline of the facts and circumstances forming the basis for the grounds;
 - (d) that the licence holder may, within a stated period (the **show cause period**), make submissions to the commission to show why the proposed action should not be taken.
- (3) The *Acts Interpretation Act 1954*, section 27B, does not apply to the show cause notice to the extent to which the decision is the result of advice given by the police commissioner to the commission under section 89P(4) or 89R(4).
- (4) The show cause period must end at least 28 days after the licence holder is given the show cause notice.
- (5) The licence holder may, in the show cause period, make submissions to the commission about the show cause notice.

89Y Consideration of submission

The commission must consider any submissions made by the licence holder in the show cause period.

89Z Ending show cause process without further action

If, after considering the submissions for the show cause notice, the commission no longer believes a ground exists to cancel the racing bookmaker's licence, the commission must—

- (a) take no further action about the show cause notice; and
- (b) give a notice to the licence holder that no further action is to be taken.

89ZA Cancellation

- (1) The commission may cancel the racing bookmaker's licence if—
 - (a) there are no submissions for the show cause notice; or
 - (b) after considering the submissions for the show cause notice, the commission still believes—
 - (i) a ground exists to cancel the racing bookmaker's licence; and
 - (ii) the act, omission or other thing constituting the ground is of a serious and fundamental nature; and
 - (iii) the public interest may be affected in an adverse and material way.
- (2) The commission must cancel the racing bookmaker's licence if—
 - (a) the licence holder is a corporation; and
 - (b) a show cause notice was given to the corporation because an executive associate or a business associate of the corporation is an identified participant in a criminal organisation; and
 - (c) either—
 - (i) there are no submissions for the show cause notice; or
 - (ii) submissions were made for the show cause notice and the commission still believes cancelling the racing bookmaker's licence is warranted.
- (3) The commission must immediately give the licence holder an information notice about the decision to cancel the racing bookmaker's licence.
- (4) The information notice must include—
 - (a) a direction to the licence holder to return the racing bookmaker's licence to the commission within 14 days after the cancellation; and
 - (b) a warning to the licence holder that, without a reasonable excuse, it is an offence to fail to comply with the direction.
- (5) The decision takes effect on the later of the following—
 - (a) the day the information notice is given to the licence holder;
 - (b) the day of effect stated in the information notice.

- (6) The *Acts Interpretation Act 1954*, section 27B, does not apply to the information notice to the extent to which the decision is the result of advice given by the police commissioner to the commission under section 89P(4) or 89R(4).

89ZB Return of cancelled racing bookmaker's licence

- (1) A person must comply with a direction to the person under section 89W(4)(a) or 89ZA(4)(a) unless the person has a reasonable excuse.
Maximum penalty—40 penalty units.
- (2) If a person is unable to comply with subsection (1) because the person's racing bookmaker's licence has been lost or destroyed, the person must, within 14 days after the cancellation, give the commission a statutory declaration stating details of the loss or destruction.
Maximum penalty—40 penalty units.
- (3) A person does not commit an offence against subsection (1) if the person is not given a warning that, without a reasonable excuse, it is an offence to fail to comply with the direction.

89ZC Censuring licence holder

- (1) This section applies if the commission—
- reasonably believes a ground exists to cancel a racing bookmaker's licence but does not believe that giving a show cause notice is warranted; or
 - after considering the submissions for a show cause notice, still believes a ground exists to cancel a racing bookmaker's licence but does not believe cancellation of the licence is warranted.
- (2) However, this section does not apply if the ground that exists to cancel a racing bookmaker's licence is that the licence holder is no longer a suitable person because the holder has a business associate or an executive associate who is—
- if the associate is an individual—an identified participant in a criminal organisation; or
 - if the associate is a corporation—a criminal organisation.
- (3) The commission may censure the licence holder for a matter relating to the ground for cancellation.
- (4) The censure can be effected only by the commission giving the licence holder an information notice about the decision to censure the holder.

Division 6 Other matters relating to licensing

89ZD Corporate licence holder must advise commission of change in executive officers or persons with substantial holdings

- (1) This section applies to a licence holder that is a corporation.
- (2) Within 14 days after either of the following changes, the licence holder must give the commission notice of the change—
- a change to the persons who are executive officers of the corporation;
 - a change to the persons who have substantial holdings in the corporation, or a holding company of the corporation.
- Maximum penalty—100 penalty units.

89ZE Commission may amend racing bookmaker's licence to show change in executive officers

- (1) This section applies if a licence holder has given the commission notice under section 89ZD(2)(a) and asks the commission to amend the racing bookmaker's licence to omit or include a person as an executive officer of the corporation.
- (2) The commission may investigate the executive officer for the purpose of deciding whether to grant the request.
- (3) However, the commission must not include the name of an executive officer in the licence unless the commission has investigated the executive officer and found the person to be suitable to be associated with the licence holder.

89ZF Surrender of racing bookmaker's licence

- (1) A licence holder may surrender the holder's racing bookmaker's licence by notice given to the commission.
- (2) The surrender of the racing bookmaker's licence takes effect—
- on the day the notice is given to the commission; or
 - if a later day of effect is stated in the notice—on the later day.
- (3) The commission must give each control body notice of the surrender.

89ZG Destruction of fingerprints

- (1) After the commission refuses to grant an application for a racing bookmaker's licence or a racing bookmaker's licence is surrendered or cancelled, the commission must destroy the fingerprints of any individual who is—
- the applicant or licence holder; or

- (b) a business associate or an executive associate of the applicant or licence holder.
- (2) Also, if the commission is reasonably satisfied an individual who was a business associate or an executive associate of an applicant or licence holder is no longer a business associate or an executive associate of the applicant or licence holder, the commission must destroy the individual's fingerprints.

Amendment agreed to.

Omission of heading—



Ms GRACE (11.30 pm): I move the following amendment—

33 Chapter 4, part 3, heading (Eligibility certificates)

Page 72, line 1—

omit.

Amendment agreed to.

Omission of heading—

Ms GRACE (11.30 pm): I move the following amendment—

34 Chapter 4, part 3, division 1, heading (Suitability of applicants and business and executive associates)

Page 72, lines 2 and 3—

omit.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 90, as read, negatived.

Clause 91, as read, negatived.

Clause 92, as read, negatived.

Omission of heading—

Ms GRACE (11.31 pm): I move the following amendment—

34B Chapter 4, part 3, division 2, heading (Applications for, and issue of, eligibility certificates)

Page 73, lines 24 and 25—

omit.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 93, as read, negatived.

Clause 94, as read, negatived.

Clause 95, as read, negatived.

Clause 96, as read, negatived.

Clause 97, as read, negatived.

Clause 98, as read, negatived.

Clause 99, as read, negatived.

Clause 100, as read, negatived.

Clause 101, as read, negatived.

Clause 102, as read, negatived.

Clause 103, as read, negatived.

Clause 104, as read, negatived.

Clause 105, as read, negatived.

Clause 106, as read, negatived.

Clause 107, as read, negatived.

Clause 108, as read, negatived.

Clause 109, as read, negatived.

Omission of heading—

Ms GRACE (11.35 pm): I move the following amendment—

34D Chapter 4, part 3, division 3, heading (Investigations of certificate holders and their business and executive associates)

Page 81, lines 9 to 11—

omit.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 110, as read, negatived.

Clause 111, as read, negatived.

Clause 112, as read, negatived.

Clause 113, as read, negatived.

Clause 114, as read, negatived.

Clause 115, as read, negatived.

Clause 116, as read, negatived.

Omission of heading—

Ms GRACE (11.36 pm): I move the following amendment—

34F Chapter 4, part 3, division 4, heading (Cancellation of eligibility certificates)

Page 85, lines 14 and 15—

omit.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 117, as read, negatived.

Clause 118, as read, negatived.

Clause 119, as read, negatived.

Clause 120, as read, negatived.

Clause 121, as read, negatived.

Clause 122, as read, negatived.

Clause 123, as read, negatived.

Clause 124, as read, negatived.

Clause 125, as read, negatived.

Clause 126, as read, negatived.

Clause 127, as read, negatived.

Omission of heading—

Ms GRACE (11.38 pm): I move the following amendment—

34H Chapter 4, part 3, division 5, heading (Other matters relating to eligibility certificates)

Page 92, lines 3 and 4—

omit.

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

AYES, 43:

ALP, 41—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, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 43:

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

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

Pair: Stewart, Rowan.

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

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 128, as read, negated.

Clause 129, as read, negated.

Insertion of new heading—



Ms GRACE (11.45 pm): I move the following amendment—

35 Chapter 4, part 3, division 6, heading (Review of decisions relating to eligibility certificates)

Page 93, lines 1 and 2—

omit, insert—

Division 7 Matters relating to review of decisions

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 130—

Ms GRACE (11.45 pm): I move the following amendment—

36 Clause 130 (Review by QCAT of decisions relating to eligibility certificates)

Page 93, lines 3 to 12—

omit, insert—

130 Application of division

This division applies if the commission makes a decision (a **commission decision**)—

- (a) refusing an application for a racing bookmaker's licence; or
- (b) cancelling a racing bookmaker's licence; or
- (c) censuring a racing bookmaker.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 130, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 131—

Ms GRACE (11.46 pm): I move the following amendments—

37 Clause 131 (Confidentiality of criminal intelligence in proceedings)

Page 93, lines 14 and 15, 'under section 130 of a gaming executive'—

omit, insert—

of a commission

38 Clause 131 (Confidentiality of criminal intelligence in proceedings)

Page 93, lines 24 and 25, 'review of the decision by QCAT or a proceeding about the decision'—

omit, insert—

an external review by QCAT under section 268 of an internal review decision about the commission decision, or a proceeding about the commission decision

39 Clause 131 (Confidentiality of criminal intelligence in proceedings)

Page 94, lines 28 and 29, 'gaming executive under section 100 or 112'—

omit, insert—

commission under section 89I, 89Q or 89R

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 131, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 132—

Ms GRACE (11.46 pm): I move the following amendment—

40 Clause 132 (Application of Judicial Review Act 1991)

Page 95, line 6, 'gaming executive'—

omit, insert—

commission

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 132, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 133 to 147, as read, agreed to.

Clause 148—

Ms GRACE (11.46 pm): I move the following amendment—

41 Clause 148 (Automatic cancellation or suspension of offcourse approval)

Page 103, lines 4, 7, 10 and 13, 'eligibility certificate or'—
omit.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 148, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 149 to 158, as read, agreed to.

Clause 159—

Ms GRACE (11.47 pm): I move the following amendment—

42 Clause 159 (Racing bookmaker's agent during particular periods)

Page 111, lines 3 to 5—
omit.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 159, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 160, as read, negatived.

Clause 161, as read, negatived.

Clause 162, as read, negatived.

Clause 163, as read, negatived.

Clauses 164 to 318—



Ms GRACE (11.48 pm): I seek leave to move the following amendments en bloc.

Leave granted.

Ms GRACE: I move the following amendments—

44 Clause 232 (Definitions for division)

Page 157, line 23, 'eligibility certificate,'—
omit.

45 Clause 232 (Definitions for division)

Page 158, lines 4 to 16—
omit, insert—

- (a) an approved form, completed by a person about the person's business reputation, character, criminal history, current financial position or financial background; or
- (b) a document accompanying an application for a licence, approval application or approved form; or
- (c) the fingerprints of a person obtained by the commission; or
- (d) another document obtained by the chief executive or the commission, relating to the person's business reputation, character, criminal history, current financial position or financial background.

46 Clause 235 (Making a false statement in application or other document)

Page 160, lines 24 to 29—
omit, insert—

- (a) in an application for a licence or approval application; or
- (b) in a document the person is required to keep, or to give to the Minister, the chief executive, the commission or another person, under this Act.

47 Clause 240 (Person must not interfere with licence holder or official of the commission or of a control body)

Page 164, line 10, 'or of a control body'—
omit.

48 Clause 240 (Person must not interfere with licence holder or official of the commission or of a control body)

Page 164, lines 18 to 20—
omit, insert—

interfere with an official of the commission performing a function or exercising a power under this Act.

- 49 Clause 248 (Interfering with particular things at licensed venue or places for holding trials)**
Page 169, lines 6 to 29—
omit.
- 50 Clause 251 (Appointments and authority)**
Page 170, line 22, ‘, the gaming executive’—
omit.
- 51 Clause 252 (Evidentiary aids)**
Page 171, lines 16 and 17, ‘, eligibility certificate’—
omit.
- 52 Clause 262 (What is an *original decision*)**
Page 177, after line 21—
insert—
(ba) censure the holder of a licence;
- 53 Clause 267 (Reviewing original decision)**
Page 181, line 5, after ‘20’—
insert—
business
- 54 Clause 267 (Reviewing original decision)**
Page 182, line 19, after ‘20’—
insert—
business
- 55 Clause 283 (Sharing of information by authorised officer)**
Page 190, line 26, ‘the ACPA’—
omit, insert—
an ACPA
- 56 Clause 288 (Regulation-making power)**
Page 193, lines 5 to 7—
omit, insert—
(a) the matters to be included in a program to audit the suitability of licensed animals and participants to continue to be licensed; and
- 57 Clause 290 (Definitions for chapter)**
Page 194, lines 24 and 25—
omit, insert—
(b) chapter 3, part 2, divisions 2 and 3;
- 58 Clause 290 (Definitions for chapter)**
Page 194, line 27—
omit, insert—
(d) chapter 6, parts 1 and 3A to 5;
- 59 Clause 297 (Examples for previous ch 3, pt 2, divs 2 and 3, pt 4 and pt 5, div 2)**
Page 200, lines 8 to 31 and page 201, lines 1 to 6—
omit, insert—
297 Examples for previous ch 3, pt 2, divs 2 and 3
(1) The following are examples of continuing matters dealt with under previous chapter 3, part 2, division 2 or 3—
(a) a policy for a code of racing, or provisions of a policy, to the extent the policy or provisions are for a licensing scheme as mentioned in previous chapter 3, part 2, division 2;
(b) an application for a licence as mentioned in previous section 88 that has not been granted or refused before the commencement.
- 60 Clause 299 (Examples for previous ch 6)**
Page 201, line 28 to page 203, line 30—
omit, insert—
299 Examples for previous ch 6, pts 1 and 3A to 5
The following are examples of continuing matters dealt with under previous chapter 6, parts 1 and 3A to 5—

61 Before clause 301

Page 206, before line 5—

insert—

Division 1 Staff of the commission

300A What is the *employee register*

- (1) The ***employee register*** is a register of employees of the board that is prepared for the commission and approved by the chief executive.

Note—

Under the Racing Act, section 9AA, the Queensland All Codes Racing Industry Board is continued in existence under that Act under the name Racing Queensland Board and is referred to as the board.

- (2) It must be stated in the employee register, for each employee of the board whose name is stated in the employee register, whether the employee is employed by the board as a race day steward.
- (3) The chief executive may approve the employee register for the purpose of subsection (1).
- (4) At any time within 1 year after the commencement, the chief executive may change the employee register to correct an omission or error.

300B Who is a *transferable employee*

A ***transferable employee*** is a person—

- (a) who, immediately before the commencement, was an employee of the board; and
- (b) whose name is stated in the employee register as an employee to be transferred to the commission.

300C Transfer of transferable employees

- (1) On the commencement—
- (a) a transferable employee becomes an employee of the commission; and
- (b) a transferable employee who is employed by the board as a race day steward, as stated in the employee register—
- (i) becomes employed by the commission as a race day steward; and
- (ii) is taken to be employed under this Act and not the *Public Service Act 2008*; and
- (c) a transferable employee who is not a race day steward, as stated in the employee register, is taken to be employed under the *Public Service Act 2008*; and
- (d) the records of the board, to the extent they relate to the employment of transferable employees, become records of the commission.
- (2) However, if an employee of the board becomes a transferable employee because of a register correction, subsection (1) applies to the employee as if the reference in the subsection to the commencement were a reference to the day after the register correction happens.
- (3) Also, if a person ceases to be a transferable employee because of a register correction, the person is taken never to have been—
- (a) a transferable employee; or
- (b) transferred to the commission.
- (4) In this section—

register correction means a change to the employee register under section 300A(4) to correct an omission or error.

300D Preservation of rights of transferable employees

The transfer of a transferable employee to the commission does not—

- (a) adversely affect the employee's total remuneration; or
- (b) prejudice the employee's existing or accruing rights to superannuation or annual, sick or long service leave; or
- (c) interrupt continuity of service, except that the employee is not entitled to claim the benefit of a right or entitlement more than once in relation to the same period of service; or
- (d) constitute a retrenchment, redundancy or termination of the employee's employment by the board; or
- (e) entitle the employee to a payment or other benefit because he or she is no longer employed by the board; or
- (f) require the board to make any payment in relation to the employee's accrued rights to annual, sick or long service leave irrespective of any arrangement between the board and the employee.

Division 2 Eligibility certificates**300E Existing applications for eligibility certificates**

- (1) An application for an eligibility certificate made under the unamended Act and not decided on the commencement is taken to have been withdrawn.
- (2) If the fingerprints of the applicant or of a business associate or executive associate of the applicant were taken under previous section 209 in relation to the application, the gaming executive must destroy the fingerprints.
- (3) The application fee that accompanied the application must be refunded in full to the applicant.

300F Existing right to apply for licence as racing bookmaker

- (1) This section applies to a person if—
 - (a) the person was granted an eligibility certificate under the unamended Act; and
 - (b) the day stated in the eligibility certificate by which the person must apply for a licence as a racing bookmaker has not lapsed; and
 - (c) the person has not applied to a control body for a racing bookmaker's licence before the commencement.
- (2) From the commencement, the person may apply to the commission for the licence before the day the eligibility certificate lapses under previous section 220(3) as if this Act had not been enacted.

300G Continuing obligation of certificate holders to give notice of particular changes

- (1) This section applies if—
 - (a) a certificate holder is required to give the gaming executive a notice under previous section 221; and
 - (b) immediately before the commencement, the certificate holder has not given the notice.
- (2) On the commencement—
 - (a) the obligation to give the notice continues to apply as if this Act had not been enacted; and
 - (b) a reference to the gaming executive in that section is taken to be a reference to the commission.

300H Approved audit program

- (1) This section applies to an audit program approved by the gaming executive under previous section 223.
- (2) On the commencement, the audit program—
 - (a) is taken to be an audit program for investigating licence holders, and the business associates and executive associates of licence holders, approved by the commission under section 89P(1); and
 - (b) may be varied, revoked or otherwise dealt with, and enforced, by the commission.

300I Continuation of show cause process

- (1) This section applies to a show cause notice given to a person who is a certificate holder under previous section 231 if, immediately before the commencement, the gaming executive had not—
 - (a) given the certificate holder a notice under previous section 234(3); or
 - (b) censured the certificate holder under previous section 235(4); or
 - (c) cancelled the eligibility certificate under previous section 236.
- (2) From the commencement, the show cause notice is taken to be a show cause notice given by the commission to the person.

300J Reviews

- (1) A review under previous chapter 6, part 3, division 6 that has started but not been finalised before the commencement may continue as if this Act had not been enacted.
- (2) If, immediately before the commencement, a person has a right of review under previous section 242(1)(b) or (c), the right continues as if this Act had not been enacted.
- (3) Previous section 242A continues to apply to a review under previous chapter 6, part 3, division 6.
- (4) Previous section 242B continues to apply to a decision of the gaming executive mentioned in previous section 242A(1).

300K Continuing obligation of control body to give notice of certain actions about racing bookmakers

- (1) This section applies if—
 - (a) a control body is required to give the gaming executive a notice under previous section 257; and
 - (b) immediately before the commencement, the control body has not given the notice.

- (2) On the commencement—
 - (a) the obligation to give the notice continues to apply as if this Act had not been enacted; and
 - (b) a reference to the gaming executive in that section is taken to be a reference to the commission.

Division 3 Miscellaneous provisions

62 Clause 310 (Insertion of new s 215A)

Page 209, line 25, 's 215A'—
omit, insert—

ss 215A–215C

63 Clause 310 (Insertion of new s 215A)

Page 211, line 13, 'a RIA'—
omit, insert—

an RIA

64 Clause 314 (Replacement of s 4 (Main purposes of Act and how they generally are achieved))

Page 213, line 9, after 'Board'—
insert—

as the control body

65 Clause 314 (Replacement of s 4 (Main purposes of Act and how they generally are achieved))

Page 213, line 18—
omit, insert—

racing, including the licensing of clubs and venues in the code; and

66 Clause 318 (Replacement of ch 2, pt 1A, div 2, hdg and ss 9AD–9AG)

Page 217, lines 29 to 34 and page 218, lines 1 to 3—
omit, insert—

net UBET product fee, in relation to the board, means the amount of the product fee paid to the board less the following amounts—

- (a) an amount paid by the board to Queensland Race Product Co Ltd ACN 081 743 722 for administrative costs;
- (b) an amount paid by the board to the commission for the provision of integrated scientific and professional services.

Amendments agreed to.

Clauses 164 to 318, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 319—



Ms GRACE (11.50 pm): I move the following amendments—

67 Clause 319 (Replacement of ss 9AI and 9AJ)

Page 219, lines 21 to 26—
omit, insert—

- (c) has skills and experience in 1 or more of the following areas—

68 Clause 319 (Replacement of ss 9AI and 9AJ)

Page 220, line 1—
omit, insert—

- (v) law; and

- (d) has not, for 2 years before the day of the appointment, owned a licensed animal.

- (1A) In deciding whether to appoint a person as a non-industry member, the Governor in Council must have regard to whether the person's skills and experience will complement the skills and experience of the other non-industry members so that, as a group, the non-industry members have skills and experience in the areas mentioned in subsection (1)(c).

Mrs STUCKEY: This is the most contentious aspect of this legislation because it replaces sections 9AI and 9AJ to provide the number of members which will constitute the Racing Queensland board and their appointment. It also defines a 'non-industry member' and a 'racing industry member'. The real bugbear of the industry across all three codes has been what was recognised in the committee report about the structure of the board. Some 148 submissions were made on the content of this bill and I want to share what was said in a couple of those. The first one is from Basil Nolan, and he said—

I, Basil Nolan, have been involved in the Thoroughbred Racing and Breeding Industry since 1957. My family founded Raheen Stud in 1957 and to this day it has continued to grow and breed and race horses. We now have the fourth generation involved in the Stud.

We have employment for fourteen (14) full time staff plus vets, farriers, maintenance staff and a huge volume of supporting businesses to keep the operation functioning.

The reason that I am opposed to this Bill is that the structure of the Bill at the moment is that the board will consist of four independent people who have had no involvement with racing for the previous two years. This is an extremely dangerous criteria as a successful racing board requires persons with an intimate and long involvement in the industry. Our livelihoods will depend on decisions that this board makes in the future and it is imperative that we have a board consisting of persons with knowledge and understanding of the industry.

Rob Heathcote is a leading thoroughbred racehorse trainer who trains Buffering. He said—

I have been a thoroughbred racehorse trainer in Queensland for 19 years ... I have seen a number of changes to my industry and unfortunately they have not always been good for the industry.

On this occasion the proposed introduction of the Racing Integrity bill will be the worst decision I have seen since I came into the Industry. I beg this government to come to your senses and not bring this in.

In Cooktown, Mr Gordon said, 'We've had no consultation with anyone from Queensland Racing regarding what may happen in the Far North.' I referred to David Whimpey in my speech last night as somebody who commented on MacSporran's recommendation on this. My question to the minister is this: how many of those 148 submissions were actually in favour of this structure?

Ms GRACE: I thank the member in relation to this matter. This is one of MacSporran's recommendations that talks about an independent majority board. The recommendation was very clear and I questioned Mr MacSporran extensively in regards to this. He recommended fairly solidly that there would be three representatives from each code on the board and that there would be four non-industry representatives as per this particular clause and the amendments that are in there.

It is one of the clauses that was also recommended by the committee as best practice in relation to the mix of an operating board under the ASX. There was no requirement from the committee to alter this. This puts the mix according to the MacSporran recommendation. We believe it is a step in the right direction. As we have said, it does not mean that independent members will not have any background in harness, thoroughbred or greyhound racing. It will be members who have not been directly involved for the last two years. That is a recommendation of MacSporran that the government has accepted, and that is what this clause reflects.

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

AYES, 43:

ALP, 41—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, Palaszczyk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 43:

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

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

Pair: Stewart, Rowan.

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

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 319, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 320 to 390—



Ms GRACE (12.00 am): I seek leave to move amendments en bloc.

Leave granted.

Ms GRACE: I move the following amendments—

69 Clause 334 (Amendment of s 11 (Approval application to be accompanied by specific matters))

Page 227, lines 21 to 26—

omit, insert—

(4) Section 11(2)(b) and (g)—

omit.

(5) Section 11(2)(c)—

omit, insert—

(c) licensing clubs and venues involved in the application code;

- (6) Section 11(2)(e)(i), 'from it as a control body'—
omit.
- (6A) Section 11(2)(c) to (f)—
renumber as section 11(2)(b) to (e).
- 70 Clause 346 (Amendment of s 34 (Powers of control body for its code of racing))**
Page 232, after line 12—
insert—
- (aa) license clubs and venues that are suitable to be licensed for the code;
 - (ab) conduct audits of licence holders to decide if the licence holders continue to be suitable to be licensed, on the control body's own initiative or at the request of the Minister;
 - (ac) investigate complaints about licence holders on the control body's own initiative or at the request of the Minister;
- 71 Clause 346 (Amendment of s 34 (Powers of control body for its code of racing))**
Page 233, after line 13—
insert—
- (ga) promote animal welfare and prevent animal cruelty, including ensuring adequate training is provided to participants to achieve this;
- 72 Clause 346 (Amendment of s 34 (Powers of control body for its code of racing))**
Page 234, lines 9 to 11—
omit, insert—
- (3) Section 34(6)—
omit, insert—
 - (6) In this section—
- 73 Clause 347 (Amendment of s 35 (Control body may charge fees for its services))**
Page 234, lines 19 to 21—
omit, insert—
- (2) Section 35(3), after 'under this Act'—
- 74 Clause 349 (Amendment of s 38 (Obligation to have racing calendar for code of racing))**
Page 235, after line 10—
insert—
- (3) Section 38—
insert—
 - (1A) The control body may amend the racing calendar if—
 - (a) the control body believes a licensed club is unsuitable to hold a race meeting; or
 - (b) a licensed club fails to comply with a control body direction given to the club under section 34(3).
- 75 Clause 357 (Replacement of s 78 (Purposes of ch 3))**
Page 242, lines 8 to 14—
omit, insert—
- (2) Generally, the control body performs its function by—
 - (a) making policies about the management of its code of racing, including, for example, about its licensing schemes for controlling activities relating to clubs and venues and about the way in which races are to be held for its code of racing; and
 - (b) making rules of racing; and
 - (c) giving directions to licensed clubs and ensuring compliance by taking disciplinary action relating to the licence of a club that does not comply with a direction.
- 76 Clause 358 (Replacement of ch 3, pt 2, div 1, hdg and ss 80–82)**
Page 242, line 29—
omit, insert—
- (2) The control body must make a policy for a licensing scheme for its code of racing.
 - (3) A regulation may prescribe that a control body
- 77 After clause 358**
Page 243, after line 2—
insert—
- 358A Amendment of s 85 (Application of policy)**
Section 85, from 'an animal' to 'venue'—
omit, insert—
- a club or venue

78 Clause 359 (Omission of ch 3, pt 2, divs 2 and 3)

Page 243, lines 3 to 5—

*omit, insert—***359 Amendment of s 86 (Purposes of control body's licensing scheme)**

Section 86(a) to (c)—

omit, insert—

- (a) the integrity of licensed clubs; and
- (b) the suitability of venues to conduct racing activities for its code.

79 Before clause 360

Page 243, before line 6—

*insert—***359A Amendment of s 87 (Control body's policy for a licensing scheme)**

- (1) Section 87(2)(h)—

omit, insert—

- (h) how and when the suitability of licensed clubs and venues will be audited to decide if a licensed club or venue continues to be suitable to be licensed;

- (2) Section 87(2)(j), 'or welfare of animals'—

omit.

- (3) Section 87(2)(o)(ii)—

omit.

- (4) Section 87(3)(c), 'or where a licensed animal is kept'—

omit.

- (5) Section 87(4)(c)—

omit.

- (6) Section 87(5) to (7)—

*omit.***359B Amendment of s 88 (Application for licence)**

- (1) Section 88(1), from 'an animal' to 'venue'—

omit, insert—

a club or venue

- (2) Section 88(3)—

omit, insert—

- (3) Also, a control body's policy relating to the licensing of a club must provide for the following matters—

- (a) for the club's application to be accompanied by a copy of a national police certificate for each executive officer of the applicant;

- (b) the application can not be granted if an executive officer of the applicant has a conviction for any of the following, other than a spent conviction—

- (i) an offence against this Act, the Racing Integrity Act or the repealed *Racing and Betting Act 1980*;

- (ii) an indictable offence, or a summary offence that involved dishonesty, fraud, stealing or unlawful betting, under any other Act or repealed Act;

- (iii) an offence against a law of another State, that is prescribed by regulation as a law about animal welfare, racing or betting;

- (iv) an animal welfare offence;

- (c) the extent to which the control body must have regard to another conviction stated on the national police certificate other than a conviction mentioned in paragraph (b);

- (d) after auditing a licensed club, if the control body is not satisfied it is suitable to continue to be licensed, the control body must take disciplinary action relating to the licence.

- (3) Section 88(4), ' , other than a licence for a club,'

omit, insert—

for a venue

359C Amendment of s 90 (Same animal, participant or venue may be licensed by control bodies)

- (1) Section 90, heading, 'animal, participant or'—
omit.
- (2) Section 90(1) and (2), 'an animal, participant or'—
omit, insert—
a

80 Clause 360 (Replacement of ss 91 and 94)

Page 244, lines 25 to 29 and page 245, lines 1 to 6—

omit, insert—

- (3) If there is an inconsistency between any of the following (each an *instrument*) and a control body's rules of racing, the instrument prevails to the extent of the inconsistency—
 - (a) this Act;
 - (b) the Racing Integrity Act;
 - (c) a policy of the control body;
 - (d) if the commission has a standard about a matter to which the rules of racing relate—the standard.

81 Clause 361 (Omission of ch 3, pt 4 and pt 5, divs 1 and 2)

Page 245, lines 26 to 28—

omit, insert—

361 Insertion of new s 107A

Chapter 3, part 4—

insert—

107A Notice of decision

- (1) This section applies if a control body decides to—
 - (a) cancel or suspend a licensed club's licence under section 101 or 104; or
 - (b) censure a licensed club under section 105; or
 - (c) direct a licensed club to rectify a matter under section 106.
- (2) The control body must give the commission notice of the decision.

82 Before clause 362

Page 246, before line 1—

insert—

361A Replacement of s 109 (Licensed club to hold race and betting meeting at licensed venue when under control of control body that licensed club and venue)

Section 109—

omit, insert—

109 Licensed club to hold race and betting meeting at licensed venue

- (1) A licensed club must not hold a contest, contingency or event in which 2 or more animals compete against each other for the purpose of providing a contest, contingency or event on which bets may be made unless—
 - (a) the contest, contingency or event is held at a licensed venue of the licensed club; and
 - (b) the control body that licensed the club and venue is managing the venue at the time; and
 - (c) the commission is exercising control at the venue at the time.
 Maximum penalty—200 penalty units.
- (2) A licensed club must not hold a meeting at which betting is carried on and at which a race is not held unless—
 - (a) the meeting is held at a licensed venue of the licensed club; and
 - (b) the control body that licensed the club and venue is managing the venue at the time; and
 - (c) the commission is exercising control at the venue at the time.
 Maximum penalty—200 penalty units.

83 Clause 369 (Replacement of chs 3A–7)

Page 249, lines 7 to 16—

omit, insert—

- (1) An **original decision** is any of the following—
- (a) a decision of a control body to refuse to grant or renew a licence;
 - (b) a decision of a control body to take disciplinary action relating to a licence;
 - (c) a decision of a control body to take an exclusion action against a person;
 - (d) a decision of a control body to impose a monetary penalty on a person;
 - (e) a decision of a control body to impose any other non-monetary penalty on a person;
 - (f) a decision of a control body to refuse to grant a race information authority for a code of racing;
 - (g) a decision of a control body to cancel a race information authority under section 113AJ;
 - (h) a decision under this Act prescribed by regulation as an original decision.

84 Clause 369 (Replacement of chs 3A–7)

Page 249, line 20, 'subsection (1)(a) or (b)'—

omit, insert—

subsection (1)(a) to (g)

85 Clause 369 (Replacement of chs 3A–7)

Page 249, line 23, '(1)(c)'—

omit, insert—

(1)(h)

86 Clause 369 (Replacement of chs 3A–7)

Page 250, lines 1 to 12—

omit, insert—

- (a) for an original decision refusing to grant or renew a licence—the applicant for the licence; or
- (b) a licence holder adversely affected by a decision of a control body to take the following action against the holder—
 - (i) disciplinary action;
 - (ii) exclusion action;
 - (iii) impose a monetary penalty;
 - (iv) impose any other non-monetary penalty; or
- (c) for an original decision refusing to grant a race information authority for a code of racing—the applicant for the race information authority; or
- (d) for an original decision to cancel a race information authority under section 113AJ—the holder of the race information authority before it is cancelled; or
- (e) prescribed by regulation for the purposes of a decision under this Act that is prescribed by regulation as an original decision.

87 Clause 369 (Replacement of chs 3A–7)

Page 251, line 21, 'QACT'—

omit, insert—

QCAT

88 Clause 369 (Replacement of chs 3A–7)

Page 252, line 9, after '20'—

insert—

business

89 Clause 369 (Replacement of chs 3A–7)

Page 253, line 13, after '20'—

insert—

business

90 Clause 370 (Omission of ch 8, pt 1, div 1, hdg)

Page 253, lines 28 to 30—

*omit.***91 Clause 371 (Amendment of s 310 (Definitions for div 1))**

Page 254, lines 2 to 7—

omit.

- 92 **Clause 371 (Amendment of s 310 (Definitions for div 1))**
 Page 254, line 14, after 'approval'—
insert—
 or licence
- 93 **Clause 371 (Amendment of s 310 (Definitions for div 1))**
 Page 254, line 15, 'racing'—
omit, insert—
 race
- 94 **Clause 373 (Amendment of s 313 (Making a false statement in application or other document))**
 Page 255, lines 14 and 15—
omit, insert—
 (1) Section 313(a), from 'accreditation' to 'certificate'—
 omit, insert—
 application for a licence
- 95 **Clause 374 (Omission of ch 8, pt 1, divs 2–4, div 5, hdg and s 327)**
 Page 255, lines 18 to 21—
omit, insert—
 374 Omission of ch 8, pt 1, div 2
 Chapter 8, part 1, division 2—
 omit.
- 96 **After clause 374**
 Page 255, after line 21—
insert—
 374A Amendment of ch 8, pt 1, div 3, hdg (Offences relating to prohibited things or interfering with licensed animals, persons or things)
 Chapter 8, part 1, division 3, heading, from 'relating'—
 omit.
 374B Omission of ss 316–318
 Sections 316 to 318—
 omit.
 374C Amendment of s 319 (Person must not interfere with licence holder or official of a control body)
 Section 319—
 insert—
 (3) In this section—
 interfere with, in relation to a licence holder or an official of a control body, means—
 (a) inflict injury on or cause injury to the licence holder or official; or
 (b) threaten to inflict injury on or cause injury to the licence holder or official; or
 (c) otherwise affect in a detrimental way the behaviour, performance or physical condition of the licence holder or official.
 374D Omission of ch 8, pt 1, div 4 (Unlawful bookmaking, places where betting done unlawfully and other provisions)
 Chapter 8, part 1, division 4—
 omit.
 374E Omission of ch 8, pt 1, div 5, hdg (Other offences)
 Chapter 8, part 1, division 5, heading—
 omit.
 374F Amendment of s 327 (Interfering with particular things at licensed venue or places for holding trials)
 Section 327(3), definition *responsible person*, paragraph (a), 'controlling'—
 omit, insert—
 managing
- 97 **Clause 377 (Replacement of ss 332 and 333)**
 Page 256, lines 19 to 24—
omit, insert—
 A document purporting to be a copy of an appointment, approval, direction, licence, notice or other document made or given under this Act is evidence of the appointment, approval, direction, licence, notice or other document and of the matters contained in it.

98 Clause 388 (Insertion of new ch 11)

Page 271, lines 20 to 24—

omit, insert—

- (d) the commission in substitution for the relevant control body for the appellable decision, if the appellable decision relates other than to a club or venue;
- (e) any other party to the appeal.

99 Clause 388 (Insertion of new ch 11)

Page 272, line 15, after 'control body'—

insert—

and the appellable decision relates other than to a club or venue

100 Clause 388 (Insertion of new ch 11)

Page 273, lines 3 to 17—

omit, insert—

- (1) If the appellable decision relates other than to a club or venue, previous chapter 4A does not apply to the appellable decision to which this division applies but the Racing Integrity Act, chapter 6, part 2, division 4 applies as if under that Act—
 - (a) the appellable decision were an original decision; and
 - (b) the aggrieved person for the appellable decision were the interested person for the original decision.
- (2) For subsection (1), the person may apply under the Racing Integrity Act, section 265 to the commission for an internal review of the decision before the person may apply, under section 268 of that Act, for an external review of the decision.
- (3) If the appellable decision relates to a club or venue, previous chapter 4A does not apply to the appellable decision but chapter 4 applies as if—
 - (a) the appellable decision were an original decision; and
 - (b) the aggrieved person for the appellable decision were the interested person for the original decision.
- (4) For subsection (3), the person may apply under section 117 to the decision-maker for the decision for an internal review of the decision before the person may apply, under section 120, for an external review of the decision.

101 Clause 388 (Insertion of new ch 11)

Page 273, line 26, 'commission'—

omit, insert—

chairperson

102 Clause 388 (Insertion of new ch 11)

Page 274, after line 2—

*insert—***490A Continued right of review by tribunal**

- (1) This section applies if an aggrieved person is given, or is entitled to be given, a QCAT information notice for a decision of a constituted board made before, on or after the commencement.
- (2) Previous section 152A and previous chapter 5, part 3 continue to apply to the decision and any review of the decision as if the provisions had not been repealed.

103 Clause 388 (Insertion of new ch 11)

Page 274, line 8, after 'decision'—

insert—

, other than an appellable decision relating to a club or venue

104 Clause 388 (Insertion of new ch 11)

Page 274, line 13, after 'applies'—

insert—

, other than an appellable decision relating to a club or venue

105 Clause 389 (Replacement of sch 3 (Dictionary))

Page 277, line 5, after 'part 1,'—

insert—

division 1,

106 Clause 389 (Replacement of sch 3 (Dictionary))

Page 277, after line 11—

*insert—****animal welfare offence*** means an animal welfare offence under the Racing Integrity Act.**107 Clause 389 (Replacement of sch 3 (Dictionary))**

Page 278, line 5, after 'part 1,'—

insert—

division 1,

108 Clause 389 (Replacement of sch 3 (Dictionary))

Page 279, line 25, after 'part 1,'—

insert—

division 1,

109 Clause 389 (Replacement of sch 3 (Dictionary))

Page 280, line 3, after 'part 1,'—

insert—

division 1,

110 Clause 389 (Replacement of sch 3 (Dictionary))

Page 280, line 9, after 'part 1,'—

insert—

division 1,

111 Clause 389 (Replacement of sch 3 (Dictionary))

Page 280, line 10, after 'part 1,'—

insert—

division 1,

112 Clause 389 (Replacement of sch 3 (Dictionary))

Page 281, lines 3 to 14—

*omit, insert—****disciplinary action***, relating to a Minister's approval or licence, means 1 or more of the following—

- (a) cancelling the approval or licence;
- (b) suspending the approval or licence for a stated period;
- (c) varying the approval or licence in either of the following ways, except if the variation is made as the result of an application of the control body or licence holder—
 - (i) changing a condition stated in the approval or licence to which it is subject;
 - (ii) stating a new condition to which the approval or licence is to be subject.

113 Clause 389 (Replacement of sch 3 (Dictionary))

Page 282, lines 30 and 31 and page 283, lines 1 to 15—

*omit, insert—****exclusion action***, relating to a person, means—

- (a) for an action taken by a control body against the person—naming the person on a list that—
 - (i) is kept under the control body's rules of racing and identifies persons whose entitlements under the rules are forfeited; and
 - (ii) is, from time to time, published in the control body's racing calendar; or
- (b) for an action taken by the commission against the person—warning off the person from entering, or remaining at, a licensed venue, or other place at which trials are or are to be conducted, when the licensed venue or place is being used for a control body's code of racing.

114 Clause 389 (Replacement of sch 3 (Dictionary))

Page 284, after line 8—

*insert—****exercise control***, by the commission at a licensed venue, see the Racing Integrity Act.

115 Clause 389 (Replacement of sch 3 (Dictionary))

Page 284, line 9, after 'part 1,'—

insert—

division 1,

116 Clause 389 (Replacement of sch 3 (Dictionary))

Page 285, lines 5 to 25—

omit, insert—

licence means—

- (a) a licence under the Racing Integrity Act in relation to—
 - (i) an animal that is suitable for racing in a code of racing; or
 - (ii) a person who is suitable to be a participant in a code of racing, including, for example, as the owner of an animal or as a racing bookmaker, racing bookmaker's clerk, rider, stable supervisor, stablehand or trainer; or
- (b) a licence under this Act in relation to—
 - (i) a club that is suitable to be licensed for a code of racing; or
 - (ii) a venue that is suitable for race meetings for a code of racing.

licence holder means—

- (a) for an animal or place—the person stated in the licence as the holder of the licence; or
- (b) otherwise—the person who is licensed.

licensed means—

- (a) for a club or venue—licensed by a control body under this Act; or
- (b) otherwise—licensed by the commission under the Racing Integrity Act.

117 Clause 389 (Replacement of sch 3 (Dictionary))

Page 286, lines 3 to 9—

omit, insert—

licensed club means a club licensed by a control body to hold race meetings for its code of racing.

licensed venue means a place licensed by a control body as a place at which a race meeting may be held by a licensed club for its code of racing.

118 Clause 389 (Replacement of sch 3 (Dictionary))

Page 286, lines 12 to 21—

omit, insert—

manage—

- (a) in relation to a code of racing or application code in an approval application, includes—
 - (i) regulating activities associated with the code or application code; and
 - (ii) prohibiting some activities, or aspects of an activity, associated with the code or application code; or
- (b) in relation to a licensed venue by a control body, means the control body that licensed the venue has included the contest, contingency, event or race meeting to be held at the venue in the control body's racing calendar.

119 Clause 389 (Replacement of sch 3 (Dictionary))

Page 289, lines 16 and 17—

omit, insert—

show cause notice—

- (a) for chapter 2, part 2, division 8—see section 32G(1); or
- (b) for chapter 3, part 4—see section 102(1).

show cause period—

- (a) for chapter 2, part 2, division 8—see section 32G(2)(g); or
- (b) for chapter 3, part 4—see section 102(2)(e).

Amendments agreed to.

Clauses 320 to 390, as amended, agreed to.

Schedule 1—

Ms GRACE (12.01 am): I move the following amendments—

120 Schedule 1 (Dictionary)

Page 293, after line 18—

insert—

board means the board under the Racing Act.

121 Schedule 1 (Dictionary)

Page 293, lines 29 to 34 and page 294, lines 1 to 11—

omit, insert—

- (ii) of an applicant for a racing bookmaker's licence—a person whom the commission reasonably believes will, if the applicant is licensed as a racing bookmaker, be associated with the ownership or management of the business conducted by the racing bookmaker; or
- (iii) of the holder of a racing bookmaker's licence—a person whom the commission reasonably believes is associated with the ownership or management of the business conducted by the racing bookmaker; and

122 Schedule 1 (Dictionary)

Page 294, lines 14 and 15—

omit.

123 Schedule 1 (Dictionary)

Page 294, after line 23—

insert—

commission decision see section 130.

124 Schedule 1 (Dictionary)

Page 296, lines 15 to 18—

omit.

125 Schedule 1 (Dictionary)

Page 296, after line 21—

insert—

exclusion action, relating to a person, means—

- (a) for an action taken by a control body against the person—naming the person on a list that—
 - (i) is kept under the control body's rules of racing and identifies persons whose entitlements under the rules are forfeited; and
 - (ii) is, from time to time, published in the control body's racing calendar; or
- (b) for an action taken by the commission against the person—warning off the person from entering, or remaining at, a licensed venue, or other place at which trials are or are to be conducted, when the licensed venue or place is being used for a control body's code of racing.

126 Schedule 1 (Dictionary)

Page 296, lines 30 to 34 and page 297, lines 1 to 17—

omit, insert—

- (b) of an applicant for a racing bookmaker's licence—an executive officer of a corporation, a partner, a trustee, or another person stated by the commission, whom the commission reasonably believes will, if the applicant is licensed as a racing bookmaker, be associated with the ownership or management of the business conducted by the racing bookmaker; or
- (c) of the holder of a racing bookmaker's licence—an executive officer of a corporation, a partner, a trustee, or another person stated by the commission, whom the commission reasonably believes is associated with the ownership or management of the business conducted by the racing bookmaker.

127 Schedule 1 (Dictionary)

Page 297, after line 22—

insert—

exercise control, by the commission at a licensed venue, means the commission performs its functions at the venue when a contest, contingency, event or race meeting is held at the venue.

Notes—

- 1 The commission exercises control at a licensed venue by having stewards present at a race meeting held at the venue to provide oversight of the meeting in accordance with the functions and powers given to stewards under the rules of racing.

- 2 If a steward who is present at a licensed venue at the time a race meeting is to be held at the venue advises the person responsible at the venue, the control body that licensed the venue or the licensed club at the venue that the meeting must be stopped or must not start, the commission is no longer exercising control at the venue.

128 Schedule 1 (Dictionary)

Page 297, lines 24 to 28—

omit.

129 Schedule 1 (Dictionary)

Page 298, line 26, 'or place'—

omit.

130 Schedule 1 (Dictionary)

Page 299, lines 9 and 10—

omit, insert—

licensed club means a licensed club under the Racing Act.

131 Schedule 1 (Dictionary)

Page 299, lines 16 to 18—

omit, insert—

licensed venue means a licensed venue under the Racing Act.

manage—

- (a) in relation to a code of racing or application code in an approval application, includes—
 - (i) regulating activities associated with the code or application code; and
 - (ii) prohibiting some activities, or aspects of an activity, associated with the code or application code; or
- (b) in relation to a licensed venue by a control body, means the control body that licensed the venue has included the contest, contingency, event or race meeting to be held at the venue in the control body's racing calendar.

132 Schedule 1 (Dictionary)

Page 302, after line 7—

insert—

race day steward means a steward who is employed by the commission to supervise particular matters at race meetings.

133 Schedule 1 (Dictionary)

Page 302, line 32, 'part 3, see section 119(1)'—

omit, insert—

part 2, see section 89X(1)

134 Schedule 1 (Dictionary)

Page 303, line 4, 'part 3, see section 119(2)(d)'—

omit, insert—

part 2, see section 89X(2)(d)

Amendments agreed to.

Schedule 1, as amended, agreed to.

Schedule 2—

Ms GRACE (12.01 am): I move the following amendments—

135 Schedule 2 (Amendment of Acts)

Page 314, lines 1 to 4—

omit.

136 Schedule 2 (Amendment of Acts)

Page 314, lines 12 to 14—

omit, insert—

- (b) at a licensed venue under the *Racing Act 2002* where a race meeting under that Act is held; or

137 Schedule 2 (Amendment of Acts)

Page 315, lines 5 to 8—

omit, insert—

2 Schedule 2, definitions *licensed club* and *licensed venue*, ‘schedule 3’—

omit, insert—

schedule 1

Amendments agreed to.

Schedule 2, as amended, agreed to.

Ms GRACE: I also table the explanatory notes.

Tabled paper: Racing Integrity Bill 2015, explanatory notes to Hon. Grace Grace's amendments [\[576\]](#).

Debate, on motion of Mr Hinchliffe, adjourned.

MOTIONS

Suspension of Sessional Orders



Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (12.02 am): I move—

That so much of the standing and sessional orders be suspended to enable the House to reconsider clause 56 of the Racing Integrity Bill.

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

AYES, 43:

ALP, 41—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, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 43:

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

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

Pair: Rowan, Stewart.

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

Resolved in the affirmative.

Reconsideration of Clause



Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (12.09 am): Pursuant to standing order 159, I move—

That clause 56 of the Racing Integrity Bill be reconsidered.

Division: Question put—That clause 56 of the bill be reconsidered.

AYES, 43:

ALP, 41—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, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 43:

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

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

Pair: Rowan, Stewart.

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

Resolved in the affirmative.

RACING INTEGRITY BILL

Consideration in Detail

Resumed from p. 1461.

Clause 56—



Ms GRACE (12.14 am): I move—

That clause 56 stand part of the bill.

Mr SPEAKER: I remind members that if a further division is now required the bells will ring for the duration of one minute.

Division: Question put—That clause 56 stand part of the bill.

AYES, 43:

ALP, 41—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, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 43:

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

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

Pair: Stewart, Rowan.

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

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 56, as read, agreed to.

Third Reading



Hon. G GRACE (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (12.17 am): I move—

That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Division: Question put—That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

AYES, 43:

ALP, 41—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, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 43:

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

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.


Pair: Stewart, Rowan.

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

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title

 **Hon. G GRACE** (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (12.21 am): 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.

TRANSPORT LEGISLATION (TAXI SERVICES) AMENDMENT BILL

Reconsideration

 **Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (12.21 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

That, notwithstanding anything contained in standing and sessional orders:

1. the third reading of the Transport Legislation (Taxi Services) Amendment Bill 2015 be rescinded and the bill be reconsidered by the House in consideration in detail for the particular purposes of reconsidering the clauses inserted by amendments 1 and 2 moved by the member for Mount Isa; and
2. reconsideration of the clauses may include:
 - (a) omitting the clauses; or
 - (b) amendment of the clauses by omitting, adding or inserting words; and
3. following the reconsideration of the clauses inserted by amendments 1 and 2 moved by the member for Mount Isa in consideration in detail, the questions for the third reading and long title shall be reput.

I note the interjections during the moving of that motion. While I might have been the fixer for an error that happened on this side tonight, right now I am being the fixer for the blue that those opposite made.

The reconsideration of the Transport Legislation (Taxi Services) Amendment Bill 2015 is necessary this evening because of the absurdity and economic vandalism of the Liberal National Party on full display last night. As a consequence of the Liberal National Party's backed amendments, the definition of a taxi has been fundamentally altered for the purposes of both insurance and enforcement.


The amendments backed by the LNP last night mean, in short, that any motor vehicle used for a booked service that does not have a taxi licence is deemed to be operating illegally. This means that charter buses, tourist bus services, chartered school bus services, community transport services, limousine services, shuttle services and hotel accommodation transfer services are all deemed illegal if they are not operated as a licensed taxi. It must also be of concern for our federal colleagues that Comcars would be deemed illegal in Queensland because of the LNP. I am sure that Prime Minister Turnbull would not appreciate being booked while on the hustings over the next few weeks!

I will say in relation to the member for Mount Isa that I appreciate his intent in bringing forward this bill this year. It is clear that the government supports the intent, and we passed a series of important amendments last night to strengthen the powers of transport inspectors and better define a taxi service.

Mr SPEAKER: One moment, Leader of the House. Members for Indooroopilly, Caloundra and Clayfield. Member for Indooroopilly! Will you please leave the chamber with your private conversation. Otherwise you will be warned.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: Unfortunately, we could not support all of the Katter's Australian Party amendments, including the ones I am moving to rescind tonight. While the motivation behind them was pure, the unintended consequences of the amendments made them unworkable and the government cannot accept them.

I have seen the public comments of the shadow minister, who has indicated support for tidying up these amendments. I acknowledge that and thank him for that. I trust that he and the LNP will support the government in ensuring that our community services and schools are not infringed by these amendments.

 **Mr EMERSON** (Indooroopilly—LNP) (12.25 am): As indicated by the minister, the LNP is intending to work with the government to clear up those unintended consequences. I do make the point that CTP is a very important part of this issue of rideshare apps. It is important that there is a level playing field, that compulsory third party is dealt with in a way that does not give an unfair advantage

to one side or another. It is important to note, of course, that if this issue had been dealt with appropriately and in a timely way by the government last year by the then transport minister and now Deputy Premier then these issues would not have arisen.


Ms Trad interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, you may be warned along with the member for Indooroopilly if you persist.


Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Consideration in Detail

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Pursuant to the resolution of the House we are now considering the clauses inserted by amendments 1 and 2 moved by the member for Mount Isa.

Clauses 1A, 1B, 2A and 2B—

 **Mr KATTER** (12.26 am): I move the following amendment—

1 Amendment of s 1B (Amendment of sch 4 (Dictionary))

Section 1B—

omit, insert—

1B Amendment of sch 4 (Dictionary)

Schedule 4—

insert—

taxi means a motor vehicle used to provide a taxi service within the meaning of the *Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act 1994*, schedule 3.

This is a quick tidy-up in relation to an amendment that was supported by the House last night. It tightens up the definition of a taxi service. As the shadow minister for transport said, it is important to level the playing field in terms of CTP. It is a minor way to impact on the industry but it is a fair point to make. It was supported by the House last night. The definition is tightened so it will not affect those other carriers such as buses, Comcars and so on.


Mr HINCHLIFFE: I indicate for the benefit of the House that the government will not be supporting the member's amendments this evening. While we support the intent of the amendments, I believe that their implementation is unnecessary given the government amendments that were passed last night. I do not believe that these insurance changes are needed and remain concerned about further unintended consequences that may arise from these amendments.

I do thank the Katter's Australian Party members for their bill, which allowed the consideration of these matters, and for their advocacy on this issue. Clearly, this issue of CTP and achieving a level playing field for all participants in the personalised transport industry will be a key matter being dealt with by the personalised transport task force, being led by Mr Jim Varghese.

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

Resolved in the negative under standing order 106.


Omission of clauses—

 **Mr HINCHLIFFE** (12.36 am): I move the following amendment—

That the clauses inserted by amendments Nos 1 and 2 moved by the member for Mount Isa—part 1A clauses 1A and 1B and clauses 2A and 2B—be omitted from the bill.

Amendment agreed to.

Third Reading

 **Mr KATTER** (Mount Isa—KAP) (12.36 am): 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.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title



Mr KATTER (Mount Isa—KAP) (12.37 am): I move the following amendment—

That the long title of the bill be amended by omitting the words after ‘State Penalties Enforcement Regulation 2014’ and inserting ‘and the Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Regulation 2005’.

Amendment agreed to.

Question put—That the long title of the bill, as amended, be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (CHAIN OF RESPONSIBILITY) AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 15 March (see p. 693).

Second Reading



Hon. SJ MILES (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef) (12.38 am): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

This bill amends the Environmental Protection Act 1994 to ensure that those people who could and should take action to prevent an environmental harm do so and that the people who could and should make a contribution to clean up and rehabilitate harm that has already occurred also do so. This bill gives effect to community expectations that their government and their parliament will no longer tolerate companies simply closing their doors and leaving taxpayers to clean up after them.

One of the powers of this bill is that it will allow EHP officers to walk onto the land of an abandoned environmental authority holder and go to the problem, which could be contaminated water leeching into waterways. Previously, officers would turn up on the doorstep of an abandoned property but could not go in because, legally, they can only inspect the premises of a licensed operator. People expect the environmental regulator to be able to take effective action to deal with pollution and this is one example where the laws mean that the regulator cannot do its job. It is a serious problem and one that this government is determined to fix.

After more than a century of mining in Queensland, there are thousands of abandoned mines, mine shafts, tunnels and other mine features. Obviously, we cannot go back in time and address all of those but we can put in place a system to make sure that that number does not increase. This has been a perennial problem in Queensland and people expect a government in the 21st century to be smart enough to come up with legal solutions that will work.

Importantly, all the serious players in the industry will tell us that they want a level playing field. If the government allows one player to behave irresponsibly, then the fear is that commercial competition puts everyone else under pressure to engage in the same behaviour. Mining is an important part of Queensland and always has been, but we have long had this issue and it accumulates. It takes only one or two businesses every year to indulge in this irresponsible behaviour and the legacy for Queensland taxpayers becomes substantial. In my time in this role, I have seen this problem firsthand. It is time for a solution. Stronger laws are needed to deal with this problem.

This bill establishes a chain of responsibility that extends the range of persons and companies that the department can issue an environmental protection order to. This bill also enables the department to impose conditions requiring financial assurance on transfer of an environmental authority. To support the changes, the bill not only expands the powers of authorised officers to access properties to gather evidence but also expands the evidentiary powers of the department. It increases the grounds that need to be considered or satisfied before a court can stay a decision about an amount of financial assurance or a decision to issue an environmental protection order.

I thank the Agriculture and Environment Committee for its constructive comments and recommendations on the bill. The committee tabled its report on 15 April 2016, putting forward six recommendations and two requests for clarification. I table the government's response to the committee's report which addresses each of the recommendations and requests for clarification.

Tabled paper: Agriculture and Environment Committee: Report No. 16—Environmental Protection (Chain of Responsibility) Amendment Bill 2016, government response [\[577\]](#).

As a result of the committee's report, I will move several amendments during consideration in detail of the bill to give effect to the committee's recommended actions. My department has also identified additional amendments that will further clarify the bill's intent to ensure that companies and their related parties comply with their environmental responsibilities. The amendments to be made are to the Environmental Protection Act 1994. A total of 18 amendments will be moved, which are mostly minor structural amendments to the bill, with five more substantial amendments that I would like to bring to the attention of the House.

The related person test is the key mechanism that establishes the chain of responsibility. It allows the department to identify the true nature of the relationship between the non-complying company and those entities that either significantly benefited from its environmentally harmful activities or had the ability to influence environmental outcomes. Operators should not be concerned about the bill if they are doing the right thing, which I know the vast majority are.

Submissions made to the committee and my ongoing consultation with industry and stakeholder groups identified opportunities to improve the definition of 'related person'. In particular, improvements will fulfil commitments made when the bill was introduced that arms-length investors, ordinary landholders and shareholders would not be captured.

In relation to proposed subsection 363AB(1)(b), which is inserted by clause 7 of the bill, the committee drew attention to the importance of excluding a family farm if it has no voluntary connection to a resource activity. The committee recommended that, to achieve this goal, landholders should not be included as a related person for the purposes of issuing an environmental protection order.

Stakeholders raised concerns about the potential application of these powers to owners who have limited or no ability to decline to allow the relevant activity to be undertaken on their land. These owners have no real capacity to influence the way in which or the standard to which activities are carried out on their land—for example, farmers hosting mining and coal seam gas activities on their land. I am proposing that section 363AB(1)(b) of the bill be amended during consideration in detail to exclude owners of the underlying tenure of mining and petroleum leases and native title parties. The bill was never intended to be used to hold farmers or native title parties responsible for practices on their land. This amendment provides farmers with certainty that that will not be the case.

I am pleased to reassure members that our amendments will remove any doubt about the status of farming landholders. The amendments remove a wide range of agreements made under a variety of acts from being a trigger to the chain of responsibility. This applies to conduct and compensation agreements and other compensation under resource legislation. It applies to make-good agreements under the Water Act. It applies to agreements in relation to native title and cultural heritage. I am grateful for the feedback provided on this matter. The government has listened and acted.

However, although the committee recommended removing entirely a reference to landowners, I believe that there are some elements of this category that should remain subject to the bill. We need to take care not to legislate for an absolute exemption for any person whose business means in part that they are a landholder. If we were to do that, a party seeking to escape the reach of these new laws could do so by contriving to have part of their business falling into the definition of 'landowner'. The amendments to this bill will ensure that only landowners who have the ability to substantially influence activities are potentially captured by the legislation.

A further concern raised with respect to the related person test is that receiving a financial benefit could be interpreted to mean any person, such as a mum-and-dad investor and small-scale shareholder, even though they have no effective control over the activities of the company. This is clearly not the intention of the bill. Although I note that there are qualifications on this assessment in new subsection 363AB(4), I will also move an amendment to clause 7 to make it clear that, if an entity is to be considered to have a relevant connection to an environmental authority holder, the financial benefit received by a company must be a significant financial benefit. This amendment clarifies the government's position.

New section 363AB will improve the bill in a number of ways. The administering authority must consider whether the related person took all reasonable steps to ensure that obligations under the Environmental Protection Act were complied with and that rehabilitation would be adequately funded. This amendment will provide reasonable operators with the reassurance that they will not be mistakenly captured by the new legislation.

Furthermore, clearly setting out the reasonable steps will act as a trigger for industry to engage in long-term thinking about environmental obligations and rehabilitation if they have not already incorporated these factors into forward business planning and investment decisions.

The department has committed to working closely with industry and other stakeholders to provide better certainty on who should be held accountable and what reasonable steps operators should take to ensure that they do not come to be in breach of their obligations. Reports of joint venture agreements being set up to allow assets to be transferred while debt remains behind demonstrates why the related person test needs to have considerable breadth.

Whilst some submissions suggested that the related person test was too broad, there were just as many submissions that expressed strong support for a broad related persons test. It was pointed out that a broad test would be more likely to cover new or innovative corporate structures that may arise in the future and that an inflexible test could constrain the effectiveness of the provisions. We have future proofed this legislation and we will be ready if future market downturns result in corporate failure to meet environmental obligations.

To make it very clear that the provisions of the bill are intended to capture only those entities that are genuinely responsible for addressing environmental harm, I propose to move an amendment during consideration in detail to outline the requirements that the administering authority must have regard to in deciding whether to issue an EPO.

Recommendation No. 4 of the committee suggested that the department develop a statutory guideline to provide operators with greater clarity regarding the manner in which the department will administer the provisions contained in clause 7, including in determining whether a person has a relevant connection to a company. This is a practical and reasonable suggestion and I am pleased to advise that the government supports this recommendation. I will table the necessary amendments.

The guideline will further clarify terms used in the new division 2, such as 'executive officer' and 'related person' to address recommendation 2 of the committee. The guideline is disallowable in the parliament, binding on the department and can be refined and updated on a continuous improvement basis. I have indicated my willingness to work with a number of organisations in the legal profession and in business that are eager to participate in developing these guidelines.

I think it is worth taking the time to go through section 363AB—that is, who is a related person of a company—in more detail to demonstrate the intent of this provision, as this section is one of the key features of the bill. The existing section 363AB of the bill states that a related person is: (1) a holding company of the company carrying out the activity; (2) a person or company that owns land on which the company is carrying out the activity—note that I intend to move an amendment during consideration in detail in relation to this subsection; or (3) a person or company with a relevant connection to the company carrying out the activity. To have a relevant connection the person must have received some financial benefit from the company or must be in a position or have been in a position in the last two years to influence the company's conduct with respect to environmental performance.

The related person and relevant connection test in the bill will capture related parties that have profited from activities carried out under the environmental authority. It will also capture parties that have the ability to influence environmental performance on the site, whether financially and/or through the ability to give directions or otherwise. Examples of a related party under this test include parent companies or company directors—or 'shadow directors'.

Let me be clear: there is no new obligation being imposed by the bill that does not already exist. Rather, the related persons test is a new tool now made available that ensures that the current legal obligations with regard to returning a site to a safe and stable standard are properly discharged. The related person test in the bill needs to be broad to capture all those artificial corporate structures and profit-shifting exercises, which we know already exist, and anticipate those that are yet to be uncovered. However, it is not the intent of the bill to capture those who are doing the right thing.

Section 363AB(4) is a list of factors which may be considered by the administering authority in deciding whether a person has a relevant connection. This includes the extent of the person's control of or financial interest in the company carrying out the activity, whether the person is an executive officer of the company carrying out the activity or a holding company—for example, a director or other person that takes part in the company's management—and the extent to which a legally recognisable structure or arrangement makes it possible for the person to receive a financial benefit from the company undertaking the activity. A financial benefit includes receiving either directly or indirectly a profit, revenue, income, dividend, or distribution or an advantage or preference. There are four other factors listed in section 363AB(4).

I understand that some stakeholders are concerned that the administering authority may cherry-pick only certain factors that may make operators liable as a related person and would prefer certainty that all of the factors be considered. I would like to point out that not all of the factors listed in

section 363AB(4) will be relevant to any particular relationship of financial benefit or influence. If a factor listed in the subsection is not relevant to a particular relationship then the administering authority should not be required to expend resources to investigate it. The suggestion by some stakeholders that the section should be amended to require consideration of each factor is not accepted as this would require the department to unnecessarily expend resources fully investigating each identified factor. If a factor listed is relevant to a person's relationship with the EA holder and the administering authority failed to consider it, it is very likely that the administering authority's decision would be overturned in judicial review proceedings. The ordinary principles of administrative law will require the administering authority to have regard to any relevant consideration in deciding that a relevant connection exists.

The decision that a person is a related person on the basis of a relevant connection will also be subject to both internal review and appeal rights. If the initial decision that a relevant connection exists did not involve consideration of a relevant factor listed in section 363AB(4), including factors which should have excluded the person, then that person could seek internal review or appeal on that basis. If there is a factor not listed in section 363AB(4) which would tend to suggest that a person should not be regarded as a related person, they would be equally entitled to raise that factor in an internal review or appeal.

I support the committee's recommendation to identify a less onerous percentage for proposed sections 522A and 535B. The bill provided that 85 per cent of the financial assurance is required to be held by the administrative authority if a stay is to be granted. Some submissions to the committee described this amount as too onerous and have called for the amount to be at the discretion of the court. However, holding insufficient financial assurance during the period of a stay will increase the risk to the state in the event that the operator should abandon the project. In response to concerns raised by the committee, I am proposing that the provision should be amended to require a lower percentage. As such, I intend to move an amendment to propose 75 per cent of the FA be required if a stay is to be granted.

On the topic of financial assurance, clause 3, which inserts new section 215(2)(c), will have the effect that the transfer of an EA to a new holder will trigger an ability to impose a condition requiring financial assurance. It has been raised that the same powers should apply in the event there is a share sale that results in the ownership of the EA holder changing which would not be considered a transfer or a change in the holder under the current EPA.

To address this situation we have expanded this provision so that we can reassess the risk associated with a new holder of an EA and require financial assurance if the level of risk warrants it in the event the shares in the EA holder are sold to a new holding company. I will move amendments during consideration in detail to ensure that section 215(2)(c) is applicable to this type of transfer.

I would like to expressly acknowledge that the ability to impose a condition requiring financial assurance upon transfer of an environmental authority will not allow the department to increase the amount of financial assurance. The financial assurance amount will still need to be determined in the usual way through an application under section 294 of the Environmental Protection Act 1994 or the submission of a plan of operations. The department has the power under the EP Act to require a change to financial assurance or to replenish it. However, section 295(4) of the EP Act clearly states that the administering authority cannot require financial assurance of an amount more than the amount that, in the authority's opinion, represents the total likely costs and expenses that may be incurred taking action to rehabilitate or restore and protect the environment because of the environmental harm that may be caused by the activity. Importantly, both the decision to impose the new condition and the decision on the amount are subject to internal review and appeal rights.

Other issues raised by the committee did not require legislative amendment but are important points to clarify. The first point relates to the executive officers and the assertion that the liabilities and obligations imposed on executive officers by the bill will duplicate or interfere with the responsibilities of executive officers under the Corporations Act 2001 or the COAG Principles of Executive Officer Liability. I would like to reassure the House that there is no conflict with Commonwealth law. Any actions taken under the new provisions must be consistent with the Corporations Act 2001. If the administering authority fails to do this, Commonwealth law will prevail and its actions will be ineffective.


With regard to the retrospectivity of the proposed sections 744, 745 and 747, during the committee's deliberations the committee had asked for advice as to why these provisions were necessary. Section 744 will allow conditions requiring financial assurance to be imposed on EAs which are transferred prior to the provisions of the bill coming into effect. This provision is intended to ensure

that the financial assurance system contained in the Environmental Protection Act 1994 can be used effectively and to ensure that actions to avoid the operation of the new provision are not effective. This provision is not connected to the EPO powers in the bill or the related person test.

To ensure that the legislation appropriately reflects the policy intent, I will move amendments during consideration in detail to make it clear that the new section 215(2)(c) applies retrospectively only to the extent that an entity becomes a new holder after the introduction of the bill. I have proposed an amendment to the bill to require a review of the new provisions two years after commencement. The amendment requires me as minister to carry out a review of the operation of the provisions to decide whether the provisions remain appropriate. As soon as reasonably practicable after finishing the review, the minister will be required to table a report about the outcome of the review in the Legislative Assembly. In addition to requiring a review of the new provisions, the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection is already required, under the Environmental Protection Act 1994, to report annually on the operation of the act, including the new provisions, and that is also to be tabled in parliament. I will be writing to the director-general outlining my expectations regarding public reporting on these new provisions.

The second point of clarification sought by the committee was on the administration of the financial assurance framework and the adequacy of financial assurance held by the department. This information has been included in the tabled report.

The bill is an important step forward for the environmental laws in Queensland, protecting the environment, the community and taxpayers while supporting a robust and healthy business environment. These amendments make the bill better and stronger than before. The proposed amendments respond to the committee's report and other issues raised by stakeholders in submissions made during the committee process. The amendments will preserve the effectiveness of the new powers while giving the private sector greater certainty about their application. Again I thank the committee members, submitters and the many stakeholders I have met and worked with in developing these laws and I look forward to the debate.

 **Mr BENNETT** (Burnett—LNP) (1.01 am): From the outset, it is important that we acknowledge the government's stated claims in relation to this legislation and we agree that they are understandable. It was a little unfortunate that the bill was rushed through the committee process and the deliberations about establishing good policy. The amendments to the Environmental Protection Act 1994 certainly drew some attention. The opposition will consider the minister's amendments, which have been tabled tonight. We have been assured that he will address the majority of stakeholder concerns.

The bill proposes to change the EPA to require companies and their related parties to bear the costs of managing rehabilitating sites that have been impacted by environmentally damaging uses. The explanatory notes indicate that the bill was introduced to address the increasing risk due to the downturn in the mining sector and the number of companies that may be unable to perform certain environmental obligations, leaving those potentially costly responsibilities with the state. The bill aims to avoid the need for the state to carry out those obligations and ensure that, if a relevant company cannot perform the duties, a related person will be held accountable.

There were some limitations on the relevant person test. The Environmental Defenders Office, the member for Ipswich and other members of the committee certainly had problems with the relevant person test. We welcome the proposed amendments that will in some way deal with this issue. The committee first heard from the minister and the department and then others about section 363AB(4). We acknowledge that without these amendments it would not be clear that the bill avoids those without a sufficiently relevant extent of control, or obtaining significant financial benefit, from being held liable for remediation or avoidance of environmental harm caused by the relevant activity. After some discussion we finally agreed that the definition of 'relevant person' to include the person who owns the land, provided in subsection 363AB(1)(b), should be amended.

Many submitters were greatly concerned about the proposed provisions for related persons, particularly the extension of associated—retrospective and future—liabilities for landowners. I welcome the minister's comments tonight that that issue will be addressed. It was of particular concern that landowners may be faced with these issues as a result of mining and resource or gas and petroleum activities occurring on their land.

The Queensland Law Society considered that section 363AB may have a negative impact on both the cost and supply of credit to mining resource companies. The Queensland Law Society also had concerns about the provision of 'relevant connection'. The Queensland Law Society argued that the pool of applicable identities is too wide. It includes shareholders, employees, service providers, bankers, investors and private royalty holders.

In its submission to the committee, the Australian Bankers Association stated—

We believe that unless appropriate amendments are made to the Bill, it could materially restrict the ability of certain companies and projects to obtain finance in Queensland. In addition, it could cause banks and other financiers to exit existing relationships where they perceive this legislation may expose them to additional risk.

Significant concerns were raised by submitters that this unfairly exposes landowners to liability for activities that they might not have control over. The bill was drafted in such a way as to cause concerns. Therefore, we welcome the amendments to shorten the 'relevant connection' as defined in the bill. Of course, we do not want to impose any undue harm or liability on landowners.

Legislation relevant to the resource sector, such as the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004, requires a company to negotiate a conduct and compensation agreement with the landowner prior to undertaking petroleum and gas exploration. Under this bill, the presence of the CCA is sufficient to make the landowner liable for statutory enforcement of any remediation, but of course we welcome the new amendments being proposed. Proposed section 363AB(2) states—

The administering authority may decide a person has a relevant connection with a company if satisfied—

- (a) the person is capable of benefiting financially ...

I notice the amendment now has a significant financial inclusion and we know that that criteria is welcomed. Currently, under the Mineral and Energy Resources (Common Provisions) Act 2014, stakeholders may be paid compensation for negotiating access or enter into a conduct and compensation agreement with mineral and resource companies to offset various negative impacts to farming land use and farming activities. As the bill was written, farmers would be potentially liable for rehabilitation both as landowners and as receiving some form of financial benefit. It is welcome that that is being tightened.

There was additional complexity for farmers under make-good arrangements, such as in the Water Act 2000. Those arrangements include the provision to make good the impairment of bores now and into the future where farmers in areas of intensive coal seam gas development are being impacted by the cumulative impacts from those bores. Make-good arrangements, which apply in various forms, mitigate those impacts. It would be significantly negative should the administering authority see these arrangements as being financially beneficial in any way. Additionally, gas bores are subject to extensive rehabilitation and examples were provided to the committee.

The bill would have imposed unintended consequences on farmers who have no definitive land access rights of veto. It was of concern that farmers and landowners could be responsible for activities when the state government has set conditions on the operator of the activity through an environmental authority. For instance, this might have happened if the site had been effectively abandoned by the operators and DEHP did not have sufficient evidence to track down the relevant persons to the company responsible. In that instance, the government would be required to respond if the landowner is not made to take necessary and urgent action. Landowners should have contractual arrangements with the operators on their site to ensure that the operators themselves remain responsible for avoiding or remediating environmental harm on the site and, therefore, the liability could return to the operator.

Under the original proposed amendments, related persons may have been responsible for meeting certain environmental defaults of companies. Related persons included not only holding companies and landowners but also persons determined to be related by the chief executive officer of the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection.

We seek from the minister clarification as to whether a person who has no actual connection with the defaulting company at the time when the default occurs, or when an environmental protection order is issued, can still be determined by the department to be a related person and then, by default, inherit the liabilities of an environmental protection order. The committee heard that, if this was the intended effect of the bill, there were going to be consequences for ordinary business transactions. For example, an owner of land on which the environmental default occurred could receive an EPO, even if they had no actual control over the defaulting company's actions or even if the defaulting company was a trespasser; a seller of shares in a company can be potentially liable for a breach of environmental obligations that occur after the company is sold, even if there is no connection between the seller and the company at the time when the default occurs; and professional advisers may be potentially liable for company defaults.

Environmental protection orders are issued in a number of situations to protect the environment, including when a person has contravened the environmental authority or has caused or is likely to have caused environmental harm. Failure to comply with an EPO attracts very high penalties. Currently, the EP Act allows an EPO to be issued to either an environmental authority holder or an entity causing or threatening to cause unlawful environmental harm.

Under the proposed changes, if an EPO is issued to a company the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection may also issue an EPO to a related person. Persons related to high-risk companies—for example, companies under external administration or their associated entities—may also be issued EPOs, even if no EPO is issued to the high-risk company and even if the high-risk company no longer holds the relevant environmental authority.

Related persons can be companies or individuals. There are three types of related persons: holding companies, landowners of land on which the defaulting company carries out the relevant activity or other persons whom DEHP determines are related. A relevant connection test will be applied, which considers whether the person benefitted financially or is capable of benefitting financially from the carrying out of the relevant activity.

When assessing the relevant connection, DEHP can take into account a number of factors. Based on this list of factors, persons who might be at risk of being a related person include: executive officers of a company or a holding company; persons who control a company or who have a financial interest in a company; and professional advisers. We see the tightening of the amendments to include other stakeholders.

The decision that a person is a related person and a decision to issue an EPO are both reviewable and can be stayed pending a determination. In the event of noncompliance or if a stay of the relevant order is secured, DEHP has the power to carry out the required works itself. We see that activity happening in Queensland now. Under the bill DEHP has the power to amend an environmental authority when it is transferred in order to place a condition requiring financial assurance on the authority. This power applies retrospectively.

The bill also increases DEHP's investigation powers. The department now has the power to enter a place where an environmental authority has applied, not just in places in which environmentally relevant activities currently occur.

There were some issues raised that I note have not been addressed in the amendments and that I seek some comment from the minister on. The concerns relate to the removal of the privilege against self-incrimination in clause 10. It has been recognised by the High Court as a human right. The removal of this privilege for individuals to protect themselves personally, as opposed to their companies, which is a different issue, is contrary to the parliamentary guideline on self-incrimination. I welcomed the briefing by the minister this afternoon and his explanation. I would ask the minister to share with the House his understanding of how clause 10 will apply in the broader context. I think that would go a long way to appease some of the concerns we still have with clause 10.

With reference to the transitional provisions, the bill introduces a new chapter into the EP Act that deals with transitional provisions. The bill essentially operates retrospectively. For example, action can be taken even if the holder of the relevant environmental authority changed before the commencement of the amendments. A relevant activity includes activities carried out before the commencement of the amendments. The issue around persons who were related persons at the time the bill was introduced but are no longer related persons certainly needed to be amended. We welcome more activity in that space.

The power to amend environmental authorities should extend to being able to amend all relevant environmental authorities which pose environmental risks of a certain level so that they are in line with the updated financial assurance guidelines of the department, without this power being dependent on being able to be exercised only on the transfer of an environmental authority to a new operator.

Some industries that impose environmental impacts were not previously required to provide financial assurances. However, through the evolution of the financial assurance framework and environmental regulation there has been a realisation that financial assurances should be required for a broader range of industries, such as refineries. Environmental authorities which currently require a financial assurance could be reviewed and amended if their assurance is found to be inadequate. I acknowledge that the committee spent a lot of time trying to understand the problems associated with financial assurance.

There was an example given during the committee's deliberations of Cockatoo Coal's coalmine extension. Cockatoo Coal applied for an amendment to their environmental authority in November 2014 to allow them to extend their mining operations. They received a draft environmental authority in December 2014. Objections to the application and the draft environmental authority were referred to the Land Court, including an objection which raised concern as to the financial viability of the proponent and the proponent's consequent ability to meet rehabilitation requirements.

While the Land Court hearing was still being determined, Cockatoo Coal went into voluntary administration. On 15 December 2015 the Land Court subsequently recommended approval of the authority. To our knowledge the final environmental authority has not been granted by the department. However, the department would have the power to grant the authority even if the company is in voluntary administration. There can be little certainty provided to the community that only responsible and worthy proponents will be granted environmental authorities when companies in voluntary administration can obtain environmental authority.

I move now to concerns raised with clause 3 which enables changes to the financial assurance obligations on transfer of an environmental authority. The Queensland Law Society argued that this could materially increase transaction uncertainty for parties considering the acquisition of an asset or a business. The Queensland Law Society submitted that companies other than those facing financial difficulty could be captured. The Cement Concrete and Aggregates Australia submitted that cases when financial assurances are appropriate in the extractive industry need to be based on proper criteria and reflect the true environmental risk to the state.

The department confirmed to the committee that clause 3 is not limited to companies in financial difficulty. This is because of the risk that a holder may come into financial difficulty in the future. The provision of financial assurance ensures that there are funds which can be drawn on to prevent or minimise environmental harm or rehabilitate or restore the environment should the holder fail to meet their environmental obligations.

The department advised that purchasers proposing to acquire a business involving an ERA could inform themselves of the risk of a financial assurance condition by recourse to financial assurance guidelines prescribed in the Environmental Protection Regulation 2008. Such purchases could similarly understand the likely amount of financial assurance through a review of the limitations contained in section 295(4) of the Environmental Protection Act and the calculation measures prescribed in the guidelines.

There were several submitters that raised concerns about workplace health and safety implications as there appears to be no time limit on the powers being sought by the department to enter sites. It was noted that the department's staff work under strict workplace health and safety guidelines. I believe that should be addressed.

While we heard about the urgency of the bill, consultation was originally limited to just within government, again highlighting the lack of transparency afforded by the government to legislation relating to environmental matters. We note the assurance from the minister that there has been subsequent and full consideration of the implications or unintended consequences for all stakeholders in the last week.

We still consider that there could have been a more far-reaching study and inquiry, including extensive consultation with relevant stakeholders, but we acknowledge the urgency of the bill. We acknowledge the government's intent to get this bill passed.

I again highlight that we understand the intent of the bill to introduce stronger legal requirements for mining companies and related industries to meet their obligations to rehabilitate mining sites. I want to talk about some of the amendments that the minister has proposed. I will highlight some of the areas that I hope we can discuss during consideration in detail.

We believe that there is a problem in the drafting of the jurisdiction to impose amendments upon an environmental authority or transitional environmental program, upon amendment or withdrawal of an EPO. Clause 3 is the amendment of section 215, other amendments. Clause 4 is the amendment of section 332, administering authority may require a draft program.

The stated intent set out in the explanatory notes is that an environmental protection order should be able to be withdrawn or amended on the basis that either an environmental authority is compulsorily amended or a transitional environmental program is approved to avoid harm or risk of harm that had resulted in the environmental protection order being issued. Unfortunately, that limitation has not been included in the bill itself.

Unless the intent is carried through to the drafting of the bill the following unintended consequences could arise. EHP would have jurisdiction to amend environmental authority conditions about noise just because they had an EPO about contaminated water, which has been amended or withdrawn. EHP would have jurisdiction to end environmental authority conditions if an EPO has been withdrawn because EHP has accepted that there was no basis for the EPO to have been imposed in the first place.

EHP would have jurisdiction to amend environmental authority conditions because a court has amended the EPO as a result of the original version of the EPO having been wrong. I ask the minister to give assurances to the House through consideration in detail that EHP will not take advantage of these loopholes. If the revised explanatory notes as tabled tonight are correct, the department appears to have resisted including amendments with qualifying words in the bill. I think there was an issue with some of the words in the bill such as 'may' and 'must'. I think they have been tightened. We welcome some consideration during that debate.

In relation to the jurisdiction to impose financial assurance upon a transfer—again, clause 3—I welcome some conversation about those issues. There are problems with the way the original drafting has addressed the issue. There are numerous provisions in the act that enable amendments to be made to environmental authorities. I believe that the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection has selected the wrong section. I have raised this with the minister and I raised this in the committee. We spoke about section 215 not being the correct section to amend to address this issue. I seek reassurance from the minister and the department tonight that this is where they did want to amend this particular issue. Again, we thought amending other sections would have given us a better outcome—sections 254 or 255 or 292.

I note that the transfer provisions in chapter 5 part 9 only apply to prescribed environmental activities, such as the nickel refinery, not to mines and petroleum and gas activities. There are existing requirements in the act and existing model conditions imposed on all current mines and petroleum and gas activities requiring them all to have financial assurances in place prior to commencing operations. Therefore, there is no need to impose this condition for the first time upon a transfer. Those existing conditions do not specify the amount of financial assurance but rather it is required to be calculated in accordance with the EHP guideline for the financial assurance calculator. For a mine, this is already required to be reviewed every time a new or amended plan of operations is submitted—at intervals of a maximum of five years but normally at least every 12 months.

We would also like to work through the amendments in clause 7 tonight. Clause 7 attempted to deal with this topic by giving EHP power to issue an EPO to carry out rehabilitation work at various types of hazardous operations. I talked about workplace health and safety before. We have to be really careful about how we deal with access to sites. We believe that the department's assurances that their staff will take appropriate action when doing this sort of activity will also put these concerns to rest.

When a polluter company is in liquidation, the liquidators have powers and duties under the Corporations Act. The issues around access of financial assurance and how we deal with people who default who may be caught up as a polluter were raised with the committee. The Corporations Act 2001, a Commonwealth law, can generally go back four years in the case of related parties and as far back as 10 years if there is evidence that the purpose of the transaction was to default creditors. The liquidators then have statutory duties under section 556 of the Corporations Act about the priority order in which they pay out those funds. We believe that the state should not attempt to override this. This is why it is so important in the first place that EHP should obtain an accurate financial assurance for rehabilitation before the operations commence rather than trying to play catch-up later. Where EHP has failed to obtain adequate financial assurance up-front, it was raised that EHP should take its place, together with other unsecured creditors. It is wrong that EHP have overlooked the need to obtain an accurately calculated financial assurance. The committee heard many examples of undercapitalised and underfinancially assured projects across Queensland.


In closing, I want to reiterate that the Agriculture and Environment Committee was overwhelmed with negative comments and feedback from key stakeholder groups including the Queensland Law Society, the Queensland Resources Council, AgForce and the Farmers' Federation. The Queensland Law Society had big issues because the bill imposed obligations on a broad range of 'related persons' rather than keeping the obligations on the person who contributed to or was aware of conduct that resulted in a company failing to meet its obligations.

The draft bill went way beyond the scope of the intended objective. Really it was a shotgun approach with the potential to do great damage. It would have made landowners liable for clean-up costs even though they may not be responsible for environmental damage. There was a raft of unintended impacts across all sectors of the Queensland economy which would have affected jobs, investment, as well as businesses. It would have increased sovereign risk which would force investors to look at other states and territories with more reasonable, sustainable and practical legislation. It would have removed the privilege against self-incrimination in clause 10, section 476, which was recognised by the High Court as a 'human right'. Removal of this privilege for individuals to protect themselves personally, as opposed to their companies, is contrary to the Legislative Standards Act.

It would have created liability for innocent people—graziers, mum-and-dad shareholders, unpaid creditors et cetera—under clause 7 without adequate controls over the subjective administration discretion which is given to the government. This also is contrary to the Legislative Standards Act. There were issues with retrospective application.

In conclusion, there were heaps of problems. However, the minister has given an absolute assurance that he has listened to the concerns and gone back to the key stakeholder groups and made necessary amendments to redress their concerns. This side of the House has been given an absolute assurance that the changes will ensure the bill will be fair and it will work to ensure taxpayers are not left with mine, resource and refinery site environmental clean-up costs.

The LNP will be holding the minister and the Palaszczuk Labor government to account and the assurance that there will be a full review of the legislation in two years and any changes that are needed will be made. For those reasons, the LNP will not be opposing the amendments. We believe that mining and resource development should be undertaken responsibly and that companies need to be held to account to do the right thing and that taxpayers should not be exposed to environmental clean-up costs.

 **Mr BUTCHER** (Gladstone—ALP) (1.25 am): I rise to support the Environmental Protection (Chain of Responsibility) Amendment Bill 2016. I would like to take this opportunity as the chair of the committee to thank the secretariat of our committee: Mr Rob Hansen, Mr Paul Douglas, Ms Maureen Coorey and Ms Carolyn Heffernan. We did do a lot of work on this bill in a very short time, as the member for Burnett just stated. I think we came away with a pretty good report for the minister.

Queenslanders have had very clear views about the importance of protecting our unique natural environment. This came across very clearly in the submissions to our inquiry. Queenslanders also have very clear expectations of the role they expect government to play to ensure that businesses and companies that pollute and cause damage to the environment are held accountable for their actions and that they clean up whatever mess they make before they move on. Sadly, this has not always happened in Queensland. Our inquiry highlighted a litany of mine sites and other intensive industries where the owners have, or may have, defaulted on their environmental responsibilities, leaving a huge mess for the state to clean up. In the current resources downturn, this problem has become all too common.

The bill is clearly designed to equip the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection with the authorities and investigative powers to address these problems and to hold those responsible for environmental damage accountable—something virtually every stakeholder involved in the inquiry has supported. The committee also supports the bill's objectives, although we may differ in our views on some of the provisions. I am happy to hear tonight that the opposition have now worked this through thoroughly with the minister and it looks like they are accepting most of those.

The submissions and evidence from our public hearings have been invaluable to our work. As the chair of this committee, I sincerely thank everyone who took the time to share their views with us during our deliberations. The committee has recommended a number of amendments based on practical concerns raised during the inquiry. I believe that the amendments we have recommended will improve the provisions of the bill and help to ensure the risks of unintended consequences of the legislation are minimised. Once again, I am happy to hear that the minister has taken note of those and made those changes.

In the past 12 months, the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection has confronted increasing difficulties in ensuring that companies in financial difficulty continue to comply with their environmental obligations. This has included sites such as the Yabulu nickel refinery, the Texas Silver Mine and the Collingwood tin mine. The government has proposed urgent amendments to ensure that the regulator can pursue a chain of responsibility so that these companies or related parties can be held accountable for the cost of managing and rehabilitating those sites. Without additional powers in the Environmental Protection Act, the EP Act, the state will incur operational and financial responsibility

for sites in financial difficulty. The bill will deliver a chain of responsibility. New powers will equip the regulator to ensure that businesses and/or the related parties who comprise the chain of responsibility around those businesses must honour these businesses' existing commitments to prevent environmental harm and to rehabilitate sites, even if the business has entered into financial difficulty.

It will deliver stronger financial assurance arrangements. The regulator will have stronger power to require an appropriate up-front bond when there are changes to business ownership or when there are changes to a business's operations. Thirdly, there will be a faster responding regulator. New powers will equip the regulator to enter sites when a business has collapsed or handed back its licence to operate. If a business has failed to take steps previously demanded under a protection order, the regulator can then perform emergency works and recover its costs from a party in the chain of responsibility.

The committee heard a wide range of views about this bill. What is clear to me is that Queenslanders have very strong expectations of the government in acting to protect our unique environment. It is important to note that virtually every stakeholder involved in the inquiry supported the intent of the bill, even if they had some reservations about particular provisions. These concerns were primarily about providing greater clarity on who is a related person and the scope of that term, and potential enhancements to the drafting to remove uncertainty about how the provisions would operate in practice.


There were no submissions in defence of companies walking away from their legal obligations to properly manage and minimise their impact on the environment. The committee has made a number of recommendations which will improve the operation of the bill, and I am pleased that the government in its response has accepted the majority of these.

One of the issues raised by many stakeholders was the potential that some landowners, such as those where a resource tenure is in effect over the land in question, may be within the scope of the bill even though they have little or no control over what happens under that tenure. These landowners will now be excluded as well as native title holders or claimants and holders of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander land.

The bill will also require that the decision-making process by the department in determining a person's relevant connection to a company must have regard to any criteria stated in a guideline made by the chief executive. These guidelines will provide additional assurance that the intention of the bill will be clear to those administering it and that only those who ought to be held accountable will be.

A further amendment will reduce to 75 per cent the amount of financial assurance to be provided while the court considers a request for a review of an assessment of financial assurance. This is a very reasonable requirement given the potential for review of financial assurance amounts to be delayed for considerable periods, exposing the state to significant risk in the event of company failure. The requirement in no way fetters the discretion of the court in making a fair and independent assessment of the final amount.

The committee also received clarification that the amendments are entirely consistent with the responsibilities of executive officers under the Corporations Act 2001 and with the COAG principles on executive officer liability. The COAG guidelines recognise that serious damage to the environment poses the potential for significant public harm and is a compelling public policy reason for imposing liability on executive officers. The Environmental Protection Act 1994 already contains executive officer liability provisions precisely because they are designed to discourage significant public harm. These amendments are consistent with that approach. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr CRIPPS** (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (1.33 am): The explanatory notes accompanying this bill state that its objectives are to amend the Environmental Protection Act 1994 to facilitate enhanced environmental protection for sites operated by companies in financial difficulty and avoid the state bearing the costs for managing and rehabilitating sites in financial difficulty. These objectives are fair enough, and I note that the member for Burnett in his statement of reservation accompanying the Agriculture and Environment Committee's report makes it quite clear that the LNP is generally supportive of the overarching policy objectives of the bill. The trouble is the provisions of the bill as it currently stands will have consequences for a whole range of people and entities.

The Agriculture and Environment Committee's report drives a bus through the huge gaps in this poorly drafted and hastily-put-together bill. The government and, in particular, the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection have asserted that the provisions of this bill are urgently required to ensure that his department can effectively impose a chain of responsibility so that companies and other related parties bear the cost of managing and rehabilitating sites they control or are associated

with. That may very well be true, but the reason why the Agriculture and Environment Committee's report could not provide a recommendation to the parliament to pass the bill is that the government, the minister and the department have brought to the House a very untidy, flawed piece of proposed legislation.

In particular, the committee has expressed its concern about the ramifications of the provisions associated with related persons. Stakeholders across-the-board from the Queensland Law Society, the Queensland Resources Council and the Queensland Farmers' Federation have all made it very clear that the government, the minister and the department have got this very wrong. These provisions have widespread ramifications.

This bill has been widely referred to as the 'get Clive Palmer bill'. It is no secret that one of the serious concerns and complications about the shutdown of the Yabulu nickel refinery north of Townsville, which is currently owned by Clive Palmer, is that if the site is abandoned permanently with the responsible person or entity not meeting the costs of rehabilitating the site, then the taxpayers of Queensland will incur a very significant liability. It has been recently reported that that cost could be in the vicinity of \$100 million at the Yabulu nickel refinery. The thought that taxpayers of Queensland could become liable for Clive Palmer's mess at the Yabulu nickel refinery horrifies and scares me utterly.

Very few people in this place understand the stark reality of that scenario more than me because the Yabulu nickel refinery is located in my electorate of Hinchinbrook. It is the environment in my electorate of Hinchinbrook which will be placed at risk if the hazardous materials currently stored on site are not managed properly or if the site is not rehabilitated comprehensively. That site contains hazardous materials that have accumulated potentially since the nickel refinery commenced operations in 1974. It is the communities that I represent—the residents of Yabulu, Black River and Saunders Beach and perhaps even areas further afield—that could be adversely affected by the failure to manage that site properly.

I certainly do not want that and the community that I represent does not want that. However, the bill before the House potentially complicates what has been another extremely vexing issue facing the Hinchinbrook electorate, the city of Townsville and North Queensland as a whole, being the uncertain future of the operation and ownership of the Yabulu nickel refinery. The history of the Yabulu nickel refinery can best be described as colourful. Ownership of the refinery has changed on several occasions and on more than one of those occasions the owner has been very motivated to sell because of their own financial difficulties or the lack of profitability of the plant. The Queensland government has on more than one occasion been asked to facilitate the transfer of ownership including transferring the environmental authority associated with the site. Most recently this occurred in 2009 when Clive Palmer agreed to purchase the Yabulu nickel refinery from BHP Billiton for a song.

Although this bill has been referred to as the 'get Clive Palmer bill' its provisions are more about the environmental risks posed by the site on which the Yabulu nickel refinery has operated since 1974 and the potential exposure to Queensland taxpayers rather than a debate about the financial viability of the refinery. However, there is an issue of profound significance for the Hinchinbrook electorate, the city of Townsville and North Queensland—800 direct jobs and many other indirect jobs which depend on the operations at the Yabulu nickel refinery. The very difficult balance between the protection of the environment and investment uncertainty is no better exemplified than the current situation at the Yabulu nickel refinery.

Sister City Partners Ltd, a not-for-profit enterprise, made a submission to the Agriculture and Environment Committee on this issue outlining what the bill means for their proposal to facilitate a community buyback initiative involving the former employees of the Yabulu nickel refinery. In their submission, Sister City Partners stated that the provisions of the Environmental Protection (Chain of Responsibility) Amendment Bill 2016—

... are of considerable concern to the investing parties, whether they be equity participants or debt providers, insofar as they create new risks about future uncontrollable exposures and liabilities. These risks are, to put it simply, a deterrent to investor interest.

They went on to cover in some detail the potential impact of the bill. They said—

In these circumstances for investors, equity holders and creditors—which are all related parties potentially—to be further exposed to additional unknown and unspecified risks of extra liabilities is potentially a deal killer in this instance.

Finally, they concluded—


... the unintended consequences of the bill's provisions are a significant impediment to us moving forward with a constructive and viable solution to a major industry in the North Queensland economy.

I say to all members very clearly that I am the very last person who would support Clive Palmer getting away with anything. I am disgusted and infuriated by his behaviour that has left 800 North Queenslanders high and dry without jobs and without access to their lawfully accumulated entitlements. Having said that, I am mindful of the fact that the objectives of the bill seek to ensure that taxpayers will not be burdened with the costs of cleaning up the environmental legacy of sites such as the Yabulu nickel refinery. I want to achieve that and the LNP wants to achieve that, but as the committee report outlined very clearly this bill as it currently stands is a complete debacle.

I listened very carefully to the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection during his second reading speech to the House. He asserted that the amendments he has circulated in his name address the concerns raised by the parliamentary committee. I also listened carefully to the contribution by the member for Burnett, who has sought genuine reassurances from the minister that these amendments, which have only just materialised this afternoon, will address the extensive problems identified in the committee report. As the member for Burnett pointed out, those concerns were expressed by a very wide and eclectic group of submitters and stakeholders to the parliamentary committee.

The LNP genuinely supports the objectives of this bill but we are also genuinely concerned about its unintended consequences and the seriousness of what those unintended consequences might be. I say to the House in the presence of the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines that many stakeholders that will be of interest to his portfolio have made it quite clear that they are extremely concerned about the potential impact on investment in the resources sector. At this time in the state of Queensland, we do not need anything else that will increase uncertainty for people risking capital to invest in resource projects that have the potential to create jobs now and into the future, especially in Queensland's regional economy.

I know that the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines appreciates that scenario. I genuinely hope that we can take the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection at his word that these amendments will address those issues raised by stakeholders, particularly those from the resources sector, in relation to investor uncertainty. I also genuinely hope, as someone from regional Queensland, that we can take the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection at his word that the potential exposure of landowners will be resolved, because they do not deserve to be burdened with any of the potential liability that has been outlined by submitters to the committee or that has been reflected in the committee's report. We are warning the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection that, if those consequences are adverse for job creation and investment and are adverse for landowners in the future, we will have to hold him and the Palaszczuk government responsible.

 **Mr HARPER** (Thuringowa—ALP) (1.43 am): I rise this morning to give my passionate and unwavering support to the Environmental Protection (Chain of Responsibility) Amendment Bill 2016. Whilst my body maintains a pulse and a level of consciousness and I have a presence in this place, I vow to stay the course, stay strong and stand up for this particular piece of legislation. I commend at the outset the minister for his determination to see this through. I also commend the Agriculture and Environment Committee for their work. I will not allow someone like Mr Clive Palmer to walk away from his responsibilities to clean up the mess—as if he has not caused enough of a mess already in Townsville—that is the pending environmental disaster that is, or what is left of, the Queensland nickel plant in Townsville. Importantly, this bill ensures that all corporate owners take responsibility for their environment should they face financial difficulties. It should not be left to the state to pick up the costs of their failings.

I was hoping we would have bipartisan support on this. It is a very rare day when I would be thankful that fellow members around the Townsville district—like the previous speaker, the member for Hinchinbrook, and from early discussion tonight the member for Burdekin—feel as strongly as I do that Mr Clive Palmer should not walk away from his obligation and leave that \$100 million clean-up to us. There is no way we should be increasing the burden of the taxpayers of this state with that cost.

I would like to table in the House the FTI administrators report. It is 124 pages of nightmarish reading. It belongs in the halls of this parliament so as to remind us of the good work we are doing this morning. In nine hours time, the second creditors meeting will occur and, potentially, Queensland Nickel will go into liquidation. If that happens, it will become all the more difficult to try to get someone to clean up their environmental mess. I table the report.

Tabled paper: Document, dated 11 April 2016, titled 'Report by Administrators, Queensland Nickel Pty Ltd (Administrators Appointed) ACN009 842 068' [\[578\]](#).

I want to alert people to some of the stark things within that report. At the time the FTI administrators took over in January 2016, there were in excess of 1,000 critical inspections of plant and equipment, of which 800 were well overdue. The exhaust stack at Yabulu was deemed to be in critical condition and at risk of collapse. Hazardous Industries and Chemicals Branch inspected the site in 2016 and found significant concerns around shortfalls in maintenance of the plant and infrastructure and had 108 recommendations. The environmental management situation was concerning. That is what the report stated. There were a number of noncompliance problems. In 2014 there was discharge of the tailings dam into the marine environment. Following QNI's decision not to execute capital works for the tailings dam lift earlier that year, these works have still not been undertaken. The member for Hinchinbrook and any member in North Queensland knows that a significant amount of rain will certainly put that beautiful area which is so close to the coastline at risk.

Why has all of this happened? We look at the previous owner, BHP Billiton. In their last three years of ownership they spent \$80 million on maintenance. Under the current owner that spending went down by 50 per cent to \$39 million in the last four years of his ownership. That certainly paints a picture. The plant is situated very near the coast, just down the road from the beautiful Saunders Beach area and up from the North Shore, the biggest growth area in Townsville. None of this surrounding area should be put at risk from the demise of this plant. People wonder why I am passionate and why I have stood up in this place and talked about it. I have done many safety inductions in that place. I was stationed at Black River down the road and had many interactions with the plant and its owners at the time. To see it in this state is a disgrace.

I agree with the previous speaker. We have seen the 800 jobs. It is only when you go to those forums that the Queensland government has held and interact with those families and hear their issues of homes being foreclosed—just as I spoke about 10 hours ago—that you really get a true sense of the damage in Townsville caused by the collapse of this company.


These people have hurt enough and now another layer of hurt sits ready to affect the broad area of North Queensland except this layer of hurt can potentially affect people's lives in a very different way. This is the very real and present danger of chemicals and toxic waste that sits in the tailings dams and, if left unchecked, our community, our state, our taxpayers, will face a huge, long-lasting, damaging effect on our environment that can potentially be around for generations.

The Palaszczuk government is dealing head on with the potential problems arising from the QNI fiasco with this bill. It is a national first with other states already expressing interest in the application of the bill. The regime created in this bill is an anti-avoidance regime, that is, parties who can and ought to address their environmental responsibilities will no longer be able to deliberately avoid their obligations by hiding behind elaborate and artificial corporate structures—and I can go as far as to say behind fake email addresses. With regard to the Yabulu nickel refinery, which has recently entered administration, the provisions of the bill may be used to ensure our Great Barrier Reef is protected from toxic discharge and the taxpayer is protected from having to foot the bill. It appears that some corporate operators are as reluctant to undertake rehabilitation as some Hollywood celebrities. Granted we are talking about a different type of rehab, but the concept is the same: healthy land leads to healthy people leads to healthy communities equals less pressure on the public purse.

When things are going well, it is easy to forget about the environmental risks. However, if not properly managed or costed, huge consequences can follow. We only have to look at the sobering recent disaster in 2015 in Brazil to see the extent of the damage that can occur. The collapse of a tailings dam at an iron ore mine site in November last year caused the biggest environmental disaster in Brazilian history. In the villages closest to the dam 82 per cent of the township was destroyed, killing 19 people and leaving more than 1,500 families displaced. Thirty-nine villages were directly affected while another 230 had their water supply and fishing activities severely impacted. Tonnes of fish died in the first month after the disaster. The mud destroyed more than 1½ thousand hectares of vegetation and left a plume of more than 80 square kilometres in the ocean. This is certainly not an isolated event. Fifteen months before that disaster, Canada suffered its biggest tailings dam failure at a copper mine. I could go on—in 2013 the Ranger mine in the Northern Territory, which contained radioactive material, burst and the contents entered the surrounding Kakadu area. It certainly had the traditional owners worried.

The people of Townsville have had enough to worry about without the prospect of the Yabulu tailings dam collapsing and releasing billions of litres of toxic water into the Great Barrier Reef. The taxpayers of Queensland should not have to worry about footing the bill for the environmental works required to make sure that the tailings dam is secure and the site is rehabilitated. The government is

doing everything in its power to ensure that the people responsible for the mess are also responsible for the bill. We are putting the interests of the community first. We are putting the interests of ordinary Queenslanders ahead of the interests of big corporate moguls. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (1.52 am): Given the lateness of the hour, I will endeavour to keep my comments brief. I rise to address the Environmental Protection (Chain of Responsibility) Amendment Bill 2016. Like others, I want to start by acknowledging the policy objectives of this bill—that is, to facilitate enhanced environmental protection for sites operated by companies in financial difficulty and avoid the state bearing the costs for managing and rehabilitating sites in financial difficulty.

It would be fair to say that there are very few in this chamber at this moment who would have more experience of trying to achieve that outcome than me, apart from perhaps my good colleague the member for Hinchinbrook, the former minister for natural resources and mines. It is a very, very fine line that an environmental regulator must walk in ensuring that they hold sufficient financial assurance—that ability to ensure that the taxpayer does not get left with the bill if a company goes under and an environmental rehabilitation of a site is required. It is a fine line between ensuring that and making the regulations so hard that we lose business, we lose jobs, we lose economic input and investment in this state—we lose it to other nations or, even worse, we lose it to New South Wales, Victoria or Western Australia—

Mr Cripps: Or South Australia.

Mr POWELL:—or South Australia, and we cannot have that. It is an incredibly fine line that I and my colleague the member for Hinchinbrook walked when we were in government. It is a fine line that the minister is walking now in terms of what we are endeavouring to achieve through this bill.

I will give a couple of examples. There are some industries that have embraced the need for financial insurance exceptionally well. I reflect particularly on the petroleum industry where in the state of Queensland, unless it has changed significantly, I understand we hold some \$1 billion worth of financial assurance. That is more than enough to completely rehabilitate the entire impact the industry could potentially have on the state of Queensland. However, unlike the petroleum industry, there are other industries, other companies and other proponents that have not embraced that new model of financial insurance in the same way. I have heard colleagues around the chamber this evening particularly refer to Queensland Nickel and the Yabulu nickel refinery north of Townsville.


Many people would ask the obvious question: why it is that the government fails to have enough financial assurance to ensure that we can prevent the taxpayer having to foot the bill should these companies go under? What is stopping the environment and heritage protection department or the natural resources and mines department from going after those companies and getting that financial assurance? Firstly, in some instances they are historical operations; they operated under antiquated legislation, acts that were specific for that operation. I reflect that during my time as the minister for environment we were successful in transitioning Queensland Nickel—the Yabulu refinery—from their act and their own environmental regulations into the modern Environmental Protection Act through a modern environmental authority. The proof was in the pudding. After a cyclone came through and we had incidents of overspills in the tailings dams we were able to impose protection orders on the operations of that site, ensure the tailings dams were lifted and ensure there was a greater level of certainty for environmental protection for the surrounding areas.

In some other instances there are a range of reasons. I do want to correct the record. In the lead-up to this debate the minister used a number of examples in the media to explain to the broader population in some ways to try to convince those of us on this side of the chamber—although that is not necessary—that this bill is worthwhile and requires support. The minister made some comments about another company, Linc, and suggested that the LNP was a bit soft on that company. I need to remind the minister that if he did indeed say that, that is not the case. It was during my term as the minister for environment that the investigation commenced, the charges were laid in the courts and the prosecution that we are now seeing commenced. I am pleased to see that under the current Palaszczuk Labor government that investigation and those charges are being continued.

I do want to raise the point that if what we are debating tonight and what we potentially will pass tonight is required, it should only be required for those proponents that do not stump up the necessary financial assurance. It should not be used retrospectively on organisations that have done the right thing. Like other colleagues, I do want to say that whilst we agree with the intent, whilst we have concerns with the bill as it stands at the moment, whilst we are taking the minister and the department on their word that the amendments they are moving tonight will achieve the desired outcome without tipping that fine balance that I spoke of at the start in the wrong direction, we must ensure that that is

actually achieved. Several months ago we debated an ethanol bill in this House. Like that, this bill needs a level of bipartisan support, but like that it is beholden on those of us in the opposition to point out concerns, flaws and possible ramifications of this bill. There is potential for overreach. There is significant potential for sovereign risk—those capricious legal changes that jeopardise capital investment, the risks that come with government policy.


It is very much a reality that that could be imbalanced and produce negative impacts for our economy here in this state for jobs, for economic investment and for business. Having said that, if the bill is applied appropriately and if the amendments are well structured and sound, this has the potential to ensure, as the intent of the bill states, a higher level of environmental protection, one that particularly comes into effect when a company is in financial difficulty, and it ensures that the state does not bear the cost for managing and rehabilitating those sites should a company come into financial difficulty.

 **Hon. CJ O'ROURKE** (Mundingburra—ALP) (Minister for Disability Services, Minister for Seniors and Minister Assisting the Premier on North Queensland) (2.00 am): I rise to speak in support of the Environmental Protection (Chain of Responsibility) Amendment Bill 2016. The bill contains amendments that safeguard the environment and the public purse, and that is something I am happy to support. Provisions in the bill extend the application of environmental protection orders to apply to a party that has a relevant relationship to the company operating an environmentally relevant activity. If a company has breached, or it seems likely that they will breach, the conditions of their environmental authority, the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection will be able to step in and issue an environmental protection order to require a related person of that company to take specific actions to remedy a risk or prevent further harm. Importantly, if related parties, including parent companies, fail to comply with the environmental protection order, then the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection may require the related party to pay the costs of taking necessary compliance action.

It is clear to me that these laws are well overdue, given the numerous occasions where companies have closed their doors without leaving enough money aside to clean up the waste and rehabilitate the land. More often than not this land is leased from the state. The Yabulu nickel refinery in North Queensland is one of these cases, and I have seen firsthand the devastating effect the closing of this refinery has had on the people of Townsville, which is my hometown. Hundreds of people have been left without jobs; they are uncertain about their families and how to support them. Now we are seeing the very real impacts that the refinery could have not only on these families but also the surrounding environment, including the Great Barrier Reef. It is critical that the site continues to be managed and rehabilitated, in particular the large tailings dam on the site. The dam requires ongoing operation to ensure the contaminated water that seeps from it is pumped back in at a rate of more than four megalitres a day. That is the equivalent of 1½ Olympic sized swimming pools of contamination which is at risk of running into the Great Barrier Reef every day.

In order to prevent serious harm to the reef it is essential that we have proper mechanisms in place to ensure this pumping activity continues regardless of the financial state of the company. We cannot wind back the clock on oil spills or rewind the contamination that has taken place at Mount Morgan or force industry to take responsibility for the 15,000 existing abandoned mine sites that exist in Queensland, but we can take action now in Townsville to prevent potential environmental harm to the reef. The cost of remediating the Queensland Nickel site could be up to \$100 million. This legislation is the next best thing to a time machine and, quite frankly, Queensland Nickel has already done enough damage in North Queensland without risking any possible damage to the Great Barrier Reef. If a toxic spill were to occur it would likely be devastating for the marine life in this sensitive area, not to mention the Great Barrier Reef tourism industry would also take a severe blow.


As a North Queenslander I know how important the reef is to our region and I want to ensure that it is around for future generations to enjoy. I am pleased to support a bill that takes a stand for Queenslanders and the Great Barrier Reef, and I commend the bill to the House.

 **Hon. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (2.03 am): I rise to speak in support of the Environmental Protection (Chain of Responsibility) Amendment Bill 2016. Mining, resource development and minerals processing remain extraordinarily important for Queensland's economic development. Just to enlighten people who may not realise, mining creates many jobs in our state; for example, over 60,000 in the Fitzroy region and approximately 52,000 in Mackay. What is important—and what is missed—is that there are 169,000 jobs in the mining sector right here in Brisbane, and that is why it is just as important for electorates such as mine as it is for electorates in regional areas. As you know, the resources sector also contributes significant funding to our schools, roads and hospitals.

What is vital in this debate is that the development of the mining and petroleum industries over the past 50 years has also been accompanied by a stringent regulatory framework that seeks to ensure impacts on communities—including Indigenous communities—and the environment are understood, minimised and managed. This bill sets out to ensure that, in circumstances where any business which may seek to design their corporate structure in a way that would possibly allow them to avoid financial liability for damage to the environment, there is a remedy available to the state to fix it. While we do not expect many cases of significant environmental damage in the majority of these circumstances, we would expect that in the event of environmental damage the cost of remediation would be met from the financial assurances that mining operators are required to provide to the Queensland government as part of their environmental authority. That system of financial assurance has operated for decades in Queensland over a number of different governments of both political persuasions.

The proposal embodied in the chain of responsibility bill is only aimed at those who seek to avoid their responsibilities; it is not aimed at the majority of mining companies who take responsibility for their operations. A significant number of industry participants have indicated to me that they support the fundamental proposition that is embodied in this bill; however, a number of companies involved in the broad mining sector have expressed some concerns about aspects of this bill. Over the past few weeks the Treasurer and I have worked with our colleague, the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection, to assess stakeholder feedback across all parts of industry and community. My colleague, the Minister for Environment, has explained the checks and balances that are incorporated into the bill, and these include: an amendment to ensure that owners of land are not unduly captured by the related person test; and an amendment to insert the requirement for a statutory guideline to provide operators with greater clarity regarding how the department will implement the new provisions.

One area that I believe is worth emphasising is that embodied in clause 7, new section 363AB(4), which provides for a number of factors the administering authority may consider in determining whether a relevant connection exists as provided in new section 363AB(2). Some stakeholders have expressed a concern that there is no requirement for the administering authority to consider any of the factors in making a determination of whether a relevant connection with a company exists. In addition to other matters, I have sought advice from my colleague, the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection, asking for a clarification on the operation of the section. I am pleased to be able to advise that this provision was drafted explicitly in accordance with drafting practice due to the application of judicial review on any decisions made by an administering authority. I have every confidence in supporting this bill, and I have every confidence that the mining sector will also support this.

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef) (2.07 am), in reply: First of all, I would like to thank all honourable members for their participation in this debate. I would particularly like to thank the member for Gladstone, who chaired the committee, all members of the committee for their work, and I particularly acknowledge the collaborative approach taken by the deputy chair, the shadow minister for environment.

Today members of the House have stood in support of this bill which will prevent taxpayers from being left with the cost of cleaning up after irresponsible operators. My department and the committee have gone through the numerous submissions we have received from stakeholders and we have considered their concerns in detail. I am confident that the amendments I am proposing go as far as possible to address those concerns without compromising the effectiveness of the bill. The member for Burnett raised concerns in relation to clause 10 where the bill removes the protection from self-incrimination. I want to reassure the honourable member that, while the bill does include the removal of the protection requiring a person to give information about an offence committed against environmental legislation, this evidence cannot be used against that person. This provision has a legitimate objective, and it is essential to assist in the investigation of offences in order to further the protection of the environment.

In relation to questions raised about clauses 3 and 4 of the bill, I clarify that where a transitional environmental program or an amendment to an EA is issued as a result of an amended or withdrawn EPO, the subject matter of the EPO limits the subject matter of the TEP or amendment. It is not the case, as the member for Burnett was concerned, that the withdrawal of an EPO about noise could trigger an EA amendment about water, for instance. Further, these powers will not be triggered by decisions of the court reviewing the department's decision to issue the EPO.

I am pleased to note that my department has been working closely with concerned stakeholders to address their issues, and the amendments in this bill are the proof that this government is listening to feedback and prepared to finetune its legislation. In particular, I thank the Queensland Resources Council for its detailed comments on the working of the industry, its operations and the market which allowed us to improve the enforceability of the bill.

The amendments propose a new criterion to be considered before an EPO is issued to a related person which is designed to exclude entities that have taken all reasonable steps to ensure environmental obligations are complied with and rehabilitation is appropriately funded. The amendments also provide for a statutory guideline to provide more direction around who may be a related person that could potentially be held liable under the new provisions. This will give people more comfort about whether this legislation will affect them. I emphasise that the guideline will be developed in partnership between my department and key stakeholders, which will include regional interests. It is our intention that it would be a living document, iteratively developed, and not a case of 'set and forget'. The working party will include representatives of relevant stakeholder groups, and that group will guide not only the content of the guideline but also our priorities in developing areas for the guideline's application.

Importantly, the amendments we have made to the bill will give farmers certainty that they will not be required to clean up after mining or coal seam gas activities on their land. I acknowledge the contribution of the Queensland Farmers' Federation, particularly their interim CEO, Ruth Wade, in contributing to the exclusion of underlying tenure holders from the definition of 'related people' and for the QFF's support for the bill. In the same vein, I thank Lock the Gate's particularly vigorous advocate Drew Hutton and his team for their efforts in protecting rural and regional Queensland. I thank also APPEA, the representative organisation for Queensland's oil and gas industry, and the Association of Mining and Exploration Companies for working closely with my department and for providing advice.

As members have heard tonight, those who are diligent in their environmental responsibilities have absolutely nothing to be concerned about, whereas those who have been reckless might find themselves connected by the chain of responsibility back to the expensive mess they have created. In response to stakeholder concerns, the provisions have been amended to make it clear that the bill applies retrospectively only to the extent that an environmental authority was transferred after the introduction of the bill. I thank the president of the Queensland Law Society, Bill Potts, for clarifying the proper operation of the financial assurance transfer clauses. The Queensland Law Society also provided helpful comment around the reach of the chain of responsibility.

Ideally, I would—I am sure we all would—like to see this new legislation actually sit unused, collecting dust on a shelf somewhere. Given the reckless behaviour of certain companies, the Queensland government will not hesitate to take action to make polluters pay if it becomes necessary. This bill represents good environmental legislation. It will ensure improved protection for our environment. It toughens up the laws relating to companies and their environmental responsibilities. I commend this bill to the House.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.

Clause 3—



Dr MILES (2.14 am): I move the following amendments—

1 Clause 3 (Amendment of s 215 (Other amendments))

Page 4, lines 10 and 11—

omit, insert—

(ba) another entity becomes a holder of the authority;

(bb) another entity becomes a holding company of a holder of the authority;

2 Clause 3 (Amendment of s 215 (Other amendments))

Page 4, line 15, 'to (p)'—

omit, insert—

to (q)

I table the explanatory notes to my amendments.

Tabled paper: Environmental Protection (Chain of Responsibility) Amendment Bill 2016, explanatory notes to Hon. Steven Miles's amendments [579].

Mr BENNETT: Understanding that we have had some discussions over the past couple of hours about section 215, I did not get from the minister in his reply to the debate the explanation that I thought I would—that section 215 was the right area in dealing with the transfers. The minister may remember our conversations around other sections—that is, sections 290 and 252—being more appropriate. There are existing sections elsewhere in the act that deal with transfers and the amendment upon a transfer. Section 215 generally deals with punitive situations justifying a compulsory amendment, not the normal commercial transfer activity.

Mr CRIPPS: Clause 3 allows the administering authority to amend an environmental authority where the environmental authority is transferred to another holder or where an environmental protection order is amended or withdrawn. Clause 3 appears to provide for circumstances where the environmental authority is going, rather than where it has come from, if the minister understands my meaning. My question is: how does the bill provide for holding to account people or entities that are releasing or discharging themselves of the possession of that environmental authority for that operation? In certain circumstances they may be seeking to distance themselves from an environmental authority so as to not take responsibility for it.

Clause 3 and amended clause 3 will appropriately provide for where an environmental authority has been transferred to somewhere and will give the opportunity for the department to appropriately amend that environmental authority to ensure the taxpayer is not exposed. However, there is a circumstance in North Queensland, somewhere in the vicinity of my electorate of Hinchinbrook. The circumstances we face are such that the entity that currently holds an environmental authority is going through a series of corporate changes in arrangements so as to distance itself from that environmental authority and distance itself from the responsibility to clean up the environmental mess which it ought to be responsible for.

My question to the minister is: how does clause 3 appropriately make sure that the department can hold responsible a person who may be distancing themselves or discharging themselves from holding an environmental authority, as opposed to the department amending an environmental authority for where an environmental authority is being transferred to?

Dr MILES: I will address the member for Hinchinbrook's point first as it is fresher in my mind. He is right: the focus here is on ensuring the conditions are appropriate in the new EA. As the member would be well aware, the vendor, if you like, does not transfer their responsibilities until such point as the new EA has been issued, whether that has new conditions or not.

The hypothetical situation the member outlined for us really does go to the broader purpose of the entire bill, and that is to give those EPO powers to apply to a wider range of people and organisations such as those that might be standing behind the relinquishing party or indeed the receiving party. Clause 7 is more relevant to attempts to address the concerns that the member raised. I apologise to the member for Burnett in that in my haste to drop paragraphs to get us all out of here I skipped over one paragraph which, if he does not mind, I might go back to. I want to assure the member for Burnett that the provision he refers to is being inserted into the most appropriate part of the bill because it logically places this power to amend an EA with the other powers in the act that allow the EA to be amended in a substantive way. The provisions the member referred to allow only formal amendments, so I trust that addresses the concerns of both members.

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 3, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 4, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 5 and 6, as read, agreed to.

Clause 7—



Dr MILES (2.21 am): I move the following amendments—

3 Clause 7 (Insertion of new ch 7, pt 5, div 2)

Page 6, lines 8 and 9—

omit.

4 Clause 7 (Insertion of new ch 7, pt 5, div 2)

Page 6, lines 24 to 29—

omit, insert—

- (b) the person owns land on which the company carries out, or has carried out, a relevant activity other than a resource activity; or
- (c) the person—
 - (i) is an associated entity of the company; and
 - (ii) owns land on which the company carries out, or has carried out, a relevant activity that is a resource activity; or
- (d) the administering authority decides under this section the person has a relevant connection with the company.

5 Clause 7 (Insertion of new ch 7, pt 5, div 2)

Page 7, lines 1 to 4—

omit, insert—

- (a) the person is capable of significantly benefiting financially, or has significantly benefited financially, from the carrying out of a relevant activity by the company; or

6 Clause 7 (Insertion of new ch 7, pt 5, div 2)

Page 8, line 31—

omit, insert—

- (6) In deciding for subsection (2) whether a person, other than an associated entity of a company, has a relevant connection with the company, it is irrelevant if the person—
 - (a) is capable of significantly benefiting financially, or has significantly benefited financially—
 - (i) under an agreement or obligation relating to native title, Aboriginal cultural heritage or Torres Strait Islander cultural heritage; or
 - (ii) under a conduct and compensation agreement, or from compensation paid or payable, under resource legislation; or
 - (iii) under a make good agreement for a water bore under the *Water Act 2000*; or
 - (b) is or has been in a position to influence the company's conduct because of an agreement or obligation mentioned in paragraph (a).
- (7) In making a decision under this section, the administering authority must have regard to any relevant guidelines in force under section 548A.
- (8) In this section—

7 Clause 7 (Insertion of new ch 7, pt 5, div 2)

Page 9, after line 4—

insert—

owner, of land, does not include a person mentioned in schedule 4, definition *owner*, paragraph 1(d) to (f).

8 Clause 7 (Insertion of new ch 7, pt 5, div 2)

Page 9, before line 5—

*insert—***363ABA****Decision whether to issue an order**

In deciding whether to issue an environmental protection order to a related person of a company under section 363AC or 363AD, the administering authority—

- (a) must have regard to any relevant guidelines in force under section 548A; and
- (b) may consider whether the related person took all reasonable steps, having regard to the extent to which the person was in a position to influence the company's conduct, to ensure the company—
 - (i) complied with its obligations under this Act; and
 - (ii) made adequate provision to fund the rehabilitation and restoration of the land because of environmental harm from a relevant activity carried out by the company.

9 Clause 7 (Insertion of new ch 7, pt 5, div 2)

Page 10, line 8, before 'serious'—

insert—

unlawful

10 Clause 7 (Insertion of new ch 7, pt 5, div 2)

Page 16, after line 10—

*insert—***363AJ Review of operation of division**

- (1) The Minister must, within 2 years after the commencement, review the operation of this division to decide whether the provisions of the division remain appropriate.
- (2) The Minister must, as soon as practicable after finishing the review, table a report about its outcome in the Legislative Assembly.

Mr BENNETT: These are welcome amendments, Minister. However, I was just wondering if the minister could take the time to elaborate and explain to the House the changes that were made in amendment No. 5 to clause 7 about the change that was made to insert the words 'significant financial benefit' and how the issues now will give confidence to those who were previously unintentionally perhaps caught up in the financial benefit test.

Mr CRIPPS: My question to the minister in relation to amendment No. 5 relating to clause 7 is also with respect to the insertion of the word 'significant' into the clause to define who will be taken to have a relevant connection to an entity carrying out an environmentally relevant activity. My concern and the reason for my question is that with the insertion of the word 'significant' to capture someone as a relevant connection I am not able to locate a corresponding definition in the bill or the amendments to the bill which define 'significant financial benefit'. In the bill that was introduced by the minister we do have a definition for 'financial benefit' in clause 7 under proposed section 363AB(6). We have a definition for a number of those matters. There are a number of definitions in clause 7, but we do not have a definition for 'significant financial benefit'.

The issue that I want to raise for the House is that we need to know if there is some sort of threshold that has to be reached that differentiates a person from receiving a financial benefit or a significant financial benefit, otherwise the person who may have a relevant connection to an activity may not be able to be administered correctly by the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection. This is also going to be problematic for amendments Nos 6 and 7 where people will be excluded from being considered to have a relevant connection on the basis of financial benefit.

If we do not have a relevant definition that precisely gives us the definition for 'significant financial benefit', those people may be captured and those people include, as per amendment No. 7, landowners and, as per amendment No. 6, persons including native title holders or persons to whom land has been granted under the Aboriginal Land Act 1991 and the Torres Strait Islander Land Act 1991. I would ask the minister to clarify whether or not the inclusion of the word 'significant' means we need to have a more accurate definition for 'significant financial benefit'.

The other question that I have in relation to amendment No. 8, given that the minister has moved them together, is 'reasonable steps'. Can the minister indicate whether or not the definition of 'reasonable steps' is the statutory or common law definition of 'reasonable steps'? If it is the statutory interpretation of 'reasonable steps', then can the minister indicate in which act that definition is contained?

Dr MILES: A number of points were raised and I am just trying to make sure that I address all of them. In terms of 'reasonable steps' that the member for Hinchinbrook asked about, I am advised that that would be the common law test. The relevant connection test that he referred to in outlining his concerns about the level of significant financial benefit fails to acknowledge that that connection test is not relevant to the kinds of landholders that we are trying to exclude from these provisions. They are excluded separately and that particular test does not apply and they are excluded based on their status as a landholder, so that applies to farmers with tenements over their property, native title holders and those kinds of landholders.

In terms of the significant test—and both the member for Burnett and the member for Hinchinbrook had questions that went to this—that specific amendment is designed to address concerns raised in committee that the bill will allow EPOs to be issued to small investors under this amendment. Only those investors with a significant financial interest in the company will be potential EPO recipients. It is designed to give certainty to small so-called mum and dad investors. The meaning of significant will necessarily depend on the scale of the activity. It will be our intention to provide more precise guidance based on different scales of activity in order to provide more guidance about what significant financial benefit is. Therefore, we have retained the definition in the bill of 'financial benefit', allowing significance to be considered based on the scale of the activity and potentially on what the guideline says.

Amendments agreed to.

Mr CRIPPS: I would appreciate it if the minister, with his indulgence, could reconsider what he just said. I am not contesting the fact that the amendments moved by the minister will seek to exclude, for those reasons that are listed in the explanatory notes, the landowners who get those compensatory payments. I am not seeking to suggest that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people under those relevant acts will not be excluded. My concern is that, because the minister has moved amendments to make it clear that only people with significant financial benefit will be caught, there is no corresponding definition of what that means in the legislation. Without a clear meaning of what is a differentiation between 'financial benefit' and 'significant financial benefit', if a landowner is going to get a significant financial benefit, or an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander person is going to get a significant financial benefit, they may not be excluded under amendment 6, or amendment 7, or amendment 4 respectively.

If I cannot get a clear understanding of the reason the bill does not carry a definition of 'significant financial benefit' instead of just 'financial benefit' and if there are any thresholds that have to be crossed to be differentiated, then we may have some interpretative issues that are going to cause problems for those landowners and Indigenous people who should be rightly excluded from the framework, as the minister is trying to achieve.

Dr MILES: It is our view that the place to define 'significant' is in the guideline, because that will allow us to consult industry and stakeholders about what represents 'significant' depending on different industries and different levels of scale. The financial benefit test is not re-enlivened for any of those landholders. Regardless of the scale of their financial benefit, they do not return to that test. That clause is designed to provide a blanket exclusion provided people meet only that criteria.

Mr Cripps: It ought to say that.

Dr MILES: It is our advice that it does say that.

Mr BENNETT: I come back to the issue of the related person test, which also relates to clause 7. Although it is acknowledged that new section 363AB defines those persons who were possibly caught up in the unintended consequences of the previous draft, is it also envisaged that a related person test could have a more definitive list of persons—landowners and others, including those people under the Aboriginal Land Act—in the minister's amendment, or is that a definitive list of who would be determined under this related person test as it is in clause 7?

Dr MILES: It is our view that, effectively, the list that is included in this legislation adequately captures the landholders who submitters were most concerned could be inadvertently captured. This amendment addresses the concerns that were raised during the committee hearing that payments received or influence exercised under conduct and compensation agreements under resource legislation or ILUAs under the Native Title Act could result in a person being determined to have a relevant connection to the AL holder. The amendment ensures that any agreement or payment of a compensatory nature will not be taken into account.

In terms of the member's general proposition that we should have a list of excluded parties, there is a hesitance to do that. When you are trying to construct legislation to avoid avoidance and you create safe harbour categories of people or organisations, there is a risk that that drives people to structure themselves to look like those kinds of exemptions. That is the hesitance to have a list that is broader than what we think is a pretty effective criteria that says, 'These landholders really should not be considered.'

Clause 7, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 8 to 12, as read, agreed to.

Clause 13—



Dr MILES (2.35 am): I move the following amendment—

11 Clause 13 (Insertion of new ss 522A and 522B)

Page 19, line 6, '85%'—

omit, insert—

75%

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 13, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 14, as read, agreed to.

Clause 15—

Dr MILES (2.36 am): I move the following amendment—

12 Clause 15 (Insertion of new ss 535B and 535C)

Page 20, line 2, '85%'—

omit, insert—

75%

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 15, as amended, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Dr MILES (2.37 am): I move the following amendment—

13 After clause 15

Page 20, after line 13—

insert—

15A Insertion of new s 548A

After section 548—

insert—

548A Guidelines about issuing particular environmental protection orders

(1) The chief executive may make guidelines about—

- (a) how the administering authority decides under section 363AB whether a person has a relevant connection with a company; and
- (b) in relation to a company to which section 363AC or 363AD applies, how the administering authority decides—
 - (i) whether to issue any environmental protection orders to related persons of the company; and
 - (ii) if so, which of the related persons of the company to issue with an order.

(2) A guideline under this section takes effect when it is approved by regulation.

Mr CRIPPS: I approached the minister earlier today after his second reading speech and invited him to explain to the House in more detail when he moved this amendment what undertakings he could give to the House about the consultation process that will occur with respect to the development of the guidelines for what the administering authority will consider when deciding whether to issue an environmental protection order. I would have liked the minister to have explained the amendment in a little bit more detail. He did not. So I have to rise to ask him to do so in response to my question.

I have to get up and talk again about the absence from the bill, or in the amendments that have been moved to the bill, of a clear definition of the difference between what is a 'significant financial benefit' and a 'financial benefit'. I need to do that now because the minister in his response to my last question indicated that the administering authority would be deciding what the difference is between a financial benefit and a significant financial benefit when they developed the guidelines. I do not know if that is a very satisfactory answer to my previous question because if the administering authority were going to decide what the difference was between a financial benefit and a significant financial benefit in the guidelines, they would have included it when they issued the bill, or the amendments to the bill.

When I go back to the bill, I see that there is only a definition for 'financial benefit'. It stands to reason that, if you are going to have a definition of 'financial benefit' and you know that you are going to issue some guidelines, if you introduce some amendments into the House and you put in an adjective to clearly change the term from 'financial benefit' to 'significant financial benefit', there is going to be some threshold test to determine the difference between the two.

If there is going to be a threshold test to determine the difference between the two you need to change the definition. If you do not change the definition you are going to have no clear direction to the department, or the administering authority in this case, about what the difference is between those two. If you are going to do it in the guidelines you can do it, but to come and tell me in an answer to a question before that you were always going to sort it out in the guidelines is total nonsense because you do not have a distinction in the definition in the bill that you have introduced into the House and you do not have a definition in the amendments that you have introduced into the House.

What we have here tonight is a clear failure of the department once again to present a clear framework for how this new legislation is going to be developed and applied on the ground. That is the result of the rushed nature of the introduction of the bill and the amendments.

Mr SPEAKER: Do you want to respond, Minister?

Dr MILES: I reiterate that the bill does define 'financial benefit' and that it is difficult to give a stipulative definition of 'significant' in that context when you are talking about such a wide breadth of possible investment types. The guideline is an appropriate place to provide more guidance about how 'significant' will be defined in different circumstances with advice from industry and from stakeholders. I emphasise that the guideline must be tabled here in parliament. The minister and the whole parliament will scrutinise and decide if that guideline is appropriate. It will be a disallowable instrument. It is not unusual for this kind of anti-avoidance legislation to operate in that way: to have a piece of legislation with subordinate instruments sitting below it which the parliament has scrutiny over but which can be more of a living document with more ongoing contribution from industry.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 16—



Dr MILES (2.41 am): I move the following amendments—

14 Clause 16 (Insertion of new ch 13, pt 25)

Page 20, after line 21—

insert—

743A Definitions for part

In this part—

amending Act means the *Environmental Protection (Chain of Responsibility) Amendment Act 2016*.

introduction day means the day the Bill for the amending Act was introduced into the Legislative Assembly.

transitional period means the period from the start of the introduction day to the day the amending Act commenced.

15 Clause 16 (Insertion of new ch 13, pt 25)

Page 20, lines 25 to 28—

omit, insert—

- (1) The reference in section 215(2)(c) to 'becomes a holder of the authority' is taken to include 'became a holder of the authority during the transitional period'.
- (2) The reference in section 215(2)(d) to 'becomes a holding company of a holder of the authority' is taken to include 'became a holding company of a holder of the authority during the transitional period'.

16 Clause 16 (Insertion of new ch 13, pt 25)

Page 21, line 19, 'on or after the commencement'—

omit, insert—

at the time the order is issued

17 Clause 16 (Insertion of new ch 13, pt 25)

Page 21, line 27 to page 22, line 1—

omit.

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 16, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 17, as read, agreed to.

Clause 18—

Dr MILES (2.42 am): I move the following amendment—

18 Clause 18 (Amendment of sch 4 (Dictionary))

Page 23, lines 17 and 18—

omit, insert—

holding company see the Corporations Act, section 9.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 18, as amended, agreed to.

Third Reading

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef) (2.43 am): 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. SJ MILES** (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef) (2.43 am): 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.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT


Parliamentary Service Email System

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, yesterday morning members started receiving many hundreds, if not thousands, of emails relating to ridesharing. This was no doubt related to the then pending consideration of the Transport Legislation (Taxi Services) Amendment Bill. Whether these emails were, in fact, being generated by individuals or individuals utilising some sort of feeder system, or simply being auto generated and were a type of email bomb or blast, one result of these emails was to compromise the Parliamentary Service's email system and members' ability to communicate.

In these circumstances the Clerk took the decision to auto block these emails to prevent the overload of our members' email accounts. The Clerk immediately advised members of the action taken and no member complained about that action. I have received a complaint from Uber about the possible blocking of the emails. I endorse the Clerk's decision and I am sure members do as well.

PRIVILEGE

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

 **Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Ms Farmer): Honourable members, on 23 February 2016 the Deputy Premier, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade and Investment wrote to the Speaker alleging that the member for Callide deliberately misled the House on 18 February 2016 when he made allegations about the conduct of the Deputy Premier when she was a member of the PCCC in the last parliament.

Mr Speaker delegated consideration of this matter in accordance with standing order 269 to me as he was a member of the PCCC at the relevant time and had some personal knowledge and involvement with the issues at the periphery of the complaint.

Yesterday the member for Callide apologised and withdrew his statements. The member for Callide's apology may not have been the most gracious of apologies but it is sufficient for me to decide that the matter does not warrant the further attention of the House via the Ethics Committee and I will not be referring the matter.

I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 23 February 2016, from the Deputy Premier, Hon. Jackie Trad, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an alleged deliberate misleading of the House [580].

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 24 February 2016, from the member for Callide, Mr Jeff Seeney MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an allegation of deliberately misleading the House [581].

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (2.46 am): I move—

That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until 9.30 am on Tuesday, 10 May 2015.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (2.47 am): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Pacific Women's Parliamentary Partnerships Forum



Ms DAVIS (Aspley—LNP) (2.47 am): It was my enormous privilege to have been selected as the Queensland representative to attend the Pacific Women's Parliamentary Partnerships Forum, which was held in Apia, Samoa, from 4 to 7 April. The Pacific Women's Parliamentary Partnerships Forum is an annual event which is coordinated by the Australian parliament and funded by the Pacific Women's Parliamentary Partnerships Project and financially supported by Australian aid. The core objective of the forum is building and sustaining networks of women in parliament in the Pacific region and to gain momentum in highlighting the role of women as key decision-makers in their respective parliaments. It is a terrific way to connect with our sister parliamentarians in the Pacific, and what a fantastic group of women they are. I think I can safely say that our time together broadened our perspectives of the challenges that women face in each of our countries and I look forward to staying connected with them.

This year's forum focused attention on women's economic empowerment. It is a sad reality that economic opportunities for women in the Pacific are amongst the worst in the world, and with the exception of Australia and New Zealand there is no Pacific country where economic opportunities for women rise above the global average.

There were many things that I learned at this forum: most significantly, that the women parliamentarians who attended, some of them only newly elected, have enormous resolve to increase opportunities for all women in the Pacific region. Possibly my greatest education was around informal economies and the heavy reliance on the informal economy for women's economic participation. Women dominate the informal economy. Indeed, women's private sector activity is mostly in the informal economy and their workplace is often the street, the marketplace or the home. What I learned is that there is a real reticence to move to the formal economy. There are a number of reasons for this, and, whilst many of the parliamentarians in attendance were businesswomen in the formal economy, encouraging more women to move into the formal economy continues to have challenges.

It is very clear that in order to give women economic empowerment there needs to be a focus on improving women's financial literacy and access to banking services. I am convinced that making these services more available and suited to women's needs will increase income in women's hands. It became evidence that in the Pacific nations it is particularly important that priority be placed on legislative protections for women, recognising that women's economic empowerment and gender equity go hand in hand. It was a very great privilege to have been asked to address the forum and share my own personal journey in small business and the challenges I encountered in an industry that has always been the domain of men. Attending this forum was a wonderful experience and I am grateful for the opportunity to have connected with so many inspiring women.

Heart of Australia



Ms LEAHY (Warrego—LNP) (2.50 am): I rise to speak about the lifesaving work being undertaken by Heart of Australia and founder Dr Rolf Gomes, whose vision and drive is delivering front-line health services to rural and regional communities in south-west and western Queensland. I want to thank Dr Gomes for his dedication in providing this healthcare model that works for the residents and saves lives in my electorate and others. The self-sufficient truck and trailer houses two custom designed private clinics, a testing room and a reception area. It is wheelchair accessible and fully air-conditioned.

The Heart of Australia visits fortnightly the communities of St George, Charleville and Roma in my electorate of Warrego and the other communities of Emerald, Barcaldine, Hughenden, Charters Towers, Longreach, Dalby, Goondiwindi and Moranbah. The services delivered include specialist


medical investigation and treatment clinics, and there are tangible benefits. There is a boost to front-line services that previously did not exist and a reduction in the financial burden on taxpayers. There is a reduction in waiting lists in towns that have poor access to specialists, a closing of the gap in preventative health services to Indigenous communities and enhanced liveability of rural towns and communities through improved health services. The service is also delivering regular medical education in the form of a structured lecture series to local health practitioners and employing local staff where possible.

I am greatly heartened by the way the residents of my electorate have embraced the Heart of Australia's services. It is a particularly important service for the elderly and disabled, who have the most difficulty travelling long distances. People like Denis Cook of the Murweh Shire Council are strong supporters of the service as is Donna Stewart, the former mayor of the Balonne Shire Council, who said that the Heart of Australia is providing the opportunity for patients who could not travel to the city to see a cardiologist. There is something else very interesting about this service, and that is the savings to the taxpayer from this model of care and early detection.

It is estimated that government savings over a 12-month period are: avoidable hospital admissions, \$2.5 million; economic burden of heart attack, \$4 million; and Queensland Health travel accommodation subsidies, \$1 million. This equates to an estimated total savings to the state government of approximately \$7.5 million per annum. This is not an insignificant saving compared with the total requested input of funding from state and federal governments of \$2 million—\$1 million from each level of government. It is particularly disappointing that this state government has declined to extend the initial start-up support which was given to the Heart of Australia. The state government suggested that the program seek individual contracts from the hospital and health services. This response contrasts with that of the federal government, which responded to the proposal for continued funding for the Heart of Australia—

(Time expired)

Mount Gravatt Electorate, TAFE Campus


 **Mr KELLY** (Greenslopes—ALP) (2.53 am): I rise to speak about the excellent work being done by staff at the Mount Gravatt campus of TAFE. This campus has been an integral part of our community, providing vocational training and support in a wide range of areas. For years the campus has been the centre of the fashion industry in Queensland, turning out designers and other staff who work in the industry and who lead this industry not just here in Queensland but also around the world. This is rightly something that people in our community are proud of. It is extremely common to meet constituents who have benefited from the education they received at this campus. People tell me how important this campus is for our local community and how the education they or their children received has helped to set them on a course for a fulfilling and meaningful career.

Just last year I worked with the team from Small Business Solutions, which is based at this campus. They did excellent work helping a local high school tuckshop develop a business plan. Through that process I learned of the many people and businesses that this organisation helps. Like people in my community, I have always been aware of the good work done by TAFE and I have always been pleased to have a campus nearby. After finishing my hospital based nurse training, I found myself in management positions in not-for-profit organisations. I did not have an academic background and, while I recognised that I needed further training, I did not feel I was ready for university. I instead turned to TAFE, which offered a more flexible, practical and affordable approach. I have benefitted greatly from this, and it gave me the skills I needed immediately, as well as the interest and confidence to complete two further university qualifications.

Sadly, under the Newman government the Mount Gravatt campus of TAFE did not fare well. Student numbers have declined dramatically as courses were withdrawn or as fees were pushed to levels that drove students away. The campus is still there, set in beautiful bushland surroundings. The buildings and infrastructure are still there. The fashion courses are still there and they are still world-class. There are several other courses still offered on site, but visiting this campus now is like visiting a ghost town—a ghost town created by Campbell Newman which at the time was surrounded by three electorates held by the LNP, whose members said nothing while this occurred. Unlike the LNP, Labor believes in providing Queenslanders with the opportunity for training to get into jobs and to upskill. That is why since the election the Palaszczuk government has abolished QTAMA, returning our public training assets to the people of Queensland.

We are investing in TAFE through our Rescuing TAFE package, and TAFE management have been working hard to attract students back to the campus. Since my election I have had frequent meetings with the minister. I know that she cares about building a strong public training provider. I was pleased to bring her to the campus and show her the facilities. I will be working hard to ensure this community gets a strong voice in the future of TAFE and the Mount Gravatt campus, because I believe that we need to make sure we continue to offer services at this campus for our community so we can deliver the jobs of the future.


Vietnam Veterans

 **Mr SORENSEN** (Hervey Bay—LNP) (2.56 am): On Australia Day 1968, two battalions of Australian troops serving in Vietnam were involved in Operation Coburg, which was an offensive against the Vietcong just outside of Saigon, now Ho Chi Minh City. Forty-eight years later, on Australia Day this year, veterans from both sides met in Vung Tau to remember those lost during that battle, which lasted over three weeks. I was present at the commemorative dinner after I was officially invited by the 2nd Battalion, Royal Australian Regiment Association, to officiate at the reunion. It was truly amazing to see Australian and Vietnamese veterans sharing smiles and toasting friends they had lost in the offensive, showing photographs of their families and genuinely enjoying each other's company.

Here we are, almost on the eve of Anzac Day, and I am sorry that I could not attend the special morning tea that Hervey Bay businessman and veteran Con Souvlis holds for veterans at this time every year. On 18 August this year, the date we call Vietnam Veterans Day, we will remember the 50th anniversary of one of the bloodiest three-hour battles fought by our soldiers in Vietnam, the Battle of Long Tan. It is a remarkable story of D Company, numbering only 108 men who came across an enemy numbering about 2,500. Eighteen Australians were killed in the Battle of Long Tan and 24 wounded, and all but one of the dead came from D Company. More than 245 Vietcong died in the battle.

While I was in Vietnam I visited the site of the battle and heard many remarkable stories of the conflict. Like many who have visited the site before me, I became quite emotional when I visited the Long Tan Cross in the rubber plantation fields just over a mile from what was D Company's base at Nui Dat. Organisers are expecting up to 3,000 to attend the 50th anniversary service. Unfortunately, due to parliament sitting on 18 August I will not be able to travel and stand alongside many of the vets from Hervey Bay who will be making the pilgrimage for the special day, but I will be able to picture those who are returning to the site of the Battle of Long Tan and to the Long Tan Cross, in a far different setting than 50 years ago.

Patterson, Dr R; Oatley, Mr R

 **Mr COSTIGAN** (Whitsunday—LNP) (2.59 am): I rise to pay tribute to the late Dr Rex Patterson, a most respected constituent and former Labor member of parliament for Dawson. Born in Bundaberg but incredibly passionate about the north, Rex was educated at UQ, ANU, the University of Illinois and the University of Chicago. He also served in the RAAF during the final months of World War II.

In 1966, at a by-election, Rex was elected Labor's first member for Dawson. In 1972, Gough Whitlam was swept to office as prime minister and Rex was appointed Minister for Northern Development. In 1973, Queen Elizabeth II swore him in as Minister for the Northern Territory. I believe that was the first and only time that has happened in our history. In 1974, at the direction of the prime minister, Rex was sent to Darwin to oversee the recovery efforts in the aftermath of Tropical Cyclone Tracy.

In October 1975, Rex became Minister for Agriculture. I dare say that was a job he probably should have had years earlier, given his passion for and knowledge of the agricultural sector, particularly the sugar and cattle industries. Sadly for Rex, his time in the portfolio was short-lived, as the dismissal came just a month later. At the subsequent election, Rex was beaten by Ray Braithwaite, who always had the utmost respect for his rival, who was extremely popular amongst farmers and graziers, despite coming from the Labor side.


I fondly remember Rex from my days as a cadet journalist. I interviewed him at his home in Blacks Beach and, in more recent times, I enjoyed our occasional chats on the plane, particularly about agriculture and northern development. After all, Rex was one of the key drivers behind the Burdekin Falls Dam, the Kinchant Dam, the Brigalow Scheme and much more. After battling illness Rex died on 6 April, aged 89. To Jayne and the rest of the family I extend my deepest condolences. Vale, Dr Rex Patterson.

This morning I also pay tribute to another great man who, although not a constituent, loved the electorate I represent so much that he invested tens of millions of dollars in the Whitsundays, driving tourism, creating jobs and inspiring people. Of course I am referring to the late Bob Oatley AC, who sadly passed away on 10 January this year. In the time remaining tonight I cannot do him justice, but I will do my best.

We are talking about a remarkable Australian who did so much to promote his beloved Hamilton Island. Bob fell in love with the place when he first sailed past in 1983. Twenty years later, he bought it. He drove big projects such as Qualia, the golf club, the yacht club and Audi Hamilton Island Race Week, and at one stage he even contemplated challenging for the America's Cup. From the cocoa and coffee plantations of Papua New Guinea to the vineyards of the Hunter Valley, from thoroughbred racing to yacht racing, Bob did it all. Of course, he loved sailing. Who can forget his eight victories with *Wild Oats XI* in the Sydney to Hobart yacht race?

To wife Val and the rest of the family, please be assured that we were all saddened to hear of Bob's passing, but I have no doubt that his spirit is still right around Hammo. Vale, Bob Oatley.

Logan Community Hubs


 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (3.02 am): Migrant and refugee families are some of the most marginalised and vulnerable people in our state. The electorate of Woodridge is one of the most diverse and multicultural in all of Australia and many vulnerable people and families live there. That is why I was delighted to announce that the Palaszczuk Labor government, through the Department of Health, will provide \$500,000 for the Logan Community Hubs program. The hubs work with migrant and refugee women and preschool children, offering services such as skills training, English classes, sewing and breakfast clubs, as well as volunteering opportunities and community events.

In Queensland, community hubs are delivered through a partnership between Access Community Services and the Scanlon Foundation, with Access Community Services delivering the service and the Scanlon Foundation backing them financially. I thank the Scanlon Foundation and Peter Scanlon, one of Australia's leading philanthropists, for their support. Currently there are five community hubs operating in Logan, and another one will open next week. Support from the Palaszczuk government will enable Access Community Services to improve front-line support services to migrant and refugee families. It will allow them to strengthen mental and physical health programs, including maternal and children's health.

I specifically mention some of the people from schools that have actively supported hubs in the electorate of Woodridge and nearby electorates. They include Garry Molloy, Pat Dore and Briony Hadfield from Woodridge State School; Muriel Collings, Elizabeth Hancock, Naomi Mills and Deanne Boddy from Woodridge North State School; Karen Brown, Lynne Kendall and Kerry Hirini from Mabel Park State School; Celestine Boundy, Jon Sorohan and Michelle Sorohan from St Pauls Catholic Primary School Woodridge; Patricia Kennedy, Rob Canning and Tammie Usher from St Francis College Crestmead; and Brad Roberts, Sam Symes and Marlo Bronsi from Regents Park State School. I would also like to thank Etienne Roux, Monica Rivas and Grainne Taia from Access Community Services.

Sometimes, language and cultural differences can mean that some people do not access services, even when they or their family members are desperately in need of help. Without programs like the Logan Community Hubs, there is a real risk that needy members of the community will not receive the support they need. We want our migrant and refugee families to feel as if they are an integral part of the Logan community, to feel welcomed, supported and fully included. Because of the focus and innovative thinking of organisations such as Access Community Services and the Scanlon Foundation, now partnered with government, community based programs such as this one are helping us do just that.

Dickfos, Mr K; Cricket

 **Mr PERRETT** (Gympie—LNP) (3.04 am): When it comes to cricket, Gympie local Kaden Dickfos is described as having the Midas touch. Mythological Greek King Midas was famous for being able to turn ordinary objects into gold, and that is one of the skills that Kaden brings to cricket every time he takes the field. That is a fitting description for such a talented all-rounder, as Gympie is proud of its association with all things gold.

At the beginning of this month Kaden was awarded Queensland Country Cricketer of the Year. In the 2015-16 season he won a premiership, he represented Queensland and he represented Australia. He was able to achieve this with the wonderful support of his family, especially his mother, Leanne; father, Lindsay; and siblings, Brent, Ebony and Taleah. As a cricket tragic myself, I was privileged to be among the crowd, including cricketing greats such as Usman Khawaja, Ian Healy and Joe Burns, that recognised Kaden's achievements as the best country cricketer in Queensland. As a co-chair of the Parliamentary Friends of Cricket, it was a great way to celebrate the talent that is found in regional areas.


More than 230,000 Queenslanders are now playing cricket. They are scattered throughout the 339 clubs that hold 1,554 matches each week. Across ovals throughout the state they include 24,560 junior players and 16,450 senior players who every weekend are seen wearing their team colours. Queensland cricket players are found in varied teams as members of junior teams, senior teams, senior players, indoor cricket teams, as Indigenous and female players, as young kids having a go and learning new skills, and in primary and secondary school cricket competitions. In the Wide Bay region, which includes the Gympie electorate, there are more than 11,000 participants, with more than 8,300 playing in schools. It is truly a remarkable and universal sport, as it can be played throughout all the regions of Queensland.

Cricket is still seen as the game families play on Christmas Day, at the beach or in the backyard. All you need is enthusiasm, a ball, a bat, some improvised wickets and it is game on. To me, the sound of summer is the sound of the first test on the radio, which means that summer has officially started. Cricket is about great memories and friendships. Growing up in Kingaroy, that summer sound included the distinctive voices of cricket commentators such as Richie Benaud, Bill Lawry, Tony Greig, Kerry O'Keefe and Alan McGilvray.

An honourable member interjected.

Mr PERRETT: Absolutely. I have memories of playing with and against our neighbour Matt Hayden and his brother Gary, and of friendships formed with the parents of Australian women's cricketer Holly Ferling. With players such as Kaden Dickfos, I can only be excited about the future of cricket in this state, especially throughout regional Queensland.

Northern Australian Infrastructure Facility

 **Mrs LAUGA** (Keppel—ALP) (3.07 am): If the Prime Minister of Australia calls an extraordinary sitting of the federal parliament for matters of national importance, which will cost millions of dollars of taxpayers' money, the public expects a productive sitting of the parliament. When it is a waste of time and money, it leaves taxpayers rightfully very angry. This week, Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull forced Australian taxpayers to fork out the incredible cost of flights to Canberra so that all 226 parliamentarians could attend an extraordinary sitting of parliament, yet the Turnbull government failed to recognise funding for infrastructure in Northern Australia as a matter of national importance and pass the Northern Australian Infrastructure Facility Bill.

From 1 July 2016, projects in Central Queensland, such as the Great Keppel Island Revitalisation Plan, could have applied for a slice of the \$5 billion worth of Northern Australia infrastructure funding. The commencement date of the scheme is now up in the air, because the Turnbull government has failed to prioritise the bill.


Last year, Rockhampton based senator and Minister for Northern Australia Matthew Canavan promised that 'the government expects that the NAIF will be available from 1 July 2016', but that is now in jeopardy. The legislation passed the lower house and proceeded to the Senate, which has now risen and will not return until budget week next month. We are now effectively in a federal election campaign without the government even passing the very legislation it needed to establish its big-ticket item for Northern Australia, the NAIF. This is insulting.

The absolute disregard for our region is now beyond words. Malcom Turnbull clearly does not think that Northern Australia is a priority, and Senator Canavan and the member for Capricornia, Michelle Landry, have proven that they have no influence in their own government. Two and a half years after the federal government was elected, Central Queensland is still waiting for something positive to materialise. Mrs Landry and Senator Canavan have been spruiking their grand plans for the north, but time and time again they fail to back it up with anything tangible.

I call on the Turnbull government to bring on the debate on the NAIF Bill on 2 May so that it can be passed. The Turnbull government owes it to the people of the Keppel electorate and Northern Australia to ensure this bill is passed. I again call on our elected federal representatives to stump up

and finally do something—anything—for Central Queensland. All the federal government has achieved is to jam the handbrake on NAIF support for the essential infrastructure that we need to create jobs for mums and dads in Central Queensland who are already doing it tough.

Pacific Pines, Police Resources

 **Mr CRAMP** (Gaven—LNP) (3.10 am): The Gaven electorate is a great place to live, and I believe that we can make it even better. As a community representative, every day I work hard to ensure my community remains a safe and positive environment. Adequate policing has always been at the forefront of my efforts in ensuring community safety. At the last election I championed for more police on the beat. Along with all my fellow locals, I considered community safety to be the most important issue then and I continue to consider that to be the case now. In fact, whenever I attend a local community event in my electorate, it is one of the first things that my fellow locals raise with me.


Since the decision under this Labor government to close the Pacific Pines police beat on weekends, I have been working to have it rostered seven days a week. That has included writing letters to the minister, asking questions on notice in parliament and presenting a parliamentary e-petition and paper petition. I have to say that over these past few months, when doorknocking the communities of Pacific Pines, Park Lake and Maudsland, it has been fantastic to receive such overwhelming support for the petition. I would like to give special thanks to Richard and Geraldine Wright from Pacific Pines, who took up my call for volunteers to walk the streets with me to gain signatures. I am sincerely grateful for the efforts of these two amazing people.

Although at the last state election Labor supported a police station for Pacific Pines, in government it appears to have backflipped on its support. In a question on notice dated 16 March 2016, the Minister for Police, Bill Byrne, declined to support a regular seven-day roster at the Pacific Pines police beat and referred the allocation of police resources to the Queensland police. However, in media reports last week, the police highlighted the need for additional police resources across growth areas on the northern Gold Coast. Police Superintendent Craig Hanlon said that the police were looking at all options. It is a bit ironic that the minister has palmed this issue off to the Police Service when police officers themselves are the ones who are calling for more resources.

However, what is clear is the overwhelming positive response to the petition in addition to the recent media comments by Superintendent Hanlon to justify the need to boost police numbers within Pacific Pines, Park Lake and Maudsland. Therefore, I now step up my campaign for increased police resources in the Gaven electorate by pushing for a dedicated patrols hub to be located at Pacific Pines. The patrols hub model will increase police numbers in comparison to the existing police beat and provide for extended rostered hours. The hub will deliver officers directly to areas of need and keep them mobile throughout their shift, allowing them to spend more time on the front line.

I want to ensure that Pacific Pines is considered for a patrols hub similar to the model that was introduced by the former LNP government. I am in the early stages of preparing a business case for consideration of this police hub as I continue my efforts to address the concerns of local residents.

Bundamba Electorate, Tree Clearing

 **Mrs JR MILLER** (Bundamba—ALP) (3.13 am): A matter of great concern to residents in my area is urban tree clearing for development. It is an issue that is raised with me every day, and today I have received concerns from Jan of Augustine Heights and other people as well.

Urban development of a large part of my community, going from Springfield through to Augustine Heights, Bellbird Park, Collingwood, Redbank Plains and also through to the new Ripley Valley, has been characterised by large-scale tree clearing reminiscent of Bjelke-Petersen's D9 dozers, because they go through with enormous chains and they destroy everything. They destroy all the trees. Developers have cut swathes through my area, including the bushland that is home to many species of native animals. These developers approach urban development with a scorched-earth policy of removing every tree—every single one—leaving a moonscape type of environment devoid of life, shade or any character. In other words, it is just dirt and dust.

Our native bushland surrounding urban areas is just as important as it is in regional and rural Queensland. It sustains life and it produces oxygen while consuming carbon emissions. It helps with rainfall runoff and it also cools and shades. Vegetation management to stop tree clearing is not only important in rural and regional areas; it is important to my area as well. Yet developers get away scot-free with moonscaping the environment.

It is clear to me that the current tree-clearing and planning legislation does not carry enough weight to stop poor town planning practices and scorched-earth development occurring. We need to embrace development that is smart, that is innovative and that is respectful of the environment upon which it is encroaching. As legislators, we must think ahead for future generations and what we leave them. Why does every single tree need to be knocked down? Why can some trees, or a few trees, not be left in these housing developments? Leaving urban development solely to developers and councils simply is not working. The state must enact legislation to protect and guide future developments that work.

I first raised this issue in the parliament in 2004 and since then little has changed, except for the pace of development, leaving even larger areas without shade and protection. Today I call on this government to commit to stopping this scorched-earth tree-clearing vandalism as soon as possible. It is hypocritical to have one rule for farmers and graziers in regional Queensland and no decent rules protecting tree clearing in urban development in South-East Queensland.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 3.16 am (Friday).

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, Palaszcuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Perrett, Pitt, Powell, Power, Pyne, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Seeney, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Trad, Walker, Watts, Weir, Wellington, Whiting, Williams