ISSN 1322-0330

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

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

FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT

Wednesday, 22 March 2017

PW WELLINGTON
SPEAKER

NJ LAURIE
CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENT

LJ OSMOND
CHIEF HANSARD REPORTER

WEDNESDAY, 22 MARCH 2017

The Legislative Assembly met at 2.00 pm.

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

PRIVILEGE

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

Mr SPEAKER: On 2 December 2016 the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services and member for Morayfield wrote to me alleging that the Leader of the Opposition deliberately misled the House in making two statements contained in a document he tabled on 1 December 2016 as part of the Leader of the Opposition's private member's statement. On the evidence before me, I considered that the Leader of the Opposition has made an adequate explanation for the basis for his two statements, which on the face of it do not appear to be factually incorrect or misleading. Therefore, I have decided that the matter does not warrant the further attention of the House via the Ethics Committee and I will not be referring the matter. I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

Tabled paper: Correspondence from the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services, Hon. Mark Ryan, and the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Tim Nicholls MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding alleged misleading of the House [468].

I seek leave to incorporate the ruling.

Leave granted.

SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED DELIBERATELY MISLEADING THE HOUSE

MR SPEAKER: Honourable Members,

On 2 December 2016, the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services, Minister for Corrective Services and Member for Morayfield wrote to me alleging that the Leader of the Opposition deliberately misled the House in making two statements contained in a document he tabled on 1 December 2016, as part of the Leader of the Opposition's Private Members' Statement.

The first statement was:

> … failed to hire enough staff for the police department …

The second statement was:

> … mismanagement of the police budget has failed to provide officers with enough cars forcing them to catch the bus or ride bicycles to perform duties …

In his letter to me, the Minister stated that the Leader of the Opposition's first statement was deliberately misleading because the Palaszczuk Government has delivered an additional 266 police officers since the 2015 election, which are in addition to the number of Police provided under the previous LNP Government.

The Minister contended the second statement was misleading because the use of bicycles is an operational strategy and is not intended to replace the use of vehicles, and decisions about placement of police numbers and the allocation of police resources are operational decisions that should be made by police, not politicians.

I sought further information from the Leader of the Opposition about the allegations made against him, in accordance with Standing Order 269(5).

The Leader of the Opposition disputed the allegation made against him, and advised that his first statement was based on the difference between the budgeted and actual FTE positions filled in the Queensland Police Service and the 11% reduction in the number of FTE positions between the March and June 2016 quarters.

The Leader of the Opposition also explained that his second statement was based on comments made by the Acting President of the Queensland Police Union in an article in The Courier Mail, dated 9 June 2016, titled 'Police car shortage forces officers to catch trains, buses during shifts'.

Standing Order 269(4) requires:

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

On the evidence before me, I considered that the Leader of the Opposition has made an adequate explanation for the basis for his two statements, which on the face of it do not appear to be factually incorrect or misleading.

I have therefore 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.

PRIVILEGE

Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by a Member and Alleged Contravention of the Parliament's Terms and Conditions of Broadcast

Mr SPEAKER: On 22 December 2016 the Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Sport and member for Springwood wrote to me alleging that the Leader of the Opposition deliberately misled the House in making four statements and including a newspaper clipping in a document he tabled on 1 December 2016 as part of the Leader of the Opposition's private member's statement. The minister also alleged the same document tabled on 1 December 2016 included an image of the minister from the broadcast of proceedings which breaches the terms and conditions of access. On the evidence before me, I considered that the Leader of the Opposition has made an adequate explanation in relation to all statements and the inclusion of the newspaper clipping and that there is no evidence that the statements were incorrect or misleading or that he knew they were misleading.

I have also decided that the allegation concerning the use of the minister's image from the broadcast of proceedings in contravention of the terms and conditions, whilst a technical breach, be considered as incidental to another matter the subject of an apology and which I have already decided not to refer to the committee. Therefore, I have decided 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: Correspondence from the Minister for Housing and Public Works, Hon. de Brenni, and the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Tim Nicholls MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding alleged misleading of the House and an alleged contravention of the Parliament's terms and conditions of broadcasting rules [469].

I seek leave to incorporate the ruling.

Leave granted.

SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED DELIBERATELY MISLEADING THE HOUSE AND ALLEGED CONTRAVENTION OF THE PARLIAMENT'S TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF BROADCAST

MR SPEAKER: Honourable Members,

On 22 December 2016, the Minister for Housing and Public Works and Member for Springwood wrote to me alleging that the Leader of the Opposition deliberately misled the House in making four statements and including a newspaper clipping in a document he tabled on 1 December 2016, as part of the Leader of the Opposition's Private Member's Statement.

The statements were:

> Ripped-up the $800 million Logan Housing Renewal Initiative—denying Logan residents 2600 new public housing, affordable homes;
>
> In scrapping the Logan Initiative the Minister bowed to union pressure while 1090 people on the housing wait-list in the Logan council area go without—with 620 of these having waited more than one year;
>
> Scrapped the use of Non-Government Organisations and community groups to manage social housing—creating employment uncertainty for those employed in the sector; and
>
> Cancelled the LNP's successful 'three strikes policy' to tackle anti-social behaviour and curb illegal activity in = more damage and higher costs.

The newspaper clipping was titled 'De Brenni should step down', and appeared in The Courier Mail on 23 April 2016.

The Minister also alleged the same document tabled on 1 December 2016 included an image of the Minister from the Broadcast of Proceedings which breaches the Terms and Conditions of Access.

In his letter to me, the Minister stated that the Leader of the Opposition deliberately misled the House with each statement and by including the newspaper clipping, and is therefore in contempt of the Parliament through his breach of Standing Order 266 of the Standing Rules and Orders of the Legislative Assembly. The Minister also advised that the Leader of the Opposition has breached the Terms and Conditions of Access to the broadcast of proceedings by including a photo of the Minister from a broadcast of proceedings in the document.

I sought further information from the Leader of the Opposition about the allegations made against him, in accordance with Standing Order 269(5).

The Leader of the Opposition refuted the claim, and argued that the Minister's allegations were political debate and did not provide evidence that his statements were incorrect or misleading. The Leader of the Opposition also advised that he had already addressed the allegation regarding contravention of the Terms and Conditions of Access of the broadcast of proceedings in relation to the matter of privilege raised by the Leader of the House.

Standing Order 269(4) requires:

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

On the evidence before me, I considered that the Leader of the Opposition has made an adequate explanation in relation to all statements and the inclusion of the newspaper clipping, and that there is no evidence that the statements were incorrect or misleading or that he knew they were misleading.

I have also decided that the allegation concerning the use of the Minister's image from the broadcast of proceedings in contravention of the Terms and Conditions be considered under another submission from the Leader of the House regarding the same matter and I will rule on that matter in due course.

I have therefore decided that these matters do 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.

PRIVILEGE

Speaker's Ruling, Answers to Questions on Notice

Mr SPEAKER: I have received correspondence from the member for Hinchinbrook regarding three separate questions on notice to the Premier and Minister for the Arts. I note that the member for Hinchinbrook's questions ask for information from multiple agencies over five financial years. In my view, the questions, while technically in order, may require unreasonable resources to fully respond.

The Premier's response to the questions was that it would be neither practicable nor reasonable to divert resources to identify the information requested over the years concerned. Where a question is asked that is broad in terms of its scope or it seeks information over a number of years, I am comfortable with the responsible minister making some effort to attempt to answer the question, even if the answer is for a shorter period or smaller scope than that requested in the question. I therefore find the questions remain unanswered. I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

Tabled paper: Correspondence from the member for Hinchinbrook, Mr Andrew Cripps MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding answers by the Premier to questions on notice [470].

I seek leave to incorporate the ruling.

Leave granted.

SPEAKER'S RULING—ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

MR SPEAKER: Honourable members,

In one of my first statements to this House as Speaker on 27 March 2015 I set out my undertakings and expectations as to how this parliament would be presided over. I did undertake to use my best endeavours to ensure ministers answered questions put to them.

I have received correspondence from the Member for Hinchinbrook regarding three separate questions on notice to the Premier and Minister for the Arts—questions 2197, 2254 and 2332. The questions are in relation to a related matter of public expenditure across a number of government, public, corporate and statutory entities over five financial years.

Standing order 114(5) places an obligation on the relevant minister to answer the question by supplying a copy of the answer to the Table Office within 30 calendar days.

I note that there is no basis in standing orders for a minister to refuse to answer a question under standing order 114 by stating that the compilation of the answer is resource intensive. In respect of questions on notice prior to estimates hearings standing order 182(6) provides the minister may refuse to answer questions which place unreasonable research requirements on their portfolios or are unnecessarily complex. But this standing order has never been held to apply to standing order 114 and the principle inherent never applied to questions on notice under standing order 114. (Although I concede it may have been stated by Ministers in the past.)

Indeed, the purpose of putting questions on notice is to seek a detailed response that would not otherwise be practical for the minister to answer in a question without notice. Hence the 30 day period for responding.

That being said, I note that the Member for Hinchinbrook's questions ask for information from multiple agencies over five financial years from one Minister. In my view the questions, whilst technically in order, may require unreasonable resources to fully respond.

I note the Premier has not answered Questions on Notice 2197, 2254 and 2332 other than to advise that it would be neither practicable nor reasonable to divert resources to identify the information requested over the years concerned. While I do not assess the quality of answers it appears that no attempt has been made to answer the questions in any way.

Where a question is asked that is broad in terms of its scope or it seeks information over a number of years, I am comfortable with the responsible Minister making an attempt to answer the question. But the Minister should attempt to answer the question.

If a Member is dissatisfied with the response, the member can always ask further questions of that Minister or other Ministers.

All three questions remain unanswered.

PRIVILEGE

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

Mr SPEAKER: On 2 March 2017 the Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply wrote to me alleging that the member for Callide deliberately misled the House when rising on a matter of privilege suddenly arising on 2 March 2017. On the evidence before me, I considered that the statement made by the member for Callide was not misleading as it appears to have been a statement of opinion or observation and not a statement of fact. Therefore, I have decided that the matter does not warrant the further attention of the House via the Ethics Committee and I will not be referring the matter. I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

Tabled paper: Correspondence from the Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply, Hon. Mark Bailey, and the Member for Callide, Mr Jeff Seeney MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an alleged misleading of the House [471].

I seek leave to incorporate the ruling.

Leave granted.

SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED DELIBERATELY MISLEADING THE HOUSE

MR SPEAKER: Honourable Members,

On 2 March 2017, the Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply wrote to me alleging that the Member for Callide deliberately misled the House when rising on a matter of privilege suddenly arising on 2 March 2017.

When raising his matter of privilege, the Member for Callide stated:

> It is a serious matter. It concerns the Minister for Energy, who has apparently tweeted a number of documents during question time. One of those documents appears to be a proceeding of a parliamentary committee. I am sure that all members are aware of the confidentiality requirements under standing order 211 regarding parliamentary committees. I will table this document, because it is already in the public domain, even though I am hesitant to do that. I will table it because the Minister for Energy has made it public.

In his letter to me, the Minister stated the document referred to by the Member for Callide was an email made public by Mr Michael Crandon MP, the then Deputy Chair of the Legal and Community Safety Committee on 10 November 2016, when he tabled the document during his contribution to the debate on the Serious and Organised Crime Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. The Minister also advised the Member for Callide appeared to have been present in the House on the date the document was tabled by Mr Crandon.

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

The Member for Callide advised that he believed everything he said in the House in relation to this issue to be true when he said it. He also advised that he believed then and still believes it was a valid issue to raise given that the Minister was tweeting documents in response to questions from the Opposition during Question Time.

Standing Order 269(4) requires:

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

On the evidence before me, I considered that the statement made by the Member for Callide was not misleading, as it appears to have been a statement of opinion or observation, and not a statement of fact.

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

However, I would like to remind members that if you are making an allegation against another member, or you are responding to an allegation of deliberately misleading the House, you must address each of the elements of the alleged contempt. It is incumbent on both the complainant and the subject member to provide any evidence to support their claim.

I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

PETITION

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

Charters Towers, Dialysis Treatment

Mr Knuth, from 642 petitioners, requesting the House to take immediate action to provide appropriate dialysis treatment in the public health system in Charters Towers enabling patients with dialysis needs to access this service without travelling gruelling distances [472].

Petition received.

TABLED PAPERS

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

MEMBERS' PAPERS

The following members' papers were tabled by the Clerk—

Member for Hervey Bay (Mr Sorensen)—

473 Nonconforming petition regarding additional parking at Yarrilee State School

Member for Mount Isa (Mr Katter)—

474 Nonconforming petition regarding the Charters Towers regional health centre

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

School Group Tour

Mr SPEAKER: I am informed that we have students and teachers from the Star of the Sea Catholic Primary School Hervey Bay observing our proceedings in the gallery. Welcome.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Gold Coast Commonwealth Games, Queen's Baton Relay

Hon. A PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (2.06 pm): The final countdown to the Gold Coast Commonwealth Games is underway. The Queen's Baton Relay has started its journey from Buckingham Palace to the Gold Coast after Her Majesty sent it on its way. The shadow minister for the Commonwealth Games, John-Paul Langbroek, joined me at the events in London. I am grateful for the bipartisan show of support, and what lovely company as well.

Gold Coast Mayor Tom Tate and I were on hand for the ceremony that has brought the spotlight firmly towards the Gold Coast. I would also like to thank Paralympic champion and Gold Coast Commonwealth Games 2018 ambassador Kurt Fearnley and legendary Queenslander, Olympic and Commonwealth gold medallist Anna Meares from Rockhampton for their involvement.

In a first for the Commonwealth Games, representatives of the Yugambeh people, traditional owners of the land where the Commonwealth Games will be held, delivered an invitation to all first nation peoples of the Commonwealth to join the celebrations on the Gold Coast in April 2018. Since leaving London last week, the Queen's baton has travelled to Sierra Leone, Ghana and Rwanda in Africa. The baton will reach Australian shores on Christmas Day for the final 100-day journey through every state and territory before arriving on the Gold Coast on 4 April next year.

The Gold Coast 2018 Commonwealth Games will be the biggest event to be held in Australia this decade. They will be the biggest event ever staged in Queensland history. We know the Gold Coast is already the most popular Western destination for Chinese tourists, and the fourth most popular for them anywhere in the world. In a fortnight's time my cabinet will govern from the Gold Coast as we mark one year until the games begin.

The Commonwealth Games will also be a great chance for Queensland to showcase its greatest asset—our people. I am pleased to advise the House that more than 47,000 people have registered to be volunteers, with 70 per cent of the applicants coming from Queensland. Applicants come from all walks of life, experiences and ages. It is wonderful to see young people putting up their hands to be part of this incredible event.

I am advised that 22 per cent of the applicants are under 25 and at the other end of the spectrum we have 78 applicants over 81. Isn't that great news! For those who are lucky enough to become volunteers of the games this will be an experience of a lifetime. The games will inject billions into Queensland's economy and support up to 30,000 jobs. This is truly a once in a lifetime opportunity for Queensland and the Gold Coast and I urge everyone to get on board.

State Schools, Infrastructure

Hon. A PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (2.09 pm): Today I have a great news for Queensland because Queensland is a great state—a great state.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, members. They are excited, Premier. They want to hear.

Ms PALASZCZUK: They are. They will when I mention this! We have already invested in more teachers and better facilities right across the state as we continue to rebuild our front-line services and deliver educational opportunities for Queensland communities right across our state. Schools are the hub of many communities where local groups meet and children's learning is celebrated, with school halls playing a central role.

Earlier this morning I joined the Minister for Education at Mansfield State High School, a great high school, to announce that we will bring forward $200 million in capital investment to fast-track school infrastructure in communities across Queensland. The Advancing Queensland Schools program includes 98 school infrastructure projects, with the construction and improvement of school halls a priority. We are investing this funding into projects to get construction underway in schools across Queensland, with an additional $45 million to be set aside for land acquisitions for new schools in growth areas across our state. This funding has been brought forward because we want to deliver this infrastructure for schools sooner and we want to see the 500 jobs that it will generate delivered sooner.

The member for Mansfield will be so pleased to hear that $6 million will be invested in his community for a new hall at Mansfield State High School.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: There is a lot of enthusiasm here.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I know. The member for Keppel will be pleased to hear that Yeppoon State High School is receiving $1.5 million to upgrade its existing hall. The member for Mackay will be pleased to hear that Mackay West State School is receiving $1 million to refurbish junior classrooms. The member for Maryborough will be pleased to hear that Maryborough State High School is receiving $4.5 million to demolish the existing multipurpose block and build a new one. The member for Nanango will be pleased to hear that we are delivering $4.5 million for a new hall at the Kingaroy State High School. Minister, perhaps you should go out there.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: There is a lot of love. The member for Thuringowa will be pleased to hear that Kirwan State High School is receiving $6 million for a new hall. The member for Thuringowa, the Minister for Education and I visited that school firsthand when we were governing from Townsville. As a direct result of governing from Townsville, this money is being put in to fix that hall for the local school. The member for Toowoomba North will be pleased to hear that the Wilsonton State High School—

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Do you want to hear it?

Mr SPEAKER: We are excited, Premier.

Ms PALASZCZUK: We are.

Mr Watts interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: You will have a chance later on this afternoon, member for Toowoomba North, to talk about it.

Ms PALASZCZUK: There is $4.5 million for a new hall. Well done, Minister for Education. This government is committed to education, unlike the former government that wanted to close schools. That is right. That is the legacy. We all remember that—

Ms Trad: And sell them.

Ms PALASZCZUK: And sell them off. Mr Speaker, I have more good news—just you wait. The member for Barron River will be pleased to hear that Caravonica State School will receive $4.5 million for a new hall. The list goes on. We are delivering. My government is delivering education in this state. It is a hallmark of my government and we will continue to deliver and we will continue to create jobs.

State Schools, Infrastructure

Hon. KJ JONES (Ashgrove—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism, Major Events and the Commonwealth Games) (2.13 pm): It has been a busy day, Mr Speaker—a very busy day in Queensland. The Palaszczuk government is delivering on our commitment to improve education for every student in every Queensland school no matter where they live. I was pleased to visit Mansfield State High School with the Premier today to announce our $200 million Advancing Queensland Schools infrastructure program. As the Premier said, this accelerated works program will fast-track close to 100 state school infrastructure projects right across Queensland. We are bringing forward more than $100 million to start construction on 30 new and upgraded school halls across Queensland. We all know firsthand how meaningful these projects—

An opposition member interjected.

Ms JONES: You would knock Christmas; I take the interjection. I have had principals crying on the phone to me—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: All right. Thank you, members.

Ms JONES:—crying with joy because they are finally getting the school hall that they deserve, and it is a Palaszczuk Labor government that will deliver it.

On that note this morning I spoke to the Wilsonton State High School principal, Marcus Jones, who is over the moon that his school will now receive up to $5 million for a brand-new school hall. That is right. You promised it, but you did not put the money in the budget and we are delivering it. I also spoke to the Cleveland District State High School principal, Paul Bancroft, who was thrilled to hear that our government will deliver $6 million for a new hall.

An honourable member interjected.

Ms JONES: It was not even top 10; I take that interjection. We will also build a $3 million hall at Balmoral State High School in the member for Bulimba's electorate. I know that she has advocated for this for a long time and I have been to that school as well. Bounty Boulevard State School will receive $5 million for a new hall. I know that the member for Murrumba has not let up on me really since the day he was elected. We are very proud to deliver this as well.

This project will also accelerate $25 million in capital renewal projects at 24 schools. Ten schools will have their special education facilities upgraded at a cost of $12 million. Nine schools will have administrative upgrades, to the value of $5.3 million. A further $5 million will go towards shade structures and covered outdoor learning areas at an additional 25 schools across Queensland. We want this work to get underway so we can create and support more than 500 jobs across Queensland.

Police BombCat

Hon. MT RYAN (Morayfield—ALP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services) (2.17 pm): Mr Speaker, you will be pleased to hear that there is more good news for Queensland. Today I am very pleased to announce a new resource for our Queensland Police Service officers—the first ever BombCat. The BombCat will be housed with the Explosive Ordnance Response Team and will be able to assist our police negotiators and special emergency response team during high-risk incidents. The Palaszczuk government has made a commitment to make sure that our police right across Queensland, including our specialist units, have the resources that they need to help keep our community safe and ensure that our front-line police officers are safe. We are continuing to deliver on that commitment.

This $600,000 investment means that Queensland now has an armed vehicle that uses advanced ballistic and blast protection and allows the safe deployment of specialist staff at high-risk job locations including tasks where explosive devices, as well as firearms, are present. The Queensland police currently has two armoured vehicles known as BearCats. However, the new BombCat is the big brother to our existing BearCats—it is bigger, stronger and will offer our police an added level of protection.

This is what our government does. We do not just talk the talk. We listen, we commit and we deliver. When our police asked for body worn cameras, we delivered. When our police asked for additional technology that would allow them to be more mobile in our communities, we delivered. When our police asked for stronger, better, more comprehensive laws to deal with serious organised crime—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr RYAN: They do not like me saying it—we delivered. Our police men and women do an outstanding job each and every day right across Queensland. I will continue to support the rollout of the resources to our front-line police officers so that they can do their job of keeping Queenslanders safe.

AFL Women's, Grand Final; Cross River Rail

Hon. JA TRAD (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning) (2.19 pm): On Saturday Queensland will make history with the inaugural women's AFL grand final. It is also the first-ever AFL grand final held outside of Victoria, and we are determined to show Victorians how it is done. We will be providing free public transport across the South-East Queensland network from first service to last service on Saturday.

Not only is it the women's grand final; it is a super Saturday of sport, with four football matches across three different codes held at Metricon, Cbus and Suncorp Stadium. We want to assure sporting fans and families that, just like the other three major games, they will be able to travel for free to and from this historic match on the Gold Coast. TransLink has been working with Stadiums Queensland, Queensland Rail, Surfside Buslines and Metricon Stadium on a transport plan for the grand final which will include extra services and shuttle buses. I encourage all Queenslanders—as the Premier, the Minister for Sport and the Minister for Women already have—to get on board, plan their journey and travel by train, light rail, bus or ferry to get behind the Lions in their history-making efforts to become the first premiership team of the women's AFL.

Cross River Rail is Labor's No. 1 infrastructure priority for the South-East Queensland corner. By removing the bottleneck across the Brisbane River, it will get people home faster, reduce congestion and create thousands of jobs. The Queensland government is taking a collaborative relationship with our federal and local government colleagues, and we are working hard to secure federal government funding for the project. We are pleased that Brisbane City Council has announced more detail on its plan for a new Brisbane metro. This new plan complements Cross River Rail, and we welcome the changes and look forward to working with council going forward. Together these projects will deliver more jobs and better public transport right across South-East Queensland.

The federal government has said that it wants to understand how these two transformational projects will work together. Last week I met with the federal Minister for Urban Infrastructure, Mr Paul Fletcher, and the Assistant Minister for Cities and Digital Transformation, Mr Angus Taylor. We had a wideranging and productive discussion. I provided both ministers with a briefing on the major progress made on Cross River Rail since the middle of last year when they were provided with the updated business case. We also demonstrated the potential for Cross River Rail to create more connected communities and more vibrant urban spaces by delivering improved land use. The support of the federal government and their seat on the board of the delivery authority are essential to progressing Cross River Rail, and we have said that publicly often. We now need the federal government to go even further in their support for Cross River Rail and make sure there is an allocation in their upcoming federal budget.

Jobs

Hon. CW PITT (Mulgrave—ALP) (Treasurer and Minister for Trade and Investment) (2.22 pm): We are serious about job creation in Queensland and we are spending more than $40 billion on public infrastructure over the next four years including a $10.7 billion capital program for 2016-17 which will support 31,000 jobs. Contrary to the agenda of those with a vested interest in selling our prized state owned assets, the Queensland government has retained our assets and is doing the heavy lifting on infrastructure spending.

It is interesting when you compare total general government sector infrastructure spending between Queensland and New South Wales. Obviously there is going to be a difference given Queensland's population is around 4.8 million people and New South Wales is around 7.5 million people. It is more appropriate to compare infrastructure spending on a per capita basis. The latest budget projections including the midyear updates show that Queensland in 2019-20 will spend

approximately $1,177 per person on infrastructure in the general government sector. That is more per capita than every other state—$170 per capita more than New South Wales and almost double Western Australia. That is a sustainable pipeline of infrastructure.

The Palaszczuk government is getting on with the job of creating jobs and growing our economy. The Premier and Minister for Education announced today that we will bring forward $200 million in capital investment to fast-track state school infrastructure throughout Queensland. The Advancing Queensland Schools program will deliver for families with a works program including 98 school infrastructure projects with the construction and improvement of school halls a priority.

I also welcome Shell Australia's announcement yesterday that its QGC joint venture was investing in Queensland with Project Ruby, which is set to expand QGC's operations in the Surat Basin. Project Ruby will underpin 350 new and existing jobs in regional Queensland during the 16-month construction phase. We are either funding or backing large and regionally significant projects with economic benefits across the state including the $21.7 billion Carmichael mine, with the potential to generate up to 10,000 jobs; the $250 million North Queensland stadium, with 750 jobs generated; the $512 million Logan Motorway enhancement project, with 1,300 jobs generated; the $420 million Gold Coast Light Rail Stage 2, with 934 jobs generated; the $3 billion Queen's Wharf development with 2,000 construction jobs and 8,000 operational jobs generated; the $1.1 billion Herston quarter redevelopment and health precinct, with 700 jobs generated per year; $15 million towards Glencore's Mount Isa Mines smelter rebrick funded from the Jobs and Regional Growth Fund, with around 400 jobs saved. The State Infrastructure Fund also has commitments of $1.35 billion including $850 million towards the Cross River Rail project, $300 million for the Priority Economic Works and Productivity Program and $180 million for the Significant Regional Infrastructure Projects Program. Well done, Deputy Premier!

Queensland is moving forward. The latest Deloitte Access Economics' *Investment monitor* shows $152.2 billion worth of known projects in Queensland in the December quarter 2016. This ranks Queensland higher than New South Wales, with $132.2 billion in projects and $68.2 billion in Victoria. The Queensland government is growing the state economy, creating jobs and making sure Queensland remains a great place to live, work and raise a family.

National Close the Gap Day

Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (2.25 pm): Thursday, 16 March 2017 was National Close the Gap Day. To coincide with this, Queensland Health's *Closing the gap: performance report 2016* was released last week. This annual report monitors the progress in closing the life expectancy and child mortality gaps between Queensland's Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and non-Indigenous Queenslanders. The report shows that Queensland continues to make progress in improving health outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Queenslanders against a range of health measures, but much more needs to be done.

Between 2005 and 2012, Queensland Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander life expectancy increased by 1.6 years for males and 1.7 years for females. In the decade between 2005 and 2015, mortality rates decreased by 18.8 per cent for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children aged from birth to four years. These are welcome improvements but, sadly, are still below that of non-Indigenous Australians. That is why the Palaszczuk government has committed more than $200 million over three years from 2015-2018 to further reduce these gaps through services and programs aimed at improving the health and wellbeing of Indigenous Queenslanders.

This morning I was pleased to officially open the new Birthing in Our Community Mums and Bubs Hub in Salisbury. This service, a partnership involving the Institute for Urban Indigenous Health, the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Community Health Service Brisbane and Mater Health Services will help Indigenous women throughout their pregnancy. The hub will provide continuity of care through pregnancy, birth and labour care, up to six weeks postnatal care, birthing support, the Stop Smoking in its Tracks incentive program, perinatal mental health, breastfeeding support and family support services.

We know this program is getting results, which is why Queensland Health will provide $3 million over two years to support the clinic. Research shows 97.8 per cent of the women supported by the Birthing in Our Communities program had five or more antenatal visits and only four per cent have birthed at low baby weight. The new hub will see 200 women—double the number that are currently in the program. These are just some of the examples of the Palaszczuk government's commitment to

improving health care for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Queenslanders. While there is still a long way to go, by working in partnership with Indigenous Queenslanders we are making progress both in addressing health inequality and closing the gap in Queensland.

Torres Strait, Indigenous Land Tenure

Hon. AJ LYNHAM (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (2.28 pm): I am pleased to confirm that this government continues to offer support to Indigenous communities seeking to freehold land and provide its members the same opportunity for land ownership as the rest of the Queensland community. However, I want to make it crystal clear, as Labor did in opposition, that it must be the will of the community that drives this process.

My visit to the Torres Strait and Cape York last week listening to community leaders confirmed absolutely the importance of this in-community decision-making process. The leaders I listened to in different communities demonstrated the diversity of views on freeholding, and it was invaluable to have this firsthand insight into that diversity. At Poruma in the Torres Strait I had a very warm welcome from the community, particularly the teachers and students at the school, as well as the trustees. The trustees at Poruma can see positives in pursuing freeholding. I appreciated them taking the time to discuss what changes freehold land ownership may offer their community and how our government could help. My Department of Natural Resources and Mines continues to work closely with the Poruma trustees to further consider the process of making freehold title available on their island.

At Napranum on the cape, the trustees believe that freeholding is not right for their community at this point in time. I acknowledge and respect that call, as we all should. Over the past two years, seven Indigenous communities have been working with government agencies on the freeholding legislative framework. I would like to thank the communities of Cherbourg, Napranum, Mapoon, Hope Vale, Poruma, Hammond Island and St Pauls for participating in this exercise. My Department of Natural Resources and Mines is now considering the lessons learned over the past two years. This will assist in their work going forward to support those communities who may choose to investigate or indeed pursue making freehold title available. It is their choice and no-one else's.

Electricity Prices

Hon. MC BAILEY (Yeerongpilly—ALP) (Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply) (2.31 pm): The Palaszczuk government is always looking for ways to support low-income Queenslanders, to give a hand up with everyday living expenses. I am pleased to inform the House that electricity savings are coming for some of the community's most vulnerable electricity consumers right across Queensland.

The Palaszczuk government has invested an additional $170 million over four years to extend the electricity rebate to healthcare cardholders and asylum seekers. This will deliver a $330 deduction per year for 157,000 additional households to help them manage the costs of their electricity bills. Eligible households will be able to apply for the rebate from their electricity retailer from next week on 1 April 2017, with payments backdated to 1 January this year. I would encourage all members to do what they can to inform their constituents to contact their retailer about this rebate. For low-income earners, $330 will go a long way towards helping to make ends meet for single-parent families, for students, for the unemployed and for other low-income earners.

The Palaszczuk government is also trialling other ways to assist Queenslanders to reduce their bills. Public housing tenants in detached government owned houses will have access to benefits of rooftop solar power in a new trial. The trial will be undertaken in Woodridge, Rockhampton, Cairns and Lockhart River and collectively will deliver up to six megawatts of new solar PV on up to 4,000 new solar rooftops right across Queensland. Eligible tenants can purchase cheaper solar power from a solar PV system installed at the premises as well as from the grid. I thank the Minister for Housing and Public Works and the member for Springwood for working so closely with me on this great initiative.

In Cairns last week I launched our new Energy Savvy Families program with the member for Barron River. The Palaszczuk government is collaborating with Ergon, the Queensland Council of Social Service and CitySmart to deliver this program which will help regional families save on their electricity bills. Digital meters will be installed at no cost in 5,500 regional homes across Queensland—in Mareeba, Cairns, Townsville, Mount Isa, Charters Towers, Rockhampton, Hervey Bay, Bundaberg, Murgon and Toowoomba. Households will receive up-to-date usage information from their digital meter, with the Queensland Council of Social Service engaging locally based neighbourhood champions who will be on hand to help with additional education and advice. Participants will have access to online

resources to help monitor their electricity habits. Importantly, households taking part in this program will be able to pay their electricity bills in smaller, more manageable monthly amounts rather than receiving quarterly bills.

The Palaszczuk government has stabilised electricity prices for households after the 43 per cent increases inflicted by those opposite in their three years with their record majority. We will continue to stand up for ordinary Queenslanders and take real action on electricity prices.

World Science Festival Brisbane

Hon. LM ENOCH (Algester—ALP) (Minister for Innovation, Science and the Digital Economy and Minister for Small Business) (2.34 pm): It gives me great pleasure to update the House on the World Science Festival Brisbane which kicked off today. I was very pleased to be able to represent the Premier at the official launch this morning. Last year when the Palaszczuk government secured the exclusive rights to host World Science Festival Brisbane it was a major coupe as it was the first time the World Science Festival was held outside of New York. This year's festival, which is on until Sunday, builds on the momentum of the inaugural event, one that injected more than $5 million into the Queensland economy.

As science minister, I have already been involved in World Science Festival Brisbane regional program events in Gladstone and Toowoomba, and the excitement generated among the locals was absolutely incredible. The Palaszczuk government will continue to attract major drawcard events—such as the World Science Festival and our innovation and investment event, Myriad, the sequel to the 2016 Advance Queensland summit—because Queensland is where it is happening. With a range of free and ticketed events, the World Science Festival Brisbane has something for everyone. From A Live Presentation of *2001: A Space Odyssey* to the pairing of wine and music, taxidermy and of course Street Science, this five-day celebration of science will create a buzz in Queensland.

Science is everywhere and is happening all around us. From making a phone call to building a house, science forms part of everything that we do. The Palaszczuk government is committed to fostering the right environment for scientific research to thrive and be commercialised right here in Queensland through our $405 million whole-of-government Advance Queensland initiative. We are doing this because we know the kinds of jobs we require to meet the needs of our state in the future are going to need new skills in STEM—science, technology, engineering and maths. Encouraging our young people to pursue a career in STEM fields is a challenge that the Palaszczuk government is committed to tackling. The World Science Festival demonstrates to students, parents and everyone in the community how exciting and important science and STEM is to our future. That is what the festival is all about—an opportunity for people to get more involved with STEM and connect with great science and even greater scientists.

Crocodile Management

Hon. SJ MILES (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef) (2.36 pm): I would like to update the House that last night at 10 o'clock wildlife officers shot and killed the crocodile believed to be responsible for the death of Warren Hughes. In a joint operation with the Queensland police, EHP's wildlife officers found the aggressive four-metre crocodile at the mouth of the Russell River. I am sure I reflect the views of all members in expressing my condolences to the family and friends of Mr Hughes. I also want to thank our wildlife officers who responded quickly and professionally and who I think we can all agree do a very important and sometimes dangerous job.

Members will also be aware of another crocodile bite, this time not fatal, in Innisfail during the early hours of Sunday morning. Inevitably, these events lead to some calls for extreme responses. I can understand in moments of shock and grief why some people might think culling is a solution. As policymakers though, we need to be informed by the science. Crocodile expert Dr Matt Brien said on Monday—

> You can't remove a species that is cryptic, that is wary, that can travel hundreds of kilometres in a few days. The idea that you can do any form of culling and be successful in removing the species is just a fallacy.

This is why we must have a responsible crocodile management strategy for Queensland. Labor's program is based on thorough evidence based research that puts public safety first. Our government has bolstered the crocodile management program, made staff in Central and North Queensland permanent where they were only temporary under the LNP, invested an additional $5.8 million and funded a multiyear population study to make sure our management approach continues to be informed by the latest science.

Our approach in Cairns has seen more dangerous crocodiles removed than in any other year. Our single and comprehensive management plan makes it easier for the public to know exactly how crocodiles will be handled, no matter where they are in croc country. There is no evidence that any alternative crocodile management options, including culling, would have prevented either of the weekend's incidents from occurring. Sporadically culling would only lull people into believing an area is safer than it really is, and that will only increase the likelihood of another tragedy.

The truth is that there will always be crocodiles in croc country. The best way to ensure your safety is to obey warning signs, keep pets out of the water and never swim in known crocodile habitat. We will continue to work closely with local governments on crocodile management and will host another CrocWise roundtable in Cairns on 30 March.

COAL WORKERS' PNEUMOCONIOSIS SELECT COMMITTEE

Report

Mrs JR MILLER (Bundamba—ALP) (2.39 pm): I lay upon the table of the House report No. 1 of the Coal Workers' Pneumoconiosis Select Committee titled *Inquiry into the reidentification of coal workers' pneumoconiosis in Queensland—interim report*. This report exemplifies the human tragedy when public administration in Queensland is corrupted by illusion and false beliefs that black lung was eradicated in this state and by the deliberate underfunding and under-resourcing over more than 30 years. Men are dying because of this and we expect more men and women to be diagnosed with this preventable disease resulting in calamitous effects on their families: losing jobs, losing houses, moving towns and fighting to get even basic medical treatment. It is wrong on every level.

To the men and women of the deep, to the coal cutters in the pits of Queensland's mines who went to work to earn a living, not to die; to those miners who cut coal to keep our lights on and to provide the wealth that builds our hospitals, our schools, our roads and the wealth that pays the wages of doctors, nurses, police, teachers, public servants and many others, I say that we, our committee, will walk with you every step until the very end. I give you this undertaking because it is the right thing to do. We will right the wrongs and tell the truth no matter where it lands politically, administratively, medically or industrially. The cap lamps of the coal cutters have joined together to form the floodlight which is now shining in this inquiry. This light will never go out—ever—because men are dying and they will continue to die.

In tabling this report, I wish to advise that in accordance with standing order 65(4) I have given a notice of motion to the Clerk of the Parliament to extend the time for the final report and the terms of reference. I commend the report to the House. I would ask everyone in this House to support the notice of motion.

Tabled paper: Coal Workers' Pneumoconiosis Select Committee: Report No. 1—Inquiry into the re-identification of Coal Workers' Pneumoconiosis in Queensland—Interim report [467].

NOTICE OF MOTION

Energy Industry

Mr KATTER (Mount Isa—KAP) (2.42 pm): I give notice that I shall move—

That this House acknowledges the market failure in the gas market precipitating the loss of Queensland industry's competitive advantage from low-cost energy, and further support a gas reservation policy or similar legislative framework as a mechanism for restoring Queensland industry's competitive advantage particularly in processing and manufacturing.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Youth Crime

Mr WALKER (Mansfield—LNP) (2.42 pm): As I mentioned in the House yesterday, members from this side of the House were in Far North Queensland on the weekend and once again we heard from the people of Cairns, as we do whenever we travel to North Queensland and Far North Queensland, about the crisis in our justice system in that part of the state. What is clear is that Queensland is suffering in this area from a complete lack of leadership, and the fault lies with Labor. Crime and particularly youth crime issues in Townsville are still rampant. Despite the claims from the three Labor members that everything is rosy, the residents of Townsville are not fooled by the head-in-the-sand approach that is endemic with this government and the constant dithering on the issue from the Attorney-General.

Whenever there is an issue that is raised in public, off goes another review and another report and another do-nothing response. They are masters of the do-nothing, know-nothing approach to government. However, as is the case with everything, including this, the execution is always bungled. The problem is that nothing ever gets done and the problems only get worse. We saw reports in the *Townsville Bulletin* over the weekend about the alarming cost of damage caused by the constant disturbances at the Cleveland Youth Detention Centre. In case members missed it, let's go through the figures because they are a damning indictment on the Attorney-General's ability to deal with this issue.

In 2013 there were two incidents with damage costing $18,475 to fix; in 2014, 14 incidents with damage costing $34,177 to fix. Now we hear this: in 2015, 13 incidents with damage costing $171,169 to fix; in 2016, 11 incidents with damage costing $327,271 to fix. In fact, two riots alone caused $180,000 worth of damage. In 2017, as at 21 February, there had been five incidents—in the first six weeks of the year—with a damage bill of $13,728 already racked up.

Under Labor there was over $500,000 worth of damage during their time in government. There have been at least three reports and reviews into the issues in our youth detention centres, but what have we seen from those reviews? Nothing. There was a review in relation to maltreatment of the inmates—nothing. A review into the incidents—nothing; no reports released, no plan to fix the problem and no identification of the problem. There has been a complete lack of leadership or any clue as to what to do, and the situation is only going to get worse.

This government is committed to moving 17-year-olds from adult centres into juvenile centres. In this already chaotic situation those opposite have a totally unplanned arrangement to move these inmates into youth detention centres. This will result in 17-year-olds being housed next to 12- and 13-year-olds. The situation is already unacceptable and is only going to get worse.

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Achievements; Sport

Hon. MC de BRENNI (Springwood—ALP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Sport) (2.45 pm): When the Lions break through their banner on Saturday the nation will be witnessing an historic moment in Australian sport. I know the success of the Lions and the AFL Women's team has inspired an entire generation of young athletes, my daughter amongst them. I will be out there on Saturday with my daughter. I will be there with the Premier, the Deputy Premier and the Minister for Women to witness history in the making. We will be there because this is a government that backs women's sport.

It is not just a game on Saturday that we are backing. Let's look at the Palaszczuk government's record on women's sport. There is our Join the Movement program giving women and girls a pathway to sport. There have been two million views of a video that has directly led to dozens of events held or scheduled. Our government has supercharged the Get Out, Get Active program with $1.7 million in the round announced last week. That is five times the investment of those opposite, and we are supporting women's sport throughout the regions. Ladies Let's Golf has been expanded into regional Queensland with $79,000 in funding. Women are hitting the water with a program with Yachting Queensland with $120,000 of funding over three years and there is $450,000 of funding for netball in Far North Queensland.

Yesterday the member for Clayfield came into this chamber and took a cheap shot—a blow below the belt—at our commitment to sport. However, who was it that invested $280 million to make Suncorp Stadium world-class? It was Labor. Who was it that invested $50 million to redevelop the Gabba? Who invested $160 million to build Cbus stadium on the Gold Coast? Who invested $82 million in the Queensland Tennis Centre? Who is it that is delivering the $82 million Anna Meares Velodrome? Who is investing $30 million in the new State Netball Centre—

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. I am having difficulty hearing the minister. If I cannot hear the minister Hansard cannot either.

Mr de BRENNI: I ask: who is investing $140 million in a new stadium for Townsville? Who is investing $320 million to make the Commonwealth Games world class? Who invested $71 million in upgrading Metricon Stadium, the stadium that brought us the Gold Coast Suns, the stadium that is giving us a base for the Commonwealth Games and the stadium that will host a history-making event here in Queensland on Saturday? It was Labor. It has always been Labor who has done the building when it comes to sport because inspiring people to play sport is a focus of this government. That is why I commend the announcement of the Deputy Premier that will see free transport across South-East Queensland this Saturday. The opposition, as I said, came in here yesterday and attempted a cheap

shot. Up until that point, how many times has the Leader of the Opposition or the member for Beaudesert bothered to make a statement about the success of the Lions AFL women's team? I have not seen it happen once. How many times did they express support for the team prior to yesterday? Not once!

I am proud of Labor's record on sport. Let's never forget the member for Southern Downs attempting to distract voters from his plans to make 12,000 people de-necessary, carping around the state about our plans to 'build another stadium'. If we did not—

(Time expired)

Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations

Mr BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (2.50 pm): If you cannot handle the sports portfolio there is not much hope for you in government. If you cannot manage a sports field there is not much hope for you in government. Today there is an article in the *Courier-Mail* with the headline 'Militant unions win out'. I table a copy of that article.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Courier-Mail*, dated 22 March 2017, titled 'Militant Unions Win Out' [475].

Did the Minister for Industrial Relations seriously think that she could secretly rescind the Queensland guidelines to stop union corruption in Queensland without anyone noticing? Did she think she could abolish the Building Construction Compliance Branch in Queensland without anyone noticing? I table a copy of the guidelines.

Tabled paper: Department of Justice and Attorney-General: Implementation Guidelines to the Queensland Code of Practice for the Building and Construction Industry—Delivering value for money to Queensland taxpayers, July 2013 [476].

The minister says in the *Courier-Mail* today, 'We have abolished that. I have rescinded that secretly because we now have the ABCC set up'—an organisation that they abolished at the federal level—'and now we are relying on the ABCC to look after union corruption in Queensland.' It does not make any sense. But it does make sense, because union organiser Mr Andrew Watson has just joined the Labor Party. I table this.

Tabled paper: Extract, dated 18 October 2016, from Andrew Watson's Facebook page, showing his screenshot featuring Australian Labor Party membership card [477].

He has put on his Facebook site a copy of his Labor Party Queensland Branch membership card and he says—

Finally got my card , maybe might be a candidate for local preselection.

Then he says—

Maybe I could get Grocon to help out with some $$$ ...

Is he extorting Grocon, a private organisation? If we look at the union disclosures recently under their legislation on the ECQ website, look at the CFMEU: $10,000, $1,000, $5,000, $3,000 and the donor electorate is Brisbane Central. I table that.

Tabled paper: Extract, undated, from the Electoral Commission of Queensland website showing CFMEU donations to Australian Labor Party [478].

Is it any wonder we are getting all of this CFMEU stuff through the parliament because of the relationship that exists? The CFMEU illegally walked off construction sites a few weeks ago and went to a strip club and started fights in the Valley. Is this the type of people they represent? Of course it is, because I table another copy of a photo of Mr Andrew Watson. Look at this flattering photo of him with his fingers up at the camera. Of course, let us not forget Mr Dave Hanna and the Premier; here is a good old selfie! I table that.

Tabled paper: Two photographs of CFMEU members and the Premier and Minister for the Arts, Hon. Annastacia Palaszczuk [479].

The jig is up for the Premier. The Premier would have Queenslanders believe that she is a nice person, a motherly figure for Queensland, smiling for the cameras and not seeing anything, not doing anything or hearing anything—that is the front of this Premier. But when she walks through that door and leaves this House we know that she represents the thuggish behaviour of the union movement in Queensland, the CFMEU—that is the front of the Premier! The jig is up, Premier. They should disassociate themselves from criminal CFMEU officials.

Industrial Relations; Racial Discrimination Act

Hon. G GRACE (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (2.53 pm): I reckon that people outside might think the Premier is nice, but I will guarantee there is not one who will think the member for Kawana is nice. The member for Kawana comes in here and talks about their guidelines. Let me tell you about their guidelines. The code of practice was introduced by the ALP in 2000. When the guidelines came in they were a code established by the Newman government in 2013. They were an ideological frolic by that government at the time aimed at penalising—

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Ms GRACE: Listen: you might learn something. I suggest the most incompetent industrial relations minister this state has ever seen just sit and listen and I will give him a good lesson. The ideological frolic of the Newman government was aimed at penalising those contractors who entered into agreements with conditions they believed they did not like. Similar guidelines were introduced in Victoria and New South Wales. As a result of a successful 2012 Federal Court challenge, the guidelines in Victoria were deemed not to be applicable, so the Newman government deemed all agreements approved by the Fair Work Commission to be compliant with their guidelines. Effectively, this meant the guidelines have been largely irrelevant and unenforceable all along.

The member for Kawana struggles to understand simple industrial principles. He struggled at the time he was industrial relations minister and he still struggles now. The only thing the guidelines did was require contractors to provide workplace relations management plans that are now—

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. I am having difficulty hearing the minister's contribution. Member for Kawana, the minister did not interject on you during your contribution and neither did the Premier. I would urge you to provide a similar courtesy.

Ms GRACE: Remember, this is the same member for Kawana who opposed a particular clause in a bill before this House and he got the wrong clause, so I rest my case.

Once the federal code came into effect, the department advised me that the Queensland guidelines are no longer necessary and are totally obsolete. We went to the people of Queensland at the election and advised them that we would remove all unfair aspects of the previous government's legislation. Removing the guidelines—which was openly done, everyone has been informed—is the last nail in the coffin of the unfair laws introduced by those opposite.

What I really wanted to talk about was the insensitivity of the Turnbull government yesterday, Harmony Day, talking about watering down section 18C. It was an absolutely shameful exhibition. He does not even have the support of his own party, but let me tell you that you have to be desperate in this House when those opposite keep getting the member for Kawana to stand up.

(Time expired)

Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply, Email Account

Mr EMERSON (Indooroopilly—LNP) (2.56 pm): At every turn Minister Bailey has sought to hide from scrutiny over the use of his private emails. With every passing day the stench of this cover-up deepens. As we heard yesterday, the CCC has taken the extraordinary step of saying that his actions, if proven, would amount to corrupt conduct. Still this devious minister refuses to stand aside, and the Premier does not have the guts or scruples to make the call either.

Ms Jones interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Minister for Education, I would urge you not to persist with those interjections.

Mr EMERSON: The minister's lapses have not been merely reckless; that implies an error of judgement only. Doing cabinet business via private email is a deliberate act—

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I rise to a point of order. This matter has been clarified in the House. This is the second time in two days that the member for Indooroopilly is seeking to mislead the House. I ask that he withdraw that untrue allegation.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, do you find the comments of the member personally offensive and are you asking that they be withdrawn?

Mr BAILEY: I do indeed, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: Member, will you withdraw?

Mr EMERSON: I withdraw. Deleting the email account is a deliberately desperate act. We know that the minister deleted this private email account two days after receiving an email from his chief of staff notifying him that the *Australian* newspaper had submitted a right to information request seeking access to it. The minister's claim that he first became aware of the RTI application regarding his private email account on 6 February, the day after he deleted it, flunks the pub test.

At every twist and at every turn this minister has tried to hide away from scrutiny and hope that this problem would disappear. In attempting to hide from scrutiny he has only made matters worse. The only reason he has reopened this account is the enormous public pressure and outrage brought to bear. He did not do it because it was the right thing to do: he waited until he was cornered. Out in the real world stealing something and giving it back does not change the fact that you took it in the first place. Despite all of this the Premier continues to stand by her man, but the Premier will not stand aside this phoney minister. Clearly there is no-one on the backbench left to do the job. The member for Bundaberg had a go and we all know how that ended up; the member for Bundamba fancies herself but none of her colleagues do; while the member for Kallangur is an ETU man with the same back door union links as the member for Yeerongpilly. This is a government in shadowy crisis. The Premier should do the right thing and stand aside this minister.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr SPEAKER: Question time will finish at 3.59 pm.

Unemployment

Mr NICHOLLS (2.59 pm): My first question is to the Premier. Queensland's participation rate is at its lowest level in more than 22 years. Why are record numbers of Queenslanders giving up looking for work under this Labor government's watch?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. Obviously he was not listening today in relation to our focus on jobs. Our focus is clearly on growing the economy and getting people back into work. We have seen that the unemployment rate has been coming down compared with when he was in government and the treasurer of this state and he cut jobs and he cut services.

I want to encourage as many people as possible to get into work. That is why we put in place our Back to Work program—$100 million. More than 2,000 people in regional Queensland now have a job. That is why the Minister for Training brought back Skilling Queenslanders for Work, which was abolished by the former Newman government. Thousands of people are getting employment after going through those skilling processes.

We will continue to drive the economy, and the economy is going well. We have lain the groundwork. We are attracting international investment to this state. Never before have we seen export rates of $1 billion a week—goods leaving our shores and going overseas. That has occurred under the watch of this Treasurer. Never before have we seen this amount of investment from private companies across our state. Government is doing its bit as well. Today we announced $200 million—500 jobs across the state that would not have otherwise existed—to build new halls, fix structures in our schools and look after schools for children with a disability.

This Labor government cares about our education system. This is in stark contrast to those opposite. What did they do about schools in this state? They did barely nothing. What they wanted to do was shut them. Who can remember the School for Travelling Show Children? They shut that down. They also shut down the Barrett Adolescent Centre, Fortitude Valley State School, Toowoomba South State School, Stuart State School, Charlton State School, Nyanda State High School and Salisbury. That was their agenda and that is their legacy. They sold off schools and did not care about education or employment in this state.

Unemployment

Mr NICHOLLS: My second question is to the Premier. With the unemployment rate rising to 6.7 per cent under this government, and with more than 33,000 jobs lost last year in Queensland—the worst result in our state's history—will the Premier explain why record numbers of Queenslanders are losing their jobs on Labor's watch?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. Obviously he wants to rewrite the history books. It is as if the three years of turmoil—

Mrs Frecklington: What about your two years? What have you been doing?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am absolutely proud of my two years and I am proud of this team. We have presided over a record Health budget and a record Education budget. We have formulated the State Infrastructure Plan, we are getting on with Cross River Rail and we are getting ready for the Commonwealth Games—the largest event in Queensland's history. We are also introducing new programs such as Back to Work. We are tackling domestic and family violence and providing new shelters across this state.

It is ironic that this question comes from the man who was in charge of decimating employment in this state. Some 14,000 people in this state lost their jobs. How dare he ask a question about jobs? How dare he raise his head?

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Premier, I know you are on a roll, but I am having difficulty hearing. There is too much chatter in the chamber.

Ms PALASZCZUK: How dare the man who presided over the budget, who made the decisions, who suddenly wants to distance himself from Campbell Newman, stand in here and ask about employment? The hypocrisy of the man! How does he look himself in the mirror at night?

Members should not think for a moment that the 14,000 people who lost their jobs do not have families and do not have friends. They remember. Public servants come up to me and thank me and my government for giving them job security. We have provided more doctors, more lawyers, more nurses and more teachers. That is the hallmark of a Labor government, unlike those opposite.

The next budget will be great. It will be a budget about jobs. Every single member of my team is passionate about it. We know that we are doing everything we can to generate jobs in this state. That is what we will do. That will be our legacy. For the man who was the architect of the worst budget in Queensland's history to come in here and talk about employment is a complete and utter disgrace.

Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Logan, the members for Albert and Gaven have both had a pretty good go and they are going on the list. This is their first warning under standing order 253A. If the member for Chatsworth continues he will join them, as will other members.

Job Creation

Mr POWER: My question without notice is for the Premier. Can the Premier update the House on job-creating projects in Queensland?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Logan for the question. I am proud of the efforts my government is making to turn this state around and keep it moving. Rio Tinto has already announced that construction is well underway on its Amrun project, but today I want to update the House. Approximately 17 per cent of the project is complete, with 500 people now working on site. That number will grow to 1,100 by the middle of this year. In addition to those workers on the project, I can advise that Rio Tinto has to date awarded in excess of $900 million in contracts to Queensland businesses to supply goods and services to the project. This is great news for Queensland—$900 million of work to Queensland businesses. Most importantly, the supply chain extends to over 509 Queensland businesses, with 55 of those from western Cape York and 11 being Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander businesses. This is what Labor does. We help facilitate these projects, we drive these projects and we make sure people have the confidence to invest in this state.

Let me talk about yesterday's announcement. I was very proud to be with Dr Anthony Lynham at Shell's announcement to continue to expand in this state. Senior vice-president Andrew Smith said that it was a vote of confidence in the Queensland economy, as compared to what is happening in other states, that they have now invested, in our term of government, close to $2 billion in the expansion of gas in this state.

There is $2 billion in terms of an expansion of gas. With regard to renewable energy, Minister Mark Bailey is driving renewable energy in this state worth more than $2 billion on our watch in this state. That is $4 billion straightaway—tick—that is happening because of the efforts of this government, and there is more to come. I recently went to India with eight regional mayors championing the cause to see more jobs in their regions, and in upcoming months we will see more investment from Adani in agriculture. I am being advised by different sections of the Indian business community that they are

looking at us to help them supply chickpeas—a vital protein ingredient needed for the growing Indian community. We are pleased to help and we are going to do everything we can to continue to grow our agricultural exports. As I have said previously, over $1 billion a week is going out in exports. This is great news for Queensland. The economy is going in the right direction and we are going to keep Queensland moving.

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Economic Plan

Mr EMERSON: My question is directed to the Premier. Premier, the Treasurer claims Labor's economic plan is working. Is the worst unemployment rate in Australia the result of Labor's plan?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I say to the member for Indooroopilly: have they forgotten the history? Have they forgotten the highest—

Government members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Yes, and this is coming from the man who sacked 1,700 people in his own department.

Ms Trad: One in five!

Ms PALASZCZUK: One in five people. I can remember the meetings with the RoadTek people telling us how they lost their jobs in regional Queensland. I can remember meeting with all of the regional mayors who were saying quite clearly to me that those opposite had ripped the guts out of roads in Western Queensland. Who is rebuilding the roads? We are.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I would urge members to show some decorum. We have quite a while to go before the end of question time.

Ms PALASZCZUK: As I said very clearly, we are working with the mayors and listening to them to make sure that we grow the economy. In terms of western roads, we are putting in the extra funding that is needed. We are rebuilding the sheep industry. For three years those opposite did absolutely nothing and now we are rebuilding it.

A government member: Roma Hospital.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Then there is the Roma Hospital. Our record is clear. I find it absolutely hypocritical that those opposite can dare stand in this House and talk about jobs when every single one of them who sat on the front bench when they were on this side of the House axed people's jobs from Queensland and the personal toll that that took on individual families. The Leader of the Opposition may sit there and laugh but I will tell him the reality: he is the man that destroyed people's lives.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. No, let us stick with the rules. Before I invite the Premier to continue, I remind all members, especially the member for Indooroopilly, who asked the question, that I do not mind reasonable interjections, but you have been continually interjecting while the Premier is answering your question and I find your behaviour to be disorderly. If you persist, I will take the appropriate action. That is a fair warning for all members. I do not mind reasonable interjections, but if you are going to persist you will be warned and I will take the appropriate action.

Ms PALASZCZUK: While talking about jobs, when the Leader of the Opposition was the treasurer he had a pain threshold. That is what he thought about people's livelihoods. He had a pain threshold about how much pain would be caused by the cuts that he was inflecting. He could not even do it himself. He had to employ Peter Costello to come in and give him a hand—get the old LNP mate in to give him a hand. The public will not forget his record. Campbell Newman will not forget. In fact, he keeps reminding us.

Ms Jones: He likes me more than you!

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take that interjection: Campbell Newman likes the Minister for Education more than the Leader of the Opposition!

Mr SPEAKER: Have you finished, Premier?

Ms PALASZCZUK: Hopefully next week we might even have the opportunity to see Mr Newman. We might get to see him at an event that is coming up. In all honesty, members of the LNP are hypocrites when it comes to jobs.

(Time expired)

Cross River Rail

Mr KING: My question is directed to the Deputy Premier. Will the Deputy Premier update the House on the importance of Cross River Rail to South-East Queensland and whether there are any alternative views?

Ms TRAD: I thank the member for Kallangur for the question. The member for Kallangur is a great advocate for public transport services and public transport infrastructure projects. Cross River Rail is our No. 1 infrastructure priority. Following on from what the Premier said, one of the reasons why Cross River Rail is so important to not only the South-East Queensland corner but also the Queensland economy as a whole is that it will be a fantastic jobs generator not only in construction but also in creating new workplaces and new services that people in South-East Queensland can rely upon and new places to live but, most importantly, it will ease congestion across the Brisbane River and provide faster commutes into work and faster commutes back home so people can spend time with their families instead of being stuck on the network.

An opposition member interjected.

Ms TRAD: I take that interjection, and we are getting on with the process of building it. The only people standing in the way are those opposite. We have the federal government sitting at the table in terms of the delivery authority and providing money to progress the project. The business case is with Infrastructure Australia. We have Brisbane City Council with its new Metro plan complementing Cross River Rail—not cannibalising it—and statements from the Lord Mayor have been extremely positive around support for Cross River Rail and working towards it, as have comments from Mayor Tom Tate, Mayor Luke Smith and Mayor Paul Pisasale. They all understand the importance of this project for the South-East Queensland region. The only people standing in the way are those opposite.

Yesterday those opposite talked about the newsletters that had been distributed throughout South-East Queensland consulting South-East Queenslanders about the change in the EIS and what they should expect to see, the benefits of Cross River Rail and how they could have their say, because that is what this government is about. We are about ensuring Queenslanders have a say because that means we improve services and we improve infrastructure. Even the federal LNP member for Brisbane, Trevor Evans, understands how important this project is, because on the front page of his recent newsletter—speaking of newsletters—he put his priority for 2017 as the Cross River Rail project. That is his top priority for his electorate, and I table a copy of the newsletter. Those opposite have never seen a public infrastructure project that they did not like, they have never seen a public transport infrastructure—

Tabled paper: Document, dated February 2017, Community Newsletter by Federal Member for Brisbane, Mr Trevor Evans MP [480].

(Time expired)

Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply, Crime and Corruption Commission Investigation

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: My question without notice is directed to the Minister for Energy. In light of the Crime and Corruption Commission's letter released yesterday, will the minister do the right thing and stand down pending the outcome of the investigation into potential corrupt conduct?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for her question. This matter has been widely canvassed. There is an investigation underway which I am fully cooperating with. I table for the parliament's record something that the opposition has not chosen to do, and that is the statement from the CCC last week which states—

With the cooperation of Minister Bailey, the CCC's forensic computing experts were able to retrieve over 30,000 emails. It is important to note that many of these emails were from a period of time before Minister Bailey became an elected official and may not be relevant to the ongoing assessment.

Tabled paper: Media release, dated 16 March 2017, by the Crime and Corruption titled 'Update on the assessment into Minister Bailey's emails' [481].

I am cooperating fully with the process. It would be entirely inappropriate for me to be commenting while an investigation is going on. The honourable thing for the opposition to do would be to wait for the CCC to do its work and see what the final report says.

Employment

Mr BROWN: My question is to the Treasurer. Will the Treasurer advise the House about the employment situation in Queensland and how Queensland compares to other states and territories?

Mr PITT: I thank the honourable member for the question. It is a very pertinent question, particularly after the line of questioning that we have received this morning. Employment is a topic that is so crucial to so many Queenslanders. Those opposite, who claim to be an alternative government, should be on top of this matter. The Leader of the Opposition stands in this place and says—

We have a Treasurer presiding over the worst unemployment rate and the lowest participation rate in the nation.

He should get his facts right. Once again, the Leader of the Opposition is wrong. I table page 15 of the latest Australian Bureau of Statistics labour force report for February 2017 where the unemployment rate for the states and territories are compared.

Tabled paper: Extract from Australian Bureau of Statistics Labour Force Status (Aged 15 and over) statistics—States and Territories—February 2017 [482].

We all know that trend is the best metric and we certainly know that the Leader of the Opposition agrees with that, because when he was treasurer he said that publicly on numerous occasions. It is a shame he has forgotten that—just like he has forgotten the past three years. We know that the trend figure is the best metric. On that basis, certainly, Queensland does not have the highest unemployment rate in the nation.

Further, Queensland's participation rate is higher than that of New South Wales. So the Leader of the Opposition is wrong on two fronts. Once again, that is indicative of the laziness of the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Clayfield. It demonstrates a lack of attention to detail. It is sloppy. It is lazy.

Mr NICHOLLS: I rise to a point of order. The Treasurer is deliberately misleading, or misquoting. In the question I asked I said that the rate was at its lowest level in more than 22 years. I did not say that, in relation to the participation rate, the rate was the lowest in the nation. Quite clearly, the Treasurer is wrong and I ask that he withdraw. I find the comments offensive and I ask that they be withdrawn.

Mr PITT: I rise to a point of order. The Leader of the Opposition is referring to two separate things. The member is incorrect. I quoted him from *Hansard* yesterday, not from his question. If the Leader of the Opposition is claiming that *Hansard* is wrong, he needs to take that up—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, members. With respect, we can have the debate at another time, but the standard procedure is that, if a member finds a comment made by someone else personally offensive, it is withdrawn.

Mr PITT: I withdraw and I table the page from *Hansard* from yesterday.

Tabled paper: Extract from *Hansard*, dated 21 March 2017, statement by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Tim Nicholls MP, during Private Members' Statements [483].

Mr SPEAKER: That is fine. Thank you.

Mr PITT: Of course, when the LNP members were in government, they did many things to drive up unemployment rather than try to bring it down. Firstly, as treasurer, the Leader of the Opposition set a four per cent target—or did Campbell set the four per cent target? Then he tried to cut 14,000 public servants—and he did, or did Campbell cut them? The Leader of the Opposition is distancing himself from Campbell Newman now, pretending that he had no role in any of the decisions that were made when he was the treasurer. Either he was a treasurer who had no influence in the last government or he has amnesia. We know that the member for Clayfield was there every step of the way making these decisions.

Over the past two years, we on this side of the House have worked to transition our economy from the highs of the mining construction boom economy to a post mining boom economy. That is the biggest single sin of those opposite: they left a huge void, a gap that is now being filled by our government and our programs. We are doing the heavy lifting. We are not getting the same response and support from the federal government. We are certainly having to pick up the pieces when those members opposite buried their heads in the sand over the entire period that they were in government. Everyone else could forecast the end of that mining construction. They could see that there was going to be a difficult period throughout regional Queensland. Yet the members opposite cut into regional Queensland. They cut programs, they cut services and they cut jobs.

It is really galling to have those opposite, but particularly the Leader of the Opposition, come in here and challenge our government on what we are doing to try to fix the unemployment mess that was left behind by them. We are working every day on behalf of Queenslanders. We will not rest until we see an improvement in our unemployment rate, because we owe it to Queenslanders and that is what Queenslanders have asked us to do.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Southport, you are warned under standing order 253A. I find your interjections designed to be disorderly and to disrupt the minister in his answer. If you persist, I will take the appropriate action.

Youth Detention

Mr WALKER: My question is to the Premier. Given the government's decision to move 17-year-olds into youth detention by November this year, does the government yet have a plan in place? Does that plan involve constructing a new youth detention centre or letting existing detainees out so that 17-year-olds can move in?

Ms PALASZCZUK: The Attorney-General is working on that. She has been not only conducting discussions with stakeholders but also chairing a subcommittee of cabinet looking at those issues extensively. I find it ironic that those opposite do not support the removal of 17-year-olds from our adult prison system.

It is about time Queensland was brought into the 21st century. My government has acted very clearly and very strongly to make this decision. We are working through all of the issues and we will meet the time line.

Sunshine Coast University Hospital

Mr SAUNDERS: My question is to the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services. Will the minister inform the House how the Sunshine Coast University Hospital will support jobs in the electorate of Maryborough?

Mr DICK: The member for Maryborough is a great champion for the electorate of Maryborough and the people of Maryborough. Since his election, he has been fighting hard for them. I am delighted to report to the House that this week is the first week that patients will be treated at the Sunshine Coast University Hospital.

The opening of this hospital—opening safely, I might add—is important not just for the people of Kawana, Maroochydore, Caloundra and Nambour; it is important for other communities across Queensland, including Maryborough. Earlier this morning, I took the opportunity to travel to Maryborough where the member for Maryborough and I visited the Wide Bay Group Linen Service. We went there because this government is investing in that laundry service—to expand it so that it can provide the laundry service for the Sunshine Coast University Hospital.

Our government will invest $3.6 million to expand the laundry at Maryborough. These are real jobs. Ten jobs during construction—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DICK: Listen to them whinge. They do not want laundry jobs in Maryborough. They do not want hardworking laundry staff to get more opportunities. That is what our government stands for—not just the specialists, not just the nurses, but the people who make hospitals work and that includes laundry staff.

There will be 10 jobs created during construction of the $3.6 million facility and 10 permanent jobs once that facility is completed. I congratulate Metcalfe Homes Pty Ltd and Keystone Architects—two great Maryborough firms—that will be part of the design and construction of that facility. It is the daily double for Maryborough: improved health service outcomes and real jobs for the community.

I thank the member for Maryborough, because he knows the truth of the matter, which is that, if the member for Clayfield had continued as treasurer, he would have sold and shut down that service. He would have outsourced laundry jobs from Maryborough to the private sector. When the member for Maryborough and I were on the laundry floor and the laundry staff were putting the big blankets on the folding machine they said, 'Cam, we're backing Annastacia and Labor because you saved our jobs.' The laundry staff know it. The new laundry staff will know it.

Can I say on the public record that we welcome trade unions to represent those workers as well. We are not about bashing unions; we are about standing up for workers and giving them real jobs. They know that the Leader of the Opposition's one mantra, that the one policy he stands for, is sack and sell. That is in his DNA. He has never repudiated or apologised for sacking 14,000 people from the public sector, 18,000 nurses and midwives, and more than 4,000 staff from the health system. He has never apologised and he has never repudiated asset sales. The member for Maryborough and all the staff—

(Time expired)

Byerwen Coal Project

Mr CRIPPS: My question without notice is to the Premier. I refer to recent media reports about an ongoing dispute between QCoal and Glencore. Does the Premier stand by the commitment that she gave to JFE Steel in Japan last year that she would support the $1 billion Byerwen coal project that is worth 350 jobs to Central Queensland? Will the Premier guarantee that her government will not do anything to put this vital project at risk? I table the Premier's ministerial media statement in this regard.

Tabled paper: Media release, undated, by the Premier and Minister for the Arts, Hon. Annastacia Palaszczuk, titled 'Premier's trade mission to Japan focussed on jobs and investment' [484].

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Hinchinbrook for that question. It is a very sensible question—perhaps the most sensible question I have heard from that side in two years. Before I get to the substance of the question, can I announce that in the member for Hinchinbrook's electorate the Bohlevale State School hall will get a $1.5 million upgrade. That is a bit more good news for the member for Hinchinbrook.

Let me talk briefly about that project and JFE Steel. This is a very important project for Queensland and I stand by that commitment to JFE Steel. When I was in Japan I had the honour of touring JFE Steel's plant. It is the largest steel making plant in Japan. I had the opportunity to see firsthand where our good quality coal goes to make steel, steel that is coming back to Queensland to be used in railway lines, steel that is being exported from Japan all over the world. Coal from Queensland is being turned into steel. We know that that means jobs for the industry. We know how important it is.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: No, I know this answer because I have been there firsthand, unlike those opposite—I do not know if anyone else has been to JFE Steel. What I do is I develop good professional working relationships with our trading partners. What I will say is that there is one side of politics that wants to put all that at risk and that is those opposite and the Leader of the Opposition for doing a deal with One Nation.

Mr CRIPPS: I rise to a point of order on a point of relevance. Will the Premier advise the House whether her government will guarantee that it will take no actions to put this critical project, the Byerwen coal project, at risk?

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I rise to a point of order. There was no point of order at all contained within the point of order that was raised by the member for Hinchinbrook. All he did was stand up and repeat the question.

Mr SPEAKER: I would ask the Premier to come back to answer the question and be relevant to the question.

Ms PALASZCZUK: We will continue to work with that company. We understand the jobs that are in that industry. Coming back from my trade mission—this is very important—the issue of the deal of the LNP with One Nation was raised with me.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, I am prepared to hear what the Premier is saying. She is saying there is a connection with the question you have asked. I am keen to hear what the Premier has to say.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am talking about how my government and JFE Steel are working together creating jobs here and exporting coal over there. Trading relationships are being put at risk by the deal by this man, the member for Clayfield, with One Nation. Whilst I travelled on my most recent trade mission investors asked me specifically about the One Nation deal.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. I find the member for Mudgeeraba's interjections are designed to disrupt the Premier in her answer. You are warned under standing order 253A. There are other people involved in that group and I may proceed further. Premier, do you have anything to add?

Ms PALASZCZUK: Yes. There will be no deals with One Nation and my government, full stop. I will be saying that every single day because I will not put—

(Time expired)

State Schools, Infrastructure

Mr CRAWFORD: My question is to the Minister for Education. How is the Palaszczuk government improving school facilities for children in the Barron River electorate as well as throughout the state?

Ms JONES: I thank the honourable member for his question. I know how passionate he is about delivering better education services and facilities in his local community. I have had the opportunity of going to his electorate multiple times since I have been the Minister for Education and visiting Caravonica State School. First of all, we delivered for Caravonica, from his representations, a new car park to ensure they have a safe place for parents to park and also to address traffic on that incoming road into Cairns, but today I am very pleased to announce, as part of our $200 million Advancing Queensland Schools funding boost that we announced today for new infrastructure in Queensland schools, that Caravonica State School, a growing school in the Cairns region, will get a $4.5 million hall.

This is a consequence of the strong advocacy of members on this side of the House who have said from day one that a Labor government here in Queensland would put education front and centre. We understand how important it is to provide those front-line services in health and education and the difference that makes in the ordinary lives of Queenslanders right across the width and breadth of this nation—of our state, not the whole nation, but let us face it, when Queensland is firing the whole country is firing!

That is why today I am very pleased to say that as part of the 30 school upgrades and new school halls being built across Queensland we are going to see infrastructure works getting underway in communities right across this state. Why are we so passionate about this? We know it means jobs in regional Queensland, whether it is in Hinchinbrook, as the Premier just mentioned before; in Kawana; in Lockyer; in Nanango at the Kingaroy State High School; at Chinchilla State High School where they are going to get $4.5 million for a brand new hall; in the electorate of Barron River; in Bundaberg at Kepnock State High School where there will be $4.5 million for a new hall; in Maryborough at Maryborough State High School, $4.5 million for a new hall there; in Thuringowa, Kirwan State High School; or Marsden State High School in the electorate of Waterford. Right across this state we are seeing this major investment.

What today demonstrates very clearly for every single Queenslander is that this government will invest in education, we will build schools and we will create jobs in regional Queensland. We will always put education front and centre. We think that every child, no matter where you live, no matter how much money their parents have, has a right to a decent, high-quality education and that is what we will fight for.

Those opposite continue to be silent. We are now in March and we still have heard nothing from their LNP comrades in Canberra about where the school funding is going to come from. It is about time they stood up to their buddies in Canberra and fought for Queensland.

Mr McEachan interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Glass House for his question, member for Redlands, you are warned under standing order 253A for your interjections. I find they were designed to disrupt the minister in her answer.

Queensland Rail, Free Travel

Mr POWELL: My question without notice is to the Premier. With refunds valued at $300,000 offered to commuters after the 8 December rail failure, free travel costing in the order of $1 million on Christmas and New Year's Eve and now free travel costing $400,000 this Saturday, does the Premier really think the public are gullible enough to fall for these shiny but costly diversions from Labor's rail fail?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I will deal with a couple of those issues. I thank the member for the question. In relation to the free travel for south-east commuters this weekend, especially for those people who want to attend the first ever AFL Women's grand final to be held in this state, the Deputy Premier came and discussed that issue with me at length yesterday and I thought, 'What a great idea!' Unfortunately the ground was not suitable. In fact, the report stated it could prove unsafe to players and they did not want to see players' safety put at risk. That was very clear and very sensible. I thank the Minister for Sport for all the work he has been doing in negotiating this with the AFL. I had the opportunity to speak to the chairman personally on the phone and he thanked both the minister and myself and the government for coming up with the solution for this Saturday.

Instead of criticising, how about those opposite start supporting our women's AFL team—our Lions team. It is about time everyone in this House got behind women's sport.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. I now warn the Deputy Premier and the member for Glass House under 253A for their interjections. I have given ample warning this afternoon to all parties. If you persist I will take the appropriate action.

Ms PALASZCZUK: As this is a non-ticketed event and the other sporting events happening in the south-east this weekend, especially on Saturday, are ticketed, how could we discriminate against those people, including families, of the south-east who want to go and show their support to the women's team? I was not going to stand for that. I stand by the decision of the Deputy Premier and myself to make it available to everyone in the south-east.

When we talk about Fairer Fares, this issue has needed addressing for many years. I thank the former minister for transport, who is now the new minister for transport, for implementing Fairer Fares. It means that across the south-east network we have cheaper fares for families. I understand the cost-of-living pressures that families are facing, which is why my government made that decision. It is why my government made the decision to allow more concession holders to access cheaper electricity. It is only my government that is delivering, unlike those opposite who failed to deliver any reforms when it came to transport or electricity. In their term of government, in terms of electricity all we saw were the massive price hikes of around 43 per cent and in transport all we saw was the sacking of workers. I am not going to put up with that.

(Time expired)

Avalon Airshow

Mr STEWART: My question is to the Minister for State Development. Will the minister advise the House about the achievements of Queensland businesses at the recent Avalon Airshow?

Dr LYNHAM: I thank the member for his question. I know he will be very pleased to hear about the success of the defence industry in Queensland. I can tell the House that, with the member for Townsville's new fitness regime, his stomach may be shrinking but his chest swells with pride when he looks at the success of defence in Townsville.

More than 30 Queensland companies headed our strongest contingent at the Australian International Airshow a couple of weeks ago. Those companies were exposed to more than $24 billion worth of business opportunities at the Asia Pacific's premier aviation event. At our stand, my Department of State Development hosted 13 of the 30 industry partners. 210,000 people attended the air show, with delegations from 445 countries. I met with many of the Queensland exhibitors and heard firsthand about the value of having a strong state government presence to showcase the depth of the state's capability to such an influential audience.

The very exciting news is that one of the Queensland stand partners, TAE from Amberley, was awarded the Aerospace Australia Civil Industry innovation award for technology they developed in partnership with the CSIRO. The project, known as Fountx, is cutting-edge technology to allow an on-site technician to collaborate with an expert many kilometres away or, indeed, across the globe. That is another example of how Queensland defence and aerospace companies are leading the commercialisation of Australian research and development into products ready for export to global markets.

The Avalon Airshow also saw a significant win for another Queensland stand partner, Vector Aerospace, which is based at Eagle Farm. Vector Aerospace signed an exclusive maintenance repair and overhaul services contract with Field Air for PT6A engines, using agricultural and firefighting aircraft. Companies such as Vector Aerospace and TAE are part of an aircraft manufacturing and repair sector that generated $1.3 billion in revenue in 2014-15, of which $600 million went directly into our economy. Queensland is in the defence business and this government is right behind them for the jobs and billions of dollars worth of business opportunities on offer.

North West Minerals Province

Mr KATTER: My question is to the Treasurer and Minister for Trade and Investment. The North West Minerals Province is one of the world's best mineral producing regions. However, investment in the region is at risk. Will the Treasurer provide detail on the recommendations from the North West Minerals Province Task Force and how he plans to support mining investment and infrastructure development from those findings?

Mr PITT: I thank the honourable member for his question. Before I get to the core of his question, I congratulate him on some of the schools funding that his electorate will receive, as announced today. If I read it correctly, it is more than $1.65 million. Obviously that will be very welcome in his part of the world. I know that a proposed bill lapsed last night. I want to thank the member for the work that he did on the Rural Debt and Drought Task Force, which lead to the farm debt mediation result that we have achieved, as well as quite a few other outcomes from that group. In rising I want to acknowledge that as I did not have the opportunity to do so last night.

As the member knows, the North West Minerals Province Task Force is a joint government and industry led initiative that is about providing recommendations to government on how to best tackle short-term challenges and identify opportunities for the resources industry in that region. The government is considering the recommendations of the task force. As a part of the budget we will be releasing a response to the task force aimed at diversifying the economy in the north-west region and, of course, promoting new investment in mining and assisting the north-west to survive and thrive.

There are actions that we have already taken under our Jobs and Regional Growth Fund. For example, shoring up the copper smelter at Mount Isa Mines, which is a $15 million co-investment with Glencore, has been a significant outcome. We believe it has saved around 400 jobs and done very good things for the local community to ensure that it will survive and thrive.

We are committed to consulting with the member. I know of the work being done by my honourable colleague the Minister for State Development, who also has responsibility for mines. He is continuing to do that work. We remain committed to supporting the north-west. Of course, we are looking at what we can do—and again that goes to the Minister for State Development, who also has responsibility for mines—to look at areas around supporting additional exploration.

I take this opportunity to welcome the investment that we have seen with the Altona copper-gold project near Cloncurry in North-West Queensland. Last week, an ASX statement confirmed that it has reached another milestone. It is still subjected to the FIRB, but we expect that it will proceed. That would be a great thing, because we expect around 300 jobs to be generated during construction and around 280 ongoing production jobs. There are some good news story coming out already.

We are considering the recommendations that the task force has made to government. We will provide a response as part of that process. I acknowledge the advocacy of the member. We continue to be a government that is working for all of Queensland, which is why we have not forgotten the very important contribution that the resources sector makes to our economy.

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Integrity Reforms

Mr RUSSO: My question is to the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills. Will the Attorney-General please update the House on integrity reforms undertaken by the Palaszczuk government?

Mrs D'ATH: I thank the member for Sunnybank for his question. Last week I was proud to join the first Biennial Conference of Transparency International Australia to discuss with the legal profession, business leaders, community organisations and public service representatives the importance of transparency in our political system. I particularly thank the member for Sunnybank, not just for his participation in the event but also for his longstanding commitment to this important area of reform.

The very first piece of legislation that we introduced as a government was targeted squarely and fairly at restoring public faith in our institutions. We dramatically lowered the threshold for the disclosure of political donations from the former government's threshold of $12,800, indexed to go up every single year, to $1,000. We provided greater independence to the Crime and Corruption Commission, making sure that the chair was truly independent and that there was bipartisan support in the appointment of our commissioners and the chief executive officer to ensure leadership structure and operational independence. We have worked hard to restore the independence and respect of another crucial institution, the judiciary. We have committed to a constructive and respectful working relationship with the courts and the legal profession, which is something that really should not be remarkable but was a serious issue in Queensland.

On 23 February this year the Queensland government launched Australia's first real-time political disclosure system. I am pleased that this is now a reality in Queensland. From 1 March political parties, donors, candidates are required within seven business days to disclose any donations of $1,000 or more—that is, every donation of $1,000 or more made from this point on. Importantly, they also need to start disclosing every single donation from January and February of this year.

Let us have a think about this. This a game changer for Queensland, but, as we heard at the conference, it is a game changer for this nation. Prior to this change someone could walk into a member of parliament's office and drop $12,000 on the table and no-one would even know about it. That was the case under the LNP laws. Under our laws donations of $1,000 or more, whether they are cumulative or not, will be declared.

Mr Mander interjected.

Mrs D'ATH: I am happy to take the interjection. There is still $100,000 not declared by the opposition. They need to show where that money has come from.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Minister, you have taken the interjection from the member for Everton.

Mrs D'ATH: Those on the other side are breaching their own code of conduct when it comes to fundraising. They must collect the names and details of people they receive funding from. They should be honest with the people of Queensland.

Cleveland, Train Services

Dr ROBINSON: My question is to the Premier. Instead of offering free travel, will the Premier ride the 5.20 pm train service to Cleveland as requested by the disgruntled paying passengers to see how bad the crowding has become since the 5.12 pm express service was cancelled in November?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for the question. In more good news for Cleveland, member for the Cleveland, the Cleveland District State High School will get a multipurpose hall worth $6 million.

Dr ROBINSON: I rise to a point of order, Mr Speaker. My point of order is on relevance.

Mr SPEAKER: I understand your point of order is on relevance. Premier, can you make your answer relevant to the question.

Ms PALASZCZUK: You do not want it?

Dr Robinson: It is about trains. It is about cuts to train services, Premier.

Ms PALASZCZUK: He does not want it.

Mr SPEAKER: The member for Cleveland rose on a point of order in relation to relevance. Premier, I ask you to make your—

Ms PALASZCZUK: I was just sharing some good news, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: I know that you want to talk about that, but that is not what the question is about. Come back to the question please.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I understand there are some issues that the member has raised about the Cleveland line. The Minister for Transport is more than happy to talk to you about that in more detail.

Dr Robinson interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Have you asked to make an appointment? No.

An opposition member interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Not with you lot, I can tell you that.

Honourable members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I see that they love hopping on light rail with me and having their selfies taken.

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, do you have anything further to add?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am more than happy for the member to talk to the Deputy Premier about that in more detail. She is more than happy to undertake the consultation.

Sugar Industry

Mrs GILBERT: My question is to the Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries. Will the minister update the House on any recent decisions that have had an impact on the sugar industry in Queensland?

Mr Costigan interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Whitsunday. You are warned under standing order 253A. I find those interjections out of order. If you persist I will take the appropriate action.

Mr BYRNE: I thank the member for the question. It is pretty typical—screaming in the dark. We have not heard much from those opposite this week on sugar—not much at all after the shenanigans of last sitting weeks. Since the mediation, which the Queensland government organised and paid for, Wilmar and QSL are committed to finalising a formal agreement. The advice that I have is that the agreement is being drafted as per the expectation of the mediation and an outcome is expected within the coming weeks—so much for them.

There have been no developments on the 2015 legislation. On 7 March 2017 the arbitrator, John Muir QC, determined the precontract provisions introduced in 2015 are 'invalid as being beyond the legislative competence of the Queensland parliament'. I told you so, but no-one over there seems to want to listen. The provisions are constitutional. I told you so, but no-one would listen. They are effectively dead. I told you they were going to be but no-one across the path would listen.

Those opposite well know what the government's position was in the 2015 debate. Those opposite who have not obliterated their memories of last sitting would know that the LNP tried to rush through legislation mirroring that of 2015 last sitting week. What we have proven beyond doubt is that the LNP's 2015 legislation did not survive its very first test.

Now we see the member for Hinchinbrook standing up trying to call on Canberra to introduce a code of conduct. On 4 May 2016 LNP Senator Barry O'Sullivan said that one was not needed. Matt Canavan, that luminary from the Liberal National Party, is the bloke who within days of being sworn in wanted to split Queensland in two—he is Katter aligned. Then he came out and said that he wants to give Queensland's GST to Western Australia—he is One Nation aligned. Then he said he appreciates a business case is necessary for the contemporary environment of the Snowy Mountains scheme but does not want it done for Rockwood Weir. He is all the over the shop with no idea. This is what he said about this issue in the debate federally—

Negotiations are still occurring between sugar mills and sugar growers and it is not the right time for the government to act before those negotiations are concluded. Everybody in the sector appreciates that the best outcome here is a commercial outcome, that the best outcome is for millers and growers to come back together. Indeed, they will have to do that at some point.

Here we have a federal Liberal National Party Queensland senator backing us in 100 per cent with everything he has ever said. What do we hear from those opposite? Absolutely nothing. To top it all off George Christensen was threatening to resign from the Liberal National Party. Barnaby Joyce was going to do something about it. What have we heard for the last three weeks—zip, silence.

(Time expired)

Sunshine Coast, Youth Unemployment

Ms SIMPSON: My question is to the Premier. Given that in the last 12 months more than 5,000 young people on the Sunshine Coast have lost their jobs and another 5,000 have given up looking for work and given that the Back to Work program does not apply to the Sunshine Coast region, what is the government doing to address the youth unemployment crisis on the Sunshine Coast?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Maroochydore for the question. Out of the education announcement today, Maroochydore State High School will get $1.5 million. That is what we are doing. We are making sure that we are actually governing for the whole of the state. Hopefully, we will see some young apprentices get employed on those projects, for example. Projects like that will actually enable people to get work and allow people to put on apprentices so that they can work locally. The Skilling Queenslanders for Work program operates right across this state. It is focused on getting young people into work. We have our concessions for apprentices to ensure people can put them on. We are seeing a huge take-up rate in that regard.

We know that youth unemployment in some parts of our state is not where it should be. That is why slowly but in a measured way we are putting in place policies. We are broadening them. We are making sure they work. We are undertaking projects like expansions to hospitals and building new facilities in schools. We are looking at the infrastructure and working with councils across our state. We are building tourism to make sure we give young people a helping hand.

Mr SPEAKER: There is one minute left.

Social Housing

Ms PEASE: My question is to the Minister for Housing and Public Works. Will the minister please update the House about how housing services are being restored in my electorate of Lytton?

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, you might have a go tomorrow. Time for questions without notice has expired.

LAND AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 29 November 2016 (see p. 4596).

Second Reading

Hon. AJ LYNHAM (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (4.00 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I thank the Agriculture and Environment Committee for its consideration of the Land and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 and for its report tabled on 7 March 2017. I also thank those who took the time to lodge a submission and participate in the committee process. The committee had four recommendations, including that the bill be passed. I will address those recommendations shortly.

The bill is in response to the government's commitment to continually review and improve the tools it uses to administer Queensland's land portfolio. I would firstly like to discuss the Land Title Act amendments, including issues raised during the committee inquiry process. The bill includes amendments which will further enhance the functioning of Queensland's world-class Torrens titling system by facilitating additional digital transactions, as well as by improving and clarifying aspects of the legal framework of the system.

Since 2013, Queensland has been a participant in national electronic conveyancing, e-conveyancing. This allows land transactions such as transfers and mortgages to be completed via an online 'hub' accessed in any of the participating jurisdictions, with relevant dealings lodged directly into the land registry of the jurisdiction in which the land is situated. The bill also assists in delivering Queensland's ongoing commitment under a Council of Australian Governments intergovernmental agreement for e-conveyancing to work towards national consistency by introducing the mechanism of a priority notice consistent with other jurisdictions.

Amendments to the Land Title Act provide for the lodgement and effect of priority notices. These will operate similarly to settlement notices which have been used in Queensland since 1994 by reserving priority for an instrument intended to be lodged at a time when the transaction is not yet completed. Priority is an important aspect of the Torrens titling system. A priority notice may be used, for example, by a purchaser of a property to reserve 'priority' for their intended transfer, during the period between entering the contract and when the sale is settled and their transfer is lodged. This will ensure that no instrument, such as another transfer or a mortgage, can be registered during that time and take priority over their transfer. Priority notices will provide the benefits of applying to a greater range of transactions than settlement notices. For example, they may be used for leases. They will also be able to be extended if, for example, there is a delay in the completion of a sale.

In its submission to the committee during its consideration of the bill, the Queensland Law Society expressed concern that the eligibility for depositing priority notices was too broad and should be confined to persons who have a current interest in the land. It is important, however, to ensure that the eligibility to use these notices is not unduly restricted. For example, family members may have negotiated a change of ownership of a farm, consisting of several freehold properties, from parents to a child. This transaction would take some time before formally being completed. The child, however, would not have an interest in the land if the transaction is not documented or no money is changing hands.

Another example could be where a person has been appointed as administrator for a landowner who has lost legal capacity. This person may intend to lodge the required document with a copy of the administrative order for noting on the title but may, for practical reasons, not be able to do this immediately. The administrator could, however, deposit a priority notice. The bill, in providing for priority notices in Queensland, is a further step towards national consistency and achieving efficiencies and benefits for business and the public through e-conveyancing.

Another way in which the bill will facilitate future e-conveyancing is a streamlining measure in relation to paper certificates of title which still exist for a small proportion of Queensland freehold properties. A legal practitioner who holds a paper certificate of title for a client will be able to undertake an e-conveyancing transaction for their client without needing to physically return the paper certificate of title to the Titles Registry. This will provide the efficiency and benefits of fully digital conveyancing transactions for more landowners and legal practitioners with appropriate safeguards in place.

Other amendments included in the bill are clarifications and minor improvements to a range of existing provisions. The amendments to improve efficiency in processes for court orders and beneficiaries have corresponding amendments to the Land Act included in the bill. The bill provides streamlining of registration processes and benefits to both owners of freehold land and lessees under the Land Act.

I will now turn my attention to the proposed Land Act amendments and discuss how they will provide benefits to a range of stakeholders who deal in state land. These benefits include clarifying legislation to provide greater certainty for customers, streamlining existing processes, reducing red tape and improving administration and management of state land. For example, approval requirements will be streamlined when transferring a road licence that is tied by covenant to freehold land, as well as for significant tourism developments on certain regulated lands.

The bill will also streamline processes relating to Indigenous land administration by reducing unnecessary levels of state oversight associated with the development of deed of grant in trust land, or DOGIT land. The bill also proposes reforms which will support the better management of state land—in particular, community purpose reserves. This includes the ability to declare community purpose reserves over functioning non-tidal watercourses and lakes to enable their better management. The bill also proposes amendments to rolling term lease extension provisions, measures to ensure a smooth transition between trustees of reserve land and replacing mandatory standard terms documents with prescribed terms. These provisions of the bill were the subject of discussions through the committee process.

I will begin by discussing the proposed rolling term lease extension amendments. When the framework for rolling term leases was introduced in 2014, the policy intention was that rolling term lease affords lessees the same rights and interests enjoyed under the original lease and the use of lease land is for the same purpose; the term of the extension is not greater than the original lease; an application for extension can only be made once during the last 20 years of the lease term, except where special circumstances exist; the rolling term lease may be extended continuously regardless of how many times it has previously been extended; the extension complies with and is valid under the Commonwealth Native Title Act 1993; and, finally, the extension process does not create a perpetual lease or an exclusive lease.

While this policy intent exists, the current provisions do not clearly allow only one application to be made within the term of a rolling lease or the term of extension that an applicant can apply for. This presents a risk that the legislation could be misinterpreted as allowing multiple applications for extension to be made within a single lease term. Therefore, to remove any risk of confusion and multiple applications, the proposed amendments seek to confirm that a rolling term lease can only be extended once within the current term of the lease and cannot be extended for longer than the original term of the current lease. These amendments will ensure that the rolling term lease provisions are implemented consistently with the original intent of the legislation and validly with regard to native title rights and interests.

During the committee inquiry process, AgForce raised some concerns that allowing a rolling term leaseholder to only apply once for an extension within a single term adversely affects security of tenure, investment and business certainty, as well as the marketability of a lease. This argument is based on the premise that it is beneficial for lessees to always have the maximum number of years ahead of them on their lease—by being able to make multiple or frequent extension applications for reasons such as forward planning, a sale of the lease or for maximising investment certainty. The Queensland government recognises that security of tenure is important for lessees and that it underpins the success and growth of businesses.

I would like to reassure those concerned that there is no risk to the security of tenure currently enjoyed by rolling term leases nor will their existing rights and interests be diminished in any way by these amendments. Since an extension will still commence immediately after the current term of a lease expires, use and occupation of leased land will continue uninterrupted. In addition, the bill does not contemplate imposing any restrictions on the number of times a rolling term lease may be extended, so

the amendments have no effect whatsoever on future lease extensions. For these reasons, security of tenure is assured. However, concerns were raised with the parliamentary committee process and in the committee's report regarding current provisions which restrict applications for rolling term leases to the last 20 years of the lease. The committee formed the view that there was no compelling reason to maintain this restriction and that it should be removed to benefit lessees.

The government has taken this on board, and I will be moving amendments during the consideration in detail stage of the bill so that an application for the extension of a rolling term lease may be made once at any time during the term of the lease. The amendment to be moved would constitute a minor shift in the rolling term lease policy framework that was introduced in 2014. It would involve removing the restriction on applications being made only in the last 20 years of the lease for the benefit of leaseholders.

The government cannot support changes to legislation that would allow additional rolling term lease extension applications to be made within a single term, even if they were to be restricted to certain circumstances. Such an approach would constitute a significant shift from approved policy and the original intent of the legislation which the bill seeks to implement—that is, that the rolling term lease is simply an extension of the term of an existing lease where the rights and interests of the extended lease are no greater than they previously were.

Multiple extensions in the current term would also change the nature of the lease. This would raise broader implications for leasing arrangements and lessees' rights and interests under the Land Act as well as native title rights and interests and compensation issues under the Commonwealth Native Title Act. In its report, the committee has recognised that the amendment which clarifies that only one extension per term may be approved is appropriate under the circumstances.

I would also like to address concerns that the sale value of a lease will be diminished by the extension amendments. I am confident that this will not occur because, as I have mentioned before, security of tenure is not threatened by the amendments. Lessees who seek the maximum level of tenure security still have the option to convert their lease to freehold. The Land Act does not prevent the freeholding of a rolling term lease and the bill does not in any way affect the conversion provisions.

I note that there are no apparent concerns from the tourism sector about the rolling term lease extension amendments, nor about other amendments which expand the rolling term lease provisions to include leases that are located within tidal water land that adjoin tourism rolling term leases. Tourism rolling term lessees will stand to benefit from amendments proposed by the bill which would allow one lease extension at any time during the currency of the term.

Another area of concern has been amendments to the Land Act that relate to the resignation of trustees. The intent of the amendments is to provide for a smoother transition between trustees of reserve land by providing greater opportunity to identify an appropriate replacement trustee prior to a resignation taking effect. The current arrangement of a signed notice of resignation taking effect upon the minister receiving the notice can result in a long gap between a trustee resigning and a new, suitable trustee being appointed. In these situations, problems arise for the practical, day-to-day management of the reserve. Cemeteries and parks are examples of the types of reserves where a loss of trustee would have a strong implication for community use, public health and safety.

The amendments in the bill were designed to minimise such disruptions in the management of reserve land. However, the way in which the policy intent of this reform will be achieved has changed as a result of feedback received from the Local Government Association of Queensland as well as the committee's relevant recommendation. The majority of trustees of reserve land are local governments. The LGAQ has raised concerns around the risk of trustees being prevented from resigning, local governments being discouraged from becoming trustees and the performance of local governments as trustees.

While the local government sector's interpretation of how this reform was originally intended to operate differs from the department's, the concerns raised are valid and have been taken on board. In response, my department has held further discussions with the LGAQ and has identified an alternative approach that will address local government concerns while still achieving the original policy intent of the bill. I will move amendments during the consideration in detail stage of the bill which provide for a notice period when a trustee resigns.

Further Land Act amendments seek to introduce a more streamlined and transparent process for ensuring that the state's requirements are included on secondary interests in state land such as subleases, trustee leases and easements. The state's requirements and interests will be captured as prescribed terms. Prescribed terms will cover matters such as requiring the holders of secondary

interests over state land to have public liability insurance. At present, such terms and conditions are applied through what are called mandatory standard terms documents. They relate to matters such as liability, indemnity and insurance requirements as well as duty of care, environmental protection and management of pests.

The current process via the registration for each individual interest of mandatory standard terms documents is considered inefficient, administratively burdensome and lacking in transparency. Currently, when a sublease, trustee lease or easement is registered, a relevant mandatory standard terms document is also registered against the interest. A unique dealing number is assigned to each registered document. To access the registered mandatory standard terms document for the interest, the customer needs to contact the titles office and request and pay for a search of the register for both the interest and associated mandatory standard terms document. The search is more difficult if the relevant dealing numbers are unknown. Therefore, it is proposed to replace the use of registered mandatory standard terms documents, and instead place relevant terms and conditions in the Land Regulation 2009, which will be referred to as 'prescribed terms'. This approach is similar to regulated conditions currently provided for in the Land Regulation for leases, licences and permits.

The prescribed terms will be based on the existing mandatory standard terms documents but will be more streamlined. They are not intended to impose new obligations on lessees, nor will they prevent lessees from entering into contractual and other commercial arrangements on terms agreed by them. The benefits of this approach are that these terms are more readily accessible by the public, hence improving transparency and ability for parties to know up-front the terms that apply to their tenure, and the use of a more streamlined approach to applying these conditions to particular interests in state land.

As part of the new prescribed terms framework, failure to comply with prescribed terms may lead to remedial action being taken and, ultimately, if this remedial action is not undertaken, the interest being cancelled. The LGAQ has proposed some practical improvements that could be made to the operation of these compliance provisions which relate to ensuring that local government trustees of affected land receive relevant notices and participate in consequent decisions affecting that trust land.

The LGAQ also sought a minor amendment confirming that, where compensation is payable under the prescribed terms framework regarding improvements, it is payable by the state. The committee has supported this approach, recommending that amendments be made to the bill to provide for notices to be given to local government trustees and to make it clear that compensation for the value of lawful improvements such as a building that becomes the property of the state is payable by the state and not local government.

The potential payment of compensation by the state under the prescribed terms framework relates to circumstances where an interest, such as a sublease, is cancelled, and the improvements relating to that sublease such as a marina or some other structure are retained and become the property of the state. It is expected, however, that this liability for compensation would only arise in very limited circumstances—namely, where it is in the public interest for the state to own the improvements.

In response, I will be moving amendments in the consideration in detail stage of the bill to address this matter. I again thank the committee and note the committee's comment that the amendments sought are uncontroversial, which was reflected with only four submissions received. The committee also commented that in general the bill is well drafted. To be clear, the committee has recommended that clauses 24 and 27 of the bill be amended to address concerns of the Local Government Association of Queensland and that section 164C of the Land Act be amended in relation to the timing of an application for an extension of a rolling term lease. The Palaszczuk government accepts these recommendations. I now table the government's response to the committee's report.

Tabled paper: Agriculture and Environment Committee: Report No. 32—Land and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016, government response [485].

To give effect to the recommendations, as outlined earlier, I will be moving a number of amendments at the appropriate time in consideration in detail. The amendments to the bill reflect consultation with the Local Government Association of Queensland in relation to their concerns and further deliberations on the rolling term lease extension application process by the committee. The amendments to be moved will not change the policy objectives of the bill but, rather, the manner in which they are achieved.

Clause 11 will be amended so that section 164C of the Land Act will allow an extension application to be made once during the term of the lease, at any time during each term of the lease. The current restriction that an application for extension can only be made within the last 20 years of the term of the lease, unless special circumstances exist, would no longer apply.

Clause 24 will be amended to provide a notice period when a trustee seeks to resign before the resignation takes effect. This approach replaces the resignation provisions currently in the bill while still supporting the smooth transition from the existing trustee to a replacement trustee.

Clause 27 will be amended to allow trustees of trust land to: firstly, receive relevant notices under the prescribed terms compliance framework; and, secondly, make submissions to the minister in relation to potential actions that may affect the trust land, including in relation to improvements. Additionally, clause 27 will be amended to explicitly state that, where compensation is payable under the prescribed terms compliance framework in relation to improvements, then it is payable by the state. These amendments will improve the transparency and fairness of the prescribed terms noncompliance framework.

I would also like to move other amendments in the bill that are not related to the committee's recommendations and which are outside the long title of the bill. These amendments seek to retrospectively validate the appointment of all relevant statutory office holders and their exercise of powers under the Coal Mining Safety and Health Act 1999, the Mining and Quarrying Safety and Health Act 1999, the Explosives Act 1999 and the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004. These amendments are not intended to interfere with judicial processes and the integrity of the courts, or to validate any improper exercise of statutory powers. Rather, they will merely remove uncertainty about the effect of procedural irregularities in the appointment process on the validity of the appointments and actions.

I will also propose amendments which will resolve a longstanding commercial dispute between QCoal and Glencore by granting a transportation mining lease to Glencore to carry out their operations for a set period of time. These amendments also provide a framework for the QCoal project to go ahead in the manner and in the timeframes that QCoal themselves have proposed as part of the application process. I will be moving some amendments during consideration in detail and I table the explanatory notes to those amendments.

Tabled paper: Land and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016, explanatory notes to Hon. Dr Anthony Lynham's amendments [486].

I commend the bill to the House.

Mr CRIPPS (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (4.21 pm): I rise to respond to the Land and Other Legislation Amendment Bill on behalf of the LNP opposition. The bill was introduced on 29 November 2016 and was referred to the Agriculture and Environment Committee, which reported on 7 March 2017 and recommended that the bill be passed. The bill, as introduced, is uncontroversial in nature, being mostly technical and administrative in its intent. It has not attracted much attention from stakeholders or the general public, and the committee only received four submissions during the course of its consideration of the bill.

The broad policy objective of the bill is to improve the administration of the Land Act and the Land Title Act by implementing a number of miscellaneous amendments. The bill will: make a number of minor amendments to the Land Act and the Land Title Act to reduce duplication, clarify existing arrangements, streamline administration, remedy inconsistencies, remove redundant regulatory requirements and reduce red tape; enable more appropriately managed state land by allowing for the dedication of non-tidal boundary watercourse or non-tidal boundary lake land as a reserve for community purposes in particular circumstances; improve the process for resignation and replacement of a trustee of trust land; effectively deal with documents that impede or delay legitimate legal action taken by other parties, for example, registered mortgagees; improve the registering of interests of trustees for sale and beneficiaries of deceased estates and withdrawing certain instruments from the register; implement in Queensland a nationally consistent priority notice in place of the current settlement notice; and encourage the uptake of electronic conveyancing by expanding the circumstances in which the registrar of titles may dispense with the production of a paper certificate of title.

Other amendments to the Land Act contained in the bill relate to: the granting of land by the state to the Commonwealth; clarifying the use of covenants over non-freehold land; clarifying the extension of rolling term leases; streamlining the subdivision of Indigenous deeds of grant in trust; simplifying the transfer of a road licence tied with freehold land; simplifying standard terms for registrable documents; and streamlining the continuation of an easement when a state lease expires. I would like to make some remarks about three amendments in the bill—namely, facilitating the dedication of non-tidal boundary watercourse or non-tidal boundary lake land as a reserve for community purposes in

particular circumstances; the clarification of the circumstances in which the extension of rolling term leases may occur; and the streamlining of the process to subdivide Indigenous deed of grant in trust land in Indigenous communities.

The first issue is the dedication of non-tidal boundary watercourse or non-tidal boundary lake land as a reserve for community purposes. Some members may recall the minor levels of excitement created by the amendments to the Land Act which appeared in the Major Sports Facilities and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 in relation to the leasing of land within a functioning non-tidal boundary watercourse or lake. Those members who were paying attention to that debate will doubtless remember the House explored the potential for issues to occur in terms of the interaction between the Land Act and the Water Act as they relate to ambulatory boundaries and what that meant for the tenure of leases issued over non-tidal land within a watercourse. I am sorry to say that no real satisfactory answers could be provided to the House by the Treasurer, who was carrying that bill, at the time.

The Palaszczuk government has returned to the House in this bill to create the capacity to dedicate as a reserve land within a non-tidal boundary watercourse or lake land, which would provide further flexibility in the management of the land for community purposes. All of the mechanisms and consultation processes as they relate to adjacent landholders are identical for the creation of a reserve as they are for the issuing of a lease. Even if the Palaszczuk government cannot explain how the potential for issues to occur in terms of the interaction between the Land Act and the Water Act as they relate to ambulatory boundaries and what that meant for the tenure of reserves issued over non-tidal land within a watercourse, at least the uncertainty will be consistent with the uncertainty that we face in terms of the issuing of a lease in the same circumstances.

The second issue that I want to explore in a bit more detail is the clarification of the circumstances in which the extension of a rolling term lease may occur for rural and farming land. The bill proposes to amend the Land Act to clarify the rolling term lease provisions provided for by the former LNP government's rural land reform initiatives delivered in 2014 which were warmly welcomed by rural landholders. The former LNP government's landmark rural land reforms delivered: a more affordable rural leasehold land rent and purchase price regime; the introduction of rolling leases for primary production leases; and a more streamlined approach for converting leasehold land to freehold land. These outstanding reforms were among the most personally satisfying that I was involved with as the former minister for natural resources.

The former LNP government's rural land reforms have certainly driven new opportunities for Queensland's rural landholders. Since the new freeholding arrangements came into place in July 2014 through to December 2016, more than 1,100 applications to freehold grazing or primary production leases across Queensland have been submitted and more than 900 freehold title deeds have since been issued. Instead of asking for the full unimproved capital value of the property, the LNP developed a new purchase price mechanism based on a net present value of revenue methodology which more accurately reflected the Queensland government's residual interest in that leasehold land. This delivered a fairer, more realistic opportunity to freehold land for rural leaseholders, providing more secure property rights and greater confidence to invest in Queensland's agricultural sector. Thanks to the LNP, freeholding is now a viable and more affordable option for farming families in the agricultural sector in Queensland. Those reforms are changing the land tenure profile of regional Queensland involved in the agriculture sector, and that is very satisfying to me personally.

One of the centrepieces of those reforms was the new rolling term lease extensions for rural leases, which achieved significant red-tape reductions via a quicker, more simplified lease renewal process. An eligible lease can now be rolled over by extending the lease, generally by a term equal to the original term of the individual lease. For example, a lease which was originally issued for 30 years but has over the decades had extensions would have its term extended by the original term of 30 years. This is, of course, the maximum period a lease could be extended by without affecting native title rights and interests.

A lessee is now able to apply for an extension at any time in the last 20 years of the term of a lease or at an earlier time if the minister is satisfied that special circumstances exist. This means that a lessee with a 30-year original term lease may apply for an extension after the first 10 years of the lease has passed. The lessee is entitled to the residual balance of the existing lease—in this example 20 years—plus an additional 30 years from the extension, that is achieving tenure security for the subsequent 50 years, an outstanding result for rural term leaseholders who now have some decent security of tenure allowing them to undertake long-term farm business planning.

Clearly the intention of the rural leasehold land reforms implemented by the previous LNP government was that there be no restrictions on the number of times a lease could be extended. The amendments in this bill seek to clarify the amendments contained in that 2014 reform bill in relation to when a rolling term lease can be renewed and the term for which a renewal may be sought by the landholder. When this bill was introduced these particular amendments immediately attracted my attention as a potential attempt to undermine the LNP's 2014 reforms. AgForce also raised concerns about these amendments publicly and in its submission to the parliamentary committee. However, through the committee process it has become clear that the Palaszczuk government did not consult properly with key stakeholders prior to the bill's introduction and failed to effectively communicate its intentions as they relate to these amendments.

Following the committee process and consultation with AgForce, I am satisfied that the amendments are acceptable and do not contravene the spirit of the 2014 LNP government's rural leasehold land reforms. The amendments in this bill clarify that an extension application may be made once during each term of the lease, that is, once during the original term of the rolling term lease and once during the term of each extension. No application to extend a rolling term lease may be made until the lease is within the last 20 years of its term. However, given that the extension will be made with 20 years remaining on the lease and that the extension will be for the original term, generally 30 years, this will still allow rural leasehold landholders to enjoy a 50-year investment horizon on their property and still allow them to undertake that long-term planning for their farm business. As I mentioned before, this is consistent with the intention of our 2014 reforms and so I do not object to this clarification.

However, as I mentioned earlier, the consultation on this amendment has been less than ideal, as the statement of reservation from the LNP MPs on the Agriculture and Environment Committee has pointed out. For example, AgForce noted in their submission that it only became aware of the bill through the committee's alert email once the bill had been introduced into the House. Having heard about the bill from the committee and not from the government, AgForce subsequently made contact with the department to seek information about the bill and in particular clause 12 relating to rolling term leases. As AgForce explained in their submission to the committee, they were not consulted on the bill and found a dearth of information in the explanatory notes accompanying the bill relating to the clarification of when and in what circumstances an application for a rolling term lease may be submitted.

The third issue that I want to explore in more detail is the amendments to remove the need for ministerial approval under the Land Act to approve plans to subdivide Indigenous DOGIT land and to enable such subdivisions to be regulated solely under the Aboriginal Land Act or the Torres Strait Islander Land Act, whichever one applies. I am not concerned about this amendment and recognise that it is a simple and straightforward red-tape-reduction initiative. However, I want to take this opportunity to ask the question and explore the question about whether or not it is likely that this provision will be used in the foreseeable future to help facilitate the creation of freehold land in Indigenous DOGIT communities in Queensland while the Palaszczuk government is in office. Regrettably, there has been a distinct lack of progress made by the Palaszczuk government in relation to the former LNP government's 2014 freeholding initiative for Indigenous land despite Indigenous community leaders continuing to call on the government to deliver freehold to them.

Along with the rural leasehold land reforms I mentioned earlier, delivering to Indigenous Queenslanders the opportunity to own their own home in their local community in freehold for the first time also ranks as one of the reforms that I take great personal pride in as the former minister for natural resources. When the previous LNP government came to office in March 2012, there had been a steady and, some might say, frustratingly slow progression from state control to community control of land associated with Indigenous communities. At that time no Indigenous Queenslanders had been afforded the opportunity to secure property in freehold in their own local communities. The reforms delivered by the former LNP government in 2014 changed that. It created a framework to give Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities the same opportunity to secure freehold title that was available to all other Queensland communities and removed barriers to home ownership and economic development opportunities. The former LNP government's 2014 reforms did not force freehold title on Indigenous Queenslanders in their communities. That bill simply put in place a mechanism to enable the relevant trustees in consultation with their respective communities to choose to make freehold available should they wish to do so.

I have maintained a watching brief on this issue over the past two years and I have been somewhat disappointed that this initiative has not moved forward under the Palaszczuk government. I get the impression that this is not a priority for the Palaszczuk government, that they are lacking in a commitment to support local Indigenous communities to consider the opportunity to make freehold land

available. I have asked a number of questions on notice of the Minister for Natural Resources in March 2015, August 2016 and November 2016 about the Palaszczuk government's commitment to the freeholding option for Indigenous home ownership and the progress of the trial in a number of pilot communities. Notwithstanding the answers to those questions on notice indicating support for the trial and for trustees of DOGIT land being able to make freehold land available in communities with the consent of the community, there have been no outcomes from that trial process after more than two years. While I recognise that the individual communities must agree, it is all too convenient for the government to just say that the ball is in their court. I would suggest that the government needs to support those communities to be able to make those historic decisions, to work through those important steps that need to be made prior to freehold land being made available and prior to the amendments in this bill being accessed to actually subdivide the DOGIT land that would be made available for freehold title.

If the Indigenous communities selected for the trial in January 2015 are not making any progress towards making freehold land available, then perhaps the government should consider making the opportunity available to other DOGIT communities which might be more enthusiastic. I noted with interest a recent call by the mayor of Palm Island for freehold land to be made available in his community. That is an unsolicited expression of interest in this opportunity and one which the government should give urgent consideration to. I was very interested to listen to the ministerial statement by the Minister for Natural Resources earlier today in which he advised the House about the progress or, rather, the lack of progress that has been made in terms of the freeholding trials in Indigenous communities on DOGIT land.

The minister advised the House that the department had spent the last two years learning lessons, but he did not provide any specific details about what progress has been made. The mayor of Palm Island earlier this month was quoted in an article in the *Courier-Mail* warning that remote Indigenous communities would remain dysfunctional without being able to secure economic opportunities and demanded that the Queensland government get serious about land tenure reform. Mayor Lacey said, 'Land tenure reform is something we need to be seriously looking at, because if we are talking about economic participation then the current land title in our community does not allow us to fully expose ourselves to proper economic participation.'

I could not agree more with Mayor Lacey in relation to this particular issue, and I urge the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines and the Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships to be more proactive and use the landmark reforms delivered by the former LNP government to get things moving in communities like Palm Island, where there is clearly an appetite for this to occur. There must not be any further delays to providing opportunities to people in Indigenous communities in Queensland to own their own homes in freehold.

I turn now to the amendments circulated by the Minister for Natural Resources this afternoon. In relation to those amendments that respond to the recommendations of the report by the Agriculture and Environment Committee, I welcome the adoption by the government of those recommendations and the circulation of the corresponding amendments. Two other amendments have been circulated by the minister relating to a number of resource industry safety acts and to the Mineral Resources Act for particular purposes. These amendments relate to much more substantial issues and notice of these proposed amendments has been relatively short, as they have only been circulated prior to question time this afternoon. The opposition is currently giving consideration to these amendments and their implications for the resources sector in Queensland.

In principle, I am always concerned about amendments that come to the House seeking to validate previous decisions by statutory office holders. There are circumstances when such validation amendments are required, and I acknowledge that. However, it makes me even more concerned that these particular validation amendments seek to validate decisions in relation to a number of resource industry safety acts.

All members, but particularly members who have previously held ministerial responsibility for resource industry safety legislation, feel the very real responsibility of ensuring that those pieces of legislation are administered carefully and robustly to ensure that the people of Queensland who work in the resources sector are safe at all times while they are at work. I listened carefully to the explanation by the Minister for Mines when he gave notice of his intention to move those amendments outside the long title of the bill during his second reading debate contribution. Given the limited opportunity I have had to peruse the substance of those amendments, I may reserve my rights while I take the opportunity to study them further.

The other amendments that have been foreshadowed by the Minister for Mines outside the long title of this bill relate to amendments to the Mineral Resources Act in an attempt to resolve what the minister has described as a long-running dispute between two resource companies in Central Queensland. In the same way as the proposed amendments to the resource industry safety acts have only been circulated recently, the proposed amendments by the minister relating to these two companies in Central Queensland have only been circulated relatively recently, and the LNP reserves its right to consider the implications of these amendments further.

In the same way as I am always very cautious of amendments that seek to validate previous decisions of statutory office holders, can I also say that in principle I am always rather concerned about amendments that come to the House which name individual resource tenures in legislation rather than providing for the framework of the administration of those resource tenures at large. It always seems to me that, when a government has to bring an amendment bill to the House that specifically names an individual resource tenure, the House should be particularly cautious about the reasons why that has had to occur. I would warn all members that they should give particular attention to the potential impact of this amendment and why the government and the Minister for Mines has found it necessary to bring this amendment to the parliament which specifically names a resource tenure in the amendments.

Given that these amendments, which will be moved outside the long title of the bill, have come to the House relatively recently and we have had the benefit of the minister's second reading debate, as I indicated earlier, the LNP opposition will be taking the opportunity between now and the consideration in detail stage to consider their potential impact on the Queensland resources sector.

Mrs GILBERT (Mackay—ALP) (4.46 pm): I rise to contribute to the Land and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. I would like to thank my fellow members on the Agriculture and Environment Committee and the committee's support staff—Rob Hansen, Paul Douglas and Joanne Walther—for their work.

The policy objectives of the bill are achieved through minor amendments to streamline the Land Act and the Land Title Act; for example, in relation to wills registered in another jurisdiction. The significant amendments to the two acts will: allow the dedication of a non-tidal boundary watercourse or lake as reserves for community purposes; expand the purpose for which a rolling term lease can be designated and clarify the process for the extension of a rolling term lease; replace the current settlement notice provisions in the Land Title Act with a system of priority notice consistent with that adopted by other Australian jurisdictions; repeal existing mandatory standard term documents and provide for their replacement via regulation; dispense with the requirement for the production of a paper certificate of title if the Registrar of Titles is satisfied that the certificate is held by a legal practitioner; and amend the provisions governing the vacation of office by trustees to ensure that the state's interests are preserved. This bill's passage will meet time frames for implementation in Queensland of a nationally consistent priority notice agreed to by the Australian Registrars' National Electronic Conveyancing Council.

The committee consulted with the Queensland Law Society, the Local Government Association of Queensland, the Department of Natural Resources and Mines and AgForce Queensland. The committee recommended that the bill be passed with three other amendments. As a signatory of COAG, Queensland has agreed to work towards national consistency in conveyancing processes to support the uptake of electronic conveyancing, commonly known as e-conveyancing. This will enable the digital creation and lodgement of land dealings such as mortgages and transfers directly into the land registers of participating jurisdictions via an online national hub.

The work carried out under the COAG agreement will see Queensland's settlement notice renamed a priority notice, with some alignments and additional features to align to a nationally consistent process across jurisdictions, and supports the uptake of e-conveyancing. These notices will still be able to be lodged with Queensland's existing e-lodgement, and paper versions will also still be able to be lodged. The Law Society broadly supports the conversion to e-conveyancing. It had a concern about the misuse of lodging of priority notices. The department reported that lodgement would be made by a person who is a party to a transaction or arrangement which is intended to result in lodgement of an instrument under the Land Title Act.

The LGAQ reported concern with amendments that remove a council's ability to resign without condition or restriction regarding vacation of office by a trustee. The LGAQ believes there would be trustees not fulfilling their duties as a reluctant trustee. An amendment to clause 24 is proposed so that the resignation of a trustee of a reserve occurs on a date agreed between the minister and the trustee;

nominated by the minister; or 12 months from the date the resignation is given to the minister, whichever is the earlier. The provisions are needed so that reserves are not left without management. This would be, for example, cemeteries and showgrounds. When a resignation is made overnight, services in communities can be left hanging without management. This would be unacceptable in the case of a cemetery, where a family may be prevented from carrying out a burial.

The LGAQ's other concern related to the clarity of local government trustees and the payment of compensation when a notice to remedy or notice to cancel interest is issued; a decision is made regarding the registration of a document; or the owner of improvements on a lot applies to the minister to remove the improvements. The department has stated that the compensation payable under the proposed section 321K is implicitly the responsibility of the state.

AgForce raised issues with rolling leases. These are leases that cannot be converted to freehold. It reported that 50 per cent of the state is currently under a rolling lease of one type or another. It is seeking an outcome for leases that will not reduce the market value of the pastoral lease and the equity and liquidity of the pastoral business. The value of the lease affects the lessee's ability to negotiate with their financial institution or to sell their lease in a profitable way. Lessees need to be able to renew their leases so that they can maximise the number of years ahead of them in the lease. This gives the lease its greatest monetary value. Ms Hewitt from AgForce also flagged the need for flexibility to renew a lease in situations of family succession. Having the maximum number of years is important in this case for refinancing by those family members. The amendments flagged by the minister should meet the needs of the holders of pastoral leases, allowing the lessees to renew the lease at least once at any time during the term of the lease.

The bill will also allow for community purpose reserves to be created within non-tidal watercourses for very specific purposes with the support of the chief executive under the Water Act 2000. This enables activities such as camping and the protection of cultural artefacts to be appropriately managed when they occur in areas such as riverbanks and boundaries of lakes. The Land Act currently makes it clear that you can have tenure within the tidal boundaries of a watercourse but not the non-tidal. The bill clarifies the process for local governments to have community purpose reserves within the bed and banks of a non-tidal watercourse. This will allow regions like Mackay to make good use of their natural assets for the community to enjoy. In my area, camping and bushwalking are most popular. I commend the bill to the House.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (4.54 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate of the Land and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I note that this bill mostly relates to improvements with the administration of the Land Act and the Land Title Act. I also note that the committee recommended the bill be passed. However, I note the statement of reservation to the committee report. It is interesting to note the apparent lack of consultation on the changes proposed by the bill. It is disappointing that the peak industry group AgForce had to proactively seek out the government to find out what changes were proposed. That group has a vested interest in any upset of the significant changes made by the shadow minister when he was a minister in relation to rolling term leases, which are vitally important to the state's pastoralists. Any changes affecting the extensions or the eligibility would have implications for their operations and of course their viability. I thank the LNP committee members who put in the work in relation to the bill inquiry. It was obviously needed, given the lack of information that, at least at the very beginning, was flowing from the minister's department.

One section of the bill serves to clarify the provisions of rolling term leases. As the shadow minister pointed out, we were all justifiably very concerned—not only us but also all of the pastoralists who would have been affected by this—that the Labor Party was again attempting to target landholders and that it may have been proposing changes to the rolling term lease provisions introduced by the LNP government in May 2014—landmark amendments and changes that needed to be made.

As I said in May 2014, the strategies we implemented were the most substantial land reform measures in a generation—reforms that improved lease security for landholders. For years this issue was completely ignored by Labor governments. The reforms delivered by the LNP government for landholders across this great state were very much overdue.

Land tenure security will always be one of the most important issues facing farmers and graziers across Queensland. Approximately 60 per cent of Queensland is state government leasehold estate. This equates to approximately 6,500 term and perpetual leases used for agriculture, grazing or pastoral purposes. It also includes around 60 offshore island tourism leases.

In my electorate of Nanango, security of land tenure is and always will be a key issue. The reforms made by the LNP in government allow those people to sleep easier at night. Many of the primary producers in my electorate have chosen to lease state land for grazing purposes, using this land as agistment blocks during dry times, as prime fattening country or as a way to grow their cattle herd numbers. Lease blocks are a part of our primary producers' business plans, and many use this leasehold land as a good way to grow their businesses without making major freehold property purchases.

When a primary producer is unsure of their land tenure security, naturally they are less likely to invest in property and it can be extremely difficult to plan for the future. Under the LNP's important changes, certain rural leases now enjoy 60 years of rolling tenure, allowing property managers to make long-term investment decisions and providing them greater negotiating power when negotiating with, most importantly, their banks.

Just last night in this House we talked about the need for good working relationships between banks and property owners whilst they are running their businesses. This is just another way that enables those landholders to be able to negotiate in good faith knowing that they have security of tenure over their land. The reforms introduced a simpler renewal process, effectively reducing assessment times from years to a matter of weeks. The change in just that alone has had a resounding effect for many business owners who own this land. Imagine going from taking years and years—and that is what it was taking under a Labor government—to just weeks under those changes. I again thank the member for Hinchinbrook for those landmark reforms. It is such a great way forward for the landholders of Queensland to know that they have that security of tenure.

In 2014 AgForce noted that the reforms were 'an excellent step in the right direction of delivering tenure security and will offer a cheap and simplified renewal process for rural leaseholders'. It is this type of reform that the LNP government was doing throughout our term in office. It was this type of reform keeping people on the land. It was this type of reform that proved that only the LNP stands up for the agricultural industry in Queensland. It is only the LNP that stands up and protects the property rights of landholders across Queensland. It is only the LNP that brings in these types of reforms that enable the agricultural industry to grow and to benefit if we look at our terms of trade and the trade figures from the last quarter and last year because of the groundwork that was set up by the LNP government. These types of reforms help create positive feelings in an industry which was largely ignored by Labor, and it has also of course been hit by floods and more recently drought. We know that these reforms have allowed our graziers and our farmers to get on with the job of putting food on our tables rather than sitting in their offices and filling out paperwork.

In the short time I have remaining I want to touch on the other great land tenure reform that we introduced when we were in government, and that was enabling Indigenous—

Mr POWER: I rise to a point of order. In all this time we have yet to have any relevance to the Land and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. This has all been about the 2014 bill. Can it be relevant to the bill?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: That just goes to show how out of touch this Labor government is.

Mr POWER: No, it goes to show that you do not know the standing orders.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Thank you. There has been a point of order. There is no point of order. Please continue, member for Nanango.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: This goes to show how out of touch this incompetent Labor government is. It has no clue that the legislation before this House is about rolling term leases. How embarrassing for this incompetent Labor government to not even have a clue what its legislation is about! This legislation is about rolling term leases. The legislation is about giving landholders security of tenure. How embarrassing for this incompetent Labor government, which flatly refused to support the agricultural industry in Queensland.

Mr Seeney: The member for Logan is an embarrassment every day.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I take that interjection from the honourable member for Callide: the member for Logan is an embarrassment.

In the short time that I have left in relation to this bill and Indigenous communities, the effect of the LNP's legislation was to enable those Indigenous communities like Cherbourg to be able to freehold. I call on the Labor government—just like the shadow minister did—to hurry up and effect these reforms.

Two years later and still this incompetent Labor government has done absolutely nothing to enable the good people of Cherbourg to be able to freehold their land. The question remains: what is this government doing? All it is doing is reviewing. That is simply not doing anything. As the shadow minister said, the people in our Indigenous communities were rejoicing when the LNP put those reforms in place and I would ask the minister to explain what the hold-up is in terms of those reforms enabling them to freehold their land. Those opposite might think that is funny—

(Time expired)

Mr POWER (Logan—ALP) (5.04 pm): Unlike the last speaker, I rise to actually speak about the Land and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. Unlike the last speaker, who obviously dug their speech from 2014 out of their drawer, I actually have read the legislation that we are debating today and it is an embarrassment that they could not make one reference to the legislation that is actually before the House, that they could not put the effort in to understanding the legislation that we are actually addressing but instead pulled out of the drawer the same speech they gave in 2014, patting themselves on the back without recognising the legislation that is actually before the House.

I note the effort of the committee that examined this bill—not the 2014 bill, for which I am sure there was a good committee, but that is not the bill that we are debating today. I acknowledge the chair, Joe Kelly—the chair of the committee that examined this bill—and the deputy chair, Pat Weir. Neither of them were in the House in 2014, but they have been addressing this bill, not the 2014 bill. I especially want to thank Joe Kelly, who has spoken to me extensively about the bill and the work of the committee. Thanks should also go to the committee secretariat that supported the consideration of this bill and the production of this report. I want to note the four organisations that made submissions to this bill in 2016—the Local Government Association of Queensland, AgForce, the Property Council of Australia and the Queensland Law Society. These are peak bodies not affected by such things as rolling term leases, but we should recognise that some of those peak bodies are partners in giving us feedback. I also want to thank the representatives from the Department of Natural Resources and Mines who provided briefings on this bill. The bill amends the Land Act 1994 and the Land Title Act 1994.

The management of land and land titles can raise issues of great dispute in our community and it is important to get the acts behind these things right. The bill allows for the designation of watercourses, as has been discussed, or lakes as reserves and aligns Queensland's title registry system with that of other jurisdictions. It also makes minor improvements to the operation of the acts. The bill makes significant amendments to two acts, including allowing the dedication of non-tidal boundary watercourses or lakes as reserves, but only for community purposes; extending the purposes for which a rolling term lease can be designated and clarifying the process for extension of rolling term leases; replacing the current settlement notice provisions in the Land Title Act with a system of priority notices consistent with that adopted by other Australian jurisdictions; repealing existing mandatory standard term documents and providing for their replacement via regulation; dispensing with the requirement for the production of a paper certificate of title if the Registrar of Titles is satisfied that the certificate is held by a legal practitioner, and that is of course in alignment with other processes we use for the transfer of title; amending the provisions governing the vacation of office by trustees to ensure that the state's interests are preserved; and removing the requirement for ministerial approval under the Land Act for subdivision of Indigenous land held under deed of grant in trust titles, allowing the subdivision to occur purely under the Aboriginal Land Act or the Torres Strait Islander Land Act 1991.

The committee noted the concerns raised by the LGAQ in relation to local government trustees being able to resign as the trustees of lands held in trust. The LGAQ advised that this provision may make it less likely for local governments to accept reserve land to be held in trust. To address this issue, the committee recommended that clause 24 of the bill be amended, and I am glad the government has accepted this recommendation. The LGAQ also raised concerns in relation to the drafting of section 321K, stating that this could be interpreted to mean that a trustee is obliged to pay compensation for the cancellation of a document rather than the state. The department accepted the recommendation to address this drafting issue and to clarify that the payment is implicitly the responsibility of the state.

I now turn to issues relating to rolling term leases—an issue which the last speaker referred to but not in relation to this bill but only the 2014 bill. I wish to thank AgForce for making a submission to the bill and appearing before the committee. I notice that the member for Hinchinbrook also mentioned the submissions that were made. I note the concerns raised by AgForce and its desire to create greater flexibility to rolling term leases to provide the greatest time possible for a lease to be granted. That is important, because, in the view of AgForce, a longer term lease allows a leaseholder a greater capacity to gain better terms when borrowing money and greater certainty when planning farm businesses.

Yesterday, we debated the banking system and how, in some cases, the inflexibility of banks and their failure to understand local practices means that we need to be able to give greater certainty. Although that is an important objective, as noted by the department, it has to be balanced against the obligations contained in the Native Title Act. The Department of Natural Resources and Mines gave the advice that the capacity to bank future leases beyond one term could potentially be incompatible with the Native Title Act. That is a concern. We know that we have to work in accordance with the Native Title Act. As such, I can understand the position of the government and the department in allowing only one renewal during the term of a lease.

However, I note that members of the committee asked why the last 20 years before the expiry of a lease was the standard period in which a lease could be renewed. The member for Greenslopes asked the committee secretariat to provide definitive advice about where this particular number of years had come from. There was not any detail about why the 20 years had been set. The committee acknowledged the desire of AgForce, and the farmers they represent, for greater certainty. After consideration of this matter, the committee recommended to remove this 20-year limit. That means that, for example, for a 30-year rolling lease leaseholders would be able to make application for a new lease in the first year of their lease, thus giving them a total of perhaps 59 years of guaranteed leasehold. Of course, after those 30 years, there is the option to again apply to renew the lease. That would allow for an option to renew after 29 years. That is a significant improvement on the current arrangement. I am told that the majority of leaseholders have a 30-year lease. I note that the minister has acknowledged that he would accept this recommendation from the committee. As the minister said, multiple further leases cannot be granted in the one period. It is important to maintain the status of leases as well as provide greater certainty.

I also note the statement of reservation put forward by the non-government members. They raised a number concerns about various aspects of the bill. The deputy chair suggested recommendations to address those concerns. AgForce and the LGAQ raised concerns about the bill, which were heard by the committee, and good recommendations were developed and supported. I note that the last speaker made the accusation that the government was not open, consultative or transparent. This very process of the committee listening to the concerns of the opposition members of the committee and the key stakeholders about this bill should be commended by this House. I invite non-government members to put forward recommendations to both the committees that I serve on and the Agriculture and Environment Committee in the future.

In my discussions with the member for Greenslopes I was told that the committee worked very well in its consideration of this bill. Through that process, this legislation has been strengthened. This bill achieves the objectives that were set out. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr WEIR (Condamine—LNP) (5.13 pm): As a member of the Agriculture and Environment Committee, I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Land and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. This is the first bill that the committee has considered since I have been a member. Previously, I was a member of the Finance and Administration Committee. During the entire time I was a member of that committee it never considered any legislation relating to agriculture—until it considered the bills that were debated last night. They related to agriculture and were referred to that committee. It was a pleasure to speak to them last night. I realised that it was remiss of me to not acknowledge the other members of the Finance and Administration Committee over the two years that I was a member of that committee. As I look around the chamber, I can see a few of the members of that committee. It was a great committee to be a member of. I thoroughly enjoyed being a member of that committee. The research director and the staff of that committee do a fantastic job. Last night, I did not acknowledge them, so I wanted to correct that today.

The minister, Dr Anthony Lynham, in his role as the Minister for Natural Resources introduced the Land and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 into the House on 29 November 2016. That bill was referred to the Agriculture and Environment Committee with a report date of 7 March. On the face of it, this bill was merely tidying up some loose ends and providing a little more clarity to aspects of the legislation. The examination of this bill by the committee should have been quite a simple process. However, owing to a complete lack of consultation with the relevant stakeholders impacted by these amendments, this proved not to be the case and the examination of this bill required much more of the committee's time than should have been necessary.

The Local Government Association raised concerns about the amendments in this bill relating to the resignation of trustees. This amendment to the Land Act means that the resignation of a trustee would take effect at the point that the minister accepts it. The amendment also sets out the criteria for the acceptance of a resignation. Currently, the resignation takes effect upon receipt by the minister.

This amendment can result in a significant period of time between the resignation taking effect and when the trustee is replaced. An indication of the lack of consultation on this amendment was summed up by the LGAQ during the public hearing as follows—

... these amendments did come out of left field and we have not seen any systemic issue to justify a seemingly heavy-handed regulatory response.

The LGAQ suggested that there should be a compulsory notice period prior to a resignation taking place, as this amendment may tie local government trustees to their function for the state potentially against their will. The department has advised that it is holding discussions with the LGAQ to ensure that there is a smooth transition from one trustee to another. I notice that that is contained in one of the amendments that the minister has pre-empted.

The LGAQ also expressed concern about the amendments relating to the provision of notices to cancel, stating—

It is noted that the Minister, not the local government trustee, gives the notice to remedy and the notice of cancellation. To support transparency and accountability, the LGAQ recommends the notice provisions be expanded to ensure a copy of the notice to remedy and the notice of intent to cancel is given to the local government trustee, not just to the lessee/permittee.

The department has undertaken to discuss the matter further with the LGAQ. The LGAQ is concerned that the payment of any compensation is not clearly drafted and could be interpreted as meaning that the trustee is obligated to pay compensation for the cancellation of a document rather than the state. The department stated that compensation payable is implicitly the responsibility of the state and will discuss the matter with the LGAQ. One would say that that should have been done long before the bill was drafted. We are still in negotiations to finalise these matters. There was a lot of confusion over them. The LGAQ was very unimpressed with the process and were asking a lot of questions.

Clause 39 of the bill replaces the current system of settlement notices with priority notices. These have substantially the same function of preventing the registration of an instrument affecting a lot, or an interest in a lot, until the notice lapses, or is withdrawn, removed or cancelled. The system of priority notices has been adopted by the Australian Registrars' National Electronic Conveyancing Council and has already been taken up by most of the other states.

The Queensland Law Society expressed concern around the possible misuse of priority notices to frustrate the rights of other parties and gave the example of 'a prospective buyer during negotiations to gain a tactical advantage over the owner and other prospective buyers or by an owner attempting to frustrate the exercise of power of sale by a mortgagee'. In response, the registrar stated that the likelihood of misuse was low going on previous experience. If someone is going to use something mischievously they can use the words as they stand now for a settlement notice. This was yet another example of the lack of consultation. This should have been all done prior to the drafting of the bill, not after. I was quite astounded that the Queensland Law Society had so many questions regarding this bill. I would have thought that they would have been part of the drafting of this bill from the beginning to the end, but they were still asking questions during the committee process.

Another example of the lack of consultation was in regard to the amendments to the rolling term leases. It was the former minister for natural resources, Andrew Cripps, who finally gave some certainty to the many landholders who rely on rolling term leases. We have already heard from some speakers how many there are in Queensland. Any amendments to those introduced during the last term of government were always going to be viewed with a great deal of suspicion and concern. The fact that Minister Lynham did not consult with the peak agriculture body, AgForce, immediately raised concern and suspicion. If there is one thing that gets an ag body's antennas up it is no consultation. As we have heard, they only became aware of these amendments when the committee sent out a notice for submissions. That is very poor consultation indeed.

This amendment once again took a lot of the committee's time because of this lack of consultation. Let us have a look at these amendments and what caused this deep suspicion. As the legislation currently stands, a rolling term lease may be extended by the approval of the minister. A leaseholder may apply for an extension of a rolling term lease at any time in the last 20 years of the 30 years of the lease or at an earlier time approved by the minister if the minister is satisfied special circumstances exist.

Clause 11 will, if adopted, amend this subsection to provide that only one application for extension may be made during each term of the lease, including terms granted by extension of the original lease. That is, one application may be made during the original term, one during the term of an extension and one in a subsequent extension and so forth.

Clause 12 amends section 164E(2)(a) of the Land Act to provide that an extension may not be granted for a period longer than the original duration of the lease. AgForce stated that the lack of consultation led to concerns that the proposed amendments would limit the number of times that a lease may be renewed and the reasoning behind the changes. Lauren Hewitt from AgForce stated—

Back in December or November when the bill was first put forward, I approached the department, just to see if there was any logic and to ask why. They did get back to me with an explanation of how it would operate. I am aware of the mechanics of how it will operate; I just do not understand the reason. Is there some frivolous or serial litigant or pest who is going for renewals or something? There might very well be a valid reason, but not in the explanatory notes and not that I have received in a response to date.

For various reasons a landowner may wish to apply for renewal of their lease earlier than the last 20 years prescribed in this amendment. This was of some concern to landowners. These reasons could range from a landowner wishing to refinance or transfer title because of a change in family partnership or to invest in some permanent infrastructure on that property, such as dams, water, sheds, et cetera. The flexibility to renew is very important for future lending and security. Under questioning from the committee, the department stated that the reasoning for the amendment was to prevent banking of leases possibly triggering native title issues. The department stated that to allow multiple applications in the current term would change the nature of the lease, with broader implications under the Land Act as well as native title rights and interest and compensation under the Native Title Act. Under the proposed amendments a lease renewed at the end of 10 years would give a 50-year lease, as was the intent in the bill. The fear is if a lease was able to be renewed again in the same term it would possibly give a landholder an extra 30 years and possibly be challenged as serving the same purpose as a perpetual lease and trigger native title compensation.

It took about three visits from the department to finally get what the purpose of these amendments was. That has not happened in Queensland. There has never been any case of banking. We were told during the hearings that in the Northern Territory it has happened. There is a landowner in the Northern Territory who did bank a lease and is now in the Federal Court facing native title compensation. When that was explained thoroughly to the members of AgForce they became aware of the implications. Nobody wants to see a landowner dragged to the Federal Court for simply trying to protect their interests. As I said earlier, it is very important to have those leases as long as you can so it is only natural that they will take the extension that is possible. In a family business, which I grew up in, there are many times that you need to review your financing and partnerships. There are a lot of changes. Also there are natural disasters and so forth. If you need to refinance with the banks then the longer the term of lease you have in front of you the better negotiating position you are in. That is why there was such concern that this may impact on the ability to renew a lease.

There was concern that whilst a person could apply for their next term in the last 20 years, because some of these situations arise they wanted the opportunity to reapply at any stage in that 30 years—say, inside that first 10 years. The department stated that there are special circumstances that exist for that, but predominantly they have been for commercial interests and not in the rural area. The minister might address that when he sums up at the end because that was a concern and it was felt that it was not fully clarified, which was a bit of a pattern throughout the whole hearing.

The committee is satisfied that landholders' rights are protected, but if the amendments were formulated with the involvement of those most likely to be impacted it would have saved the committee and all involved a lot of time and concern. As other members of the committee know, we spoke to the department the day before we were to table the report. It really dragged out and time got very, very tight at the end. It was completely unnecessary. It was only because so many of those who were involved and impacted were not fully across it. It created a lot of extra work for the committee.

The shadow minister spoke about non-tidal reserves. I am glad he gets so much excitement out of the subject, because I must say it did not generate the same excitement in the committee. The department explained that this is for reserves that are used by the community and that may be along rivers or lakes, so that they can be serviced and maintained. That ability is not there at the moment. As we have heard, the legislation allows for the dispensing of paper certificates of title if they are held by a legal practitioner. In this day and age of electronics, that is only fair and reasonable. It caused no concern to the committee.

As I said, this should have been a very straightforward committee inquiry. However, it dragged on and took so much time simply because of a lack of consultation and a lack of understanding by the bodies that are immediately impacted. I note the member for Gregory will be speaking on behalf of his area, as will the member for Warrego, as leases are a massive part of those areas. Interference with

them in any way, shape or form raises immediate suspicion and distrust. People need to have the confidence to work and develop their land and to use it in the most productive way possible. It is very understandable that they are so concerned about any amendments to the legislation.

Mr MADDEN (Ipswich West—ALP) (5.31 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Land and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. The policy objective of the bill is to improve the administration of the Land Act 1994 and the Land Title Act 1994. In his first reading speech, the minister asked that the bill be referred to the Agriculture and Environment Committee, of which I am a member. For its review of the bill, the committee wrote to all stakeholders inviting submissions, sought briefings from the Department of Natural Resources and Mines, held a public hearing on 15 February 2017, and sought further written advice from the Department of Natural Resources and Mines regarding issues raised in submissions and issues of fundamental legislative principle.

In its report No. 32 to the 55th Parliament, the Agriculture and Environment Committee made four recommendations: firstly, that the Land and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 be passed; secondly, that clause 24 of the bill be amended in accordance with the recommendations of the Local Government Association of Queensland to remove the proposed amendments and instead require a notice period between the receipt of a resignation by the minister and the resignation taking effect; thirdly, that the bill provide for a provision of notices to local government trustees under proposed sections 321E, 321G, 321H and 321J and to alter the wording of proposed section 321K to make it clear that compensation is payable by the state and not by local government; and finally, that section 164C(5) of the Land Act 1994 be amended to permit holders of rolling term leases to make one single application for extension at any point during the term of the lease.

As the minister outlined in his first reading speech on 29 November 2016, the bill allows for the introduction of e-conveyancing and includes the current settlement notice mechanism to be replaced with a nationally recognised consistent priority notice. The current system of settlement notices has been in place since it was inserted in the Land Title Act in 1994. It was instituted to provide statutory protection for purchasers and financiers under a contract of sale between the time of settlement and the time of lodgement of documents with the Registrar of Titles. Approximately 70,000 settlement notices are lodged with the registry each year. However, it seems that the system operates smoothly, having never arisen as an issue in the multiple rounds of amendments to the Land Title Act.

The bill replaces the current system of settlement notices set out in part 7A of the Land Title Act with this new system of priority notices. These have substantially the same function, which is to prevent the registration of an instrument affecting a lot or an interest in a lot until the notice lapses or is withdrawn, removed or cancelled. This priority notice enables a person intending to purchase land or take a mortgage to prevent registration of other dealings occurring on the land until their contract has been completed and titling documents registered. The introduction of priority notices is supported by the members of the Australian Registrars' National Electronic Conveyancing Council, of which the Queensland Registrar of Titles is a member. The move to e-conveyancing will support the state's steps towards fostering a digital economy.

The bill will also make a number of minor amendments to the Land Act and the Land Title Act that will reduce duplication, clarify existing arrangements, streamline administration, remedy inconsistencies, remove redundant regulatory requirements and improve the customer's experience by reducing red tape. The Land Title Act 1994 is the primary governing instrument for the registration of freehold land in Queensland. Under the Torrens title system, which has been in use in Queensland since 1861, this is the basis of claims to landownership in our state. The core of the Torrens system is that transference of landownership is given effect not when an instrument is executed by the parties but when the instrument is registered by an office of the state.

The bill predominantly makes minor amendments aimed at streamlining the use of the Land Title Act and the Land Act. Both of those acts are amended to grant executors of a will registered in another jurisdiction equal status to those of one registered in Queensland. The bill allows for the dedication of non-tidal boundary watercourses or lakes as reserves for community purposes. It also expands the purpose for which a rolling term lease can be designated and clarifies the process for the extension of rolling term leases. The bill dispenses with the requirement for the production of a paper certificate of title if the Registrar of Titles is satisfied that the certificate is held by a legal practitioner.

A further amendment to the land titling legislation is aimed at ensuring that caveats are used appropriately when lodged by registered owners in dispute with a mortgagee. Another amendment clarifies that any compensation arising from the improper use of a caveat is to be paid by the person

claiming an interest in the land and not a legal practitioner lodging the caveat on that person's behalf. The bill will also deal with improving the process for registration and replacement of a trustee of land. It removes the requirement for ministerial approval under the Land Act for subdivision of Indigenous land held under a deed of grant in trust, allowing the subdivision to occur purely under the Aboriginal Land Act 1991 or the Torres Strait Islander Land Act 1991.

Rolling term leases have been a periodic feature of Australian real estate law since the 1840s. Leases over state land are issued for a specific purpose such as grazing, agriculture, sport, tourism or telecommunications. Those leases are generally for terms of up to 30 years. The Land Act provides for rolling term leases for agriculture, grazing and pastoral purposes and for all term leases issued for tourism purposes located on declared offshore islands. A rolling term lease may be extended by approval of the minister. Alternatively, a leaseholder may apply for the extension of a rolling term lease at any time in the last 20 years of the term of the lease or at an earlier time if approved by the minister, as long as the minister is satisfied that special circumstances exist.

The Agriculture and Environment Committee recommend in its report that the Land Act 1994 be amended to permit leaseholders of rolling term leases the ability to make one single application for an extension of the lease at any point during the term of the lease. As Ms Lauren Hewitt, General Manager Policy AgForce Queensland, stated at the public hearing on 15 February 2017—

> What people generally would try to do is build into their leases the maximum number of years ahead of them. They might seek to renew early. Often we would urge them to seek to renew early, even before the last 20 per cent or 20 years of their lease, to try to build up, particularly in the instance of a sale, the number of years ahead of them. We think that is a perfectly valid thing for people to do.

As to the amendment concerning Glencore and QCoal's longstanding commercial dispute, the proposed amendment is necessary and in the best interests of the state. As to the other amendment concerning the appointment of authorised officers in the Department of Natural Resource and Mines, it has recently emerged that a particular authorised officer in the Department of Natural Resources and Mines may not have been validly appointed. After discovering the officer's invalid appointment, the Department of Natural Resources and Mines carried out a review of the appointment of all inspectors, inspection officers and authorised officers under the mining, petroleum and explosives safety legislation. The review has highlighted that there is uncertainty as to the validity of some appointments which stems from the same and similar defects in the appointment procedure. The proposed amendment will remove this uncertainty.

In closing, I would like to thank my fellow members of the Agriculture and Environment Committee—members past and present—the committee secretariat and the submitters. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr MILLAR (Gregory—LNP) (5.41 pm): I can just feel the enthusiasm in the House when it comes to talking about this bill tonight. Everybody is hanging on every word as we talk about the Land and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. There is absolute enthusiasm for this. On everybody's lips is the question: what is next? This is fantastic.

It gives me great pleasure to talk about the Land and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. What we are talking about is something that is incredibly important to the people in the seat of Gregory, Warrego, Condamine, Hinchinbrook and Mount Isa. What we are talking about is fundamental property rights and protecting the fundamental property rights of primary producers.

The bill amends the Land Act 1994 and the Land Title Act 1994 to allow for the designation of watercourses or lakes as reserves, align Queensland's tidal registry system with that of other jurisdictions and make minor changes to improve the operation of the acts. One thing I will talk about when it comes to this bill is the consultation undertaken by the department and the government or, should I say, the lack of consultation undertaken by the department and the government with one of our key agricultural groups, AgForce. I was not surprised because it has happened before in this term of government where AgForce has not been consulted, has not been brought to the table and has not been allowed to communicate. We saw that when it came to the vegetation management laws that the Labor Party wanted to introduce. I will talk about that a little later.

The bill predominantly makes minor amendments aimed at streamlining the use of the Land Act and the Land Title Act. For example, provisions throughout both acts are amended to grant executors of a will registered in another jurisdiction equal status to those of one registered in Queensland.

The bill makes amendments to the two acts. The amendments include: allowing the dedication of non-tidal boundary watercourses or lakes as reserves for community purposes; and expanding the purpose for which a rolling term lease can be designated and clarifying the process for extension of a rolling term lease. Members on this side of the House certainly know the importance of expanding the purpose for which a rolling term lease can be designated and clarifying the process of extension of a rolling term lease.

As we heard from the member for Condamine, this relates to security of tenure for primary producers right across Queensland. We need to have security of tenure. It is essential for us to have security of tenure when we go to our banks. When we talk to our bank managers about overdrafts, extending our loans or maybe buying another property to expand the agricultural operation, they want to know about our security of tenure. That is the catalyst for being able to borrow money, to make that purchase, to expand one's operation, to buy more cattle, to fatten up cattle to take them to market—to take them to the meatworks or to the saleyards—and to continue to operate a profitable agricultural business.

As I said last night in this House, agriculture is the unsung hero of Queensland's economy. We have had the mining boom. That has been great. Mining plays a critically important part in our economy. Agriculture has been here for a very long time and will continue to be here for a very long time. It is the food on our tables and the fibre on our backs. It is important that it is secure. We need to ensure that we have profitable businesses so that we can continue not only to feed ourselves or clothe ourselves but also to export our valuable agricultural products overseas which means so much to the Queensland state coffers and what we need to do in Queensland. Security of tenure is important.

The amendments to the bill also include replacing the current settlement notice provisions in the Land Title Act with a system of priority notices, consistent with that adopted by other jurisdictions across the nation; repealing existing mandatory standard term documents and providing for their replacement via regulation; dispensing with the requirement for the production of a paper certificate of title if the Registrar of Titles is satisfied that the certificate is held by a legal practitioner; amending the provisions governing the vacation of office by trustees to ensure that the state's interests are preserved; and removing the requirement for ministerial approval under the Land Act for subdivisions of Indigenous land held under a DOGIT, allowing the subdivision to occur purely under the Aboriginal Land Act 1991 or the Torres Strait Islander Land Act 1991.

I am a proud member of the agriculture committee. What my fellow committee members and I have seen time and time again is that important stakeholders—people who should have been included—have little consultation when it comes to bills. Was I surprised? No. Was the member for Condamine surprised? No. Was the member for Warrego surprised? No. We have to consult with the agricultural industry. I will say that again. It is important to consult with agricultural industries on these important pieces of legislation, especially when we are talking about things like rolling term leases.

Let us start with AgForce, our peak broadacre group. It is well known. It is a fierce advocate for agriculture in this state. Its president is Grant Maudsley and its CEO is Charles Burke. It is only down the road from the departmental offices in Mary Street. I am sure the member for Hinchinbrook will correct me if I am wrong, but I think it would not be any more than 500 metres to the AgForce offices. They could pop in there and say, 'We have some changes we would like to discuss with you. Before we put them through or draft them, we would like to see if there is anything that may be of concern to you. You might be able to guide us to make sure we get it right.'

Let's face it: AgForce are well known in government circles. I think it is nearly 14 years since the Cattlemen's Union, the Graingrowers Association and the United Graziers' Association—that proud organisation which has been well represented in the back end of my electorate of Gregory and, of course, the member for Mermaid Beach, a young Richmond boy, would remember the United Graziers' Association.

Mr Stevens: The Cattlemen's Union too.

Mr MILLAR: And the Cattlemen's Union, absolutely. Those three organisations came together as AgForce. That organisation has been around for 14 years. Do you think AgForce should be consulted? I think so. Do you think the department should have headed down to AgForce—

Ms Leahy: Even a phone call.

Mr MILLAR:—or even made a phone call to AgForce?

Mr Stevens: They could have got one of Mark's emails.

Mr MILLAR: They could have sent an email to say, 'Heads up: we have some changes. We would certainly like to talk to you about what we are going to do.' No, it did not happen. Were the Queensland Farmers' Federation—another good organisation which represents intensive agriculture, from canegrowers to the horticultural industry to the cotton industry—consulted? Not really, no—'We did not consult them.'

As members would have read in the committee report—I am sure all members read the committee report when it was tabled—the opposition members of the committee put on the record our concerns about the very poor consultation by the government in relation to the Land and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. Had the department's consultation on this bill been conducted properly, the problems that the committee identified with the bill and flagged for amendment in its report could have been resolved before the bill was even introduced by the minister. It is important that we continue to consult with these key stakeholders. Instead, the committee had to seek extra briefings from the department after eleventh hour meetings between departmental officers and stakeholders to work out amendments to fix the bill's significant shortcomings.

AgForce, the peak body representing the state's agricultural interests, noted in their submission—it is noted in the committee report—that they only became aware of the bill through the committee's alert once the bill had been introduced and referred for consideration. Bing—up comes an email saying there is a bill for consideration. AgForce go, 'We didn't know that was going on. You would think they would have given us a call.' It certainly beggars belief that the department would not think it necessary to consult with peak industry bodies like AgForce or the Queensland Farmers' Federation.

AgForce informed the committee that the consultation on these clauses of the bill was less informative of its effect and intended purpose than it might have desired. This breakdown in the consultation process may have caused a misconception that the proposed amendment to clauses 11 and 12 will limit the number of times a lease may be extended. This is an important issue. As the member for Condamine said in his speech, the ability for graziers to be able to renew their lease is absolutely essential when it comes to refinancing, when it comes to heading to your accountant, picking him up and taking him along to the bank manager and saying, 'I need to refinance. We have had a change in the family situation. Grandad has decided to retire and we need to take him out of the family operation, the family trust. We have leasehold land. We have a rolling term lease. We need to go to the bank to refinance to make sure that process is as simple and easy as possible.'

Mr Weir: That's the first question the bank would ask.

Mr MILLAR: I take that interjection from the member for Condamine. It is the first question the bank manager asks: 'How long is your rolling term lease? How much security do you have?' This is at the core of a very important property right that people who have rolling term leases need. It is a property right that needs to be protected. It needs to be protected because it is essential for them to continue on. It is hard enough sometimes in droughts and with low commodity prices to continue the operation. The last thing you want to be worrying about is: 'Do I have security of tenure going forward? Am I able to move the operation forward?' It is important that that operation has security of tenure.

Having heard about the bill from the committee, AgForce subsequently made contact with the Department of Natural Resources and Mines to seek some information. AgForce had to call the department. They had to ring them up and say, 'I hear you have a bill that has been introduced by the minister. Do you think we might want to have a bit of a talk about it? Do you think we might need to have some consideration? Would the minister like us to come up and have a bit of a chat or even someone from the department? Can we come up and have a chat to them?'

It is important to AgForce. It is important to the people they represent which is the broadacre lobby group and broadacre agricultural production which is the cattle industry. I note that the member for Gympie is in the House. He knows all about this. He knows all about rolling term leases and the issue of leases. It can be a heartbreaking, nervous and sometimes frustrating time when you are talking about these things. The last thing we need to do is put confusion out there in regard to this.

AgForce rang up the department and said, 'Let's have a talk.' Having heard about the bill from the committee, they rang the Department of Natural Resources and Mines to seek information about the justification of the bill and, in particular, clause 12, which relates to rolling term leases. Rolling term leases are vitally important to the state's pastoralists, as I have said, and any changes affecting the extensions and eligibility can have implications for their operations and their viability. As AgForce

explained in their submission, they were not consulted on the bill. Lauren Hewitt, who is the head of AgForce policy, appeared before the committee so that we could hear what she had to say. I asked Lauren—

... I want to go back to your concerns about clause 11. When you approached the department, did they come back with anything? Did they come back with an explanation of any kind? You said they did not give you a satisfactory one, but did they come back with an explanation?

She replied—

Yes, they certainly did. They came back with an explanation about how the mechanics of it would work in a number of ways. It was a little further explanation on how the mechanics of it would operate, but to me what was missing in there was a rationale about why the change was required.

I asked Lauren—

When you asked them to explain the rationale, what was their response?

She replied—

Nothing that gave me any satisfaction to know that that was a valid change in the framework.

Not only were they not consulted; when they decided to ring up the department and say, 'We might need to come and have a talk to you to find out if this is important to us—and we think it is important to us. We will come up and see you,' the department did not give Lauren Hewitt or AgForce any satisfaction of knowing that it was a valid change in the framework. If we are changing the framework or changing something, shouldn't we give a valid reason why we need to change it?

Ms Leahy: What are the drivers of change?

Mr MILLAR: Why are we doing it? I take that interjection from the member for Warrego. What are the drivers of change? Why do we need to change this? Wouldn't it have been handy to have a talk to AgForce before this bill was introduced into the House? As I said before, AgForce got an email alert once the bill had been read a first time by the minister in the House and referred for consideration. AgForce would have gone, 'There is a bill before the House that we know nothing about. We did not know it was coming. What is happening here?'

It is important that consultation with these people continues and continues on a regular basis, whether it is with AgForce or the Queensland Farmers' Federation. They represent an industry which is so vitally important for the agricultural industry. It is so vitally important for our economy. We need to bring them with us when we are talking about security of tenure. We need to bring them with us when we are talking about a property right issue such as rolling term leases. We need to be able to give them satisfactory reasons why we are changing something such as rolling term leases. They also need to know the rationale. They need to be included in the negotiations around why this is happening, because they know best when it comes to how this will affect their membership and how this will affect the broadacre agricultural community right across the state which is so important to our economy. It is so important to make sure that they have security of tenure when they go and see their bank manager to say, 'I have made a change. We need to refinance.'

As the member for Condamine said in his speech, the first thing they ask you is, 'How long is your rolling term lease?' It is so important to have security around that. In talking to producers across Queensland, they want to have an understanding of why laws are changed in this parliament. They want to feel comfortable and confident when laws are changed that they are included in this process. It is important to them. This is their livelihood. It is so important to them that they have to go and refinance. It is a very important decision they have to make.

I call on the minister to make sure that AgForce is always included when we are talking about these issues. I also remind the department that it must consult with AgForce on a regular basis. I think that is incredibly important. We need to make sure that AgForce, QFF or whoever have access to the department and the minister—

Ms Leahy: At an early stage.

Mr MILLAR: Absolutely, at an early stage.

Debate, on motion of Mr Millar, adjourned.

ORDER FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS

The CLERK: In accordance with standing order 29, I advise the House of the following outstanding order: order of the House dated 1 March 2017 requiring the Deputy Premier and Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning to produce to the House a report from Queensland Rail on the outcome of the chair's 'stress test' of the Citytrain timetable.

MOTION

Energy Industry

Mr KATTER (Mount Isa—KAP) (6.01 pm): I move—

That this House acknowledges the market failure in the gas market precipitating the loss of Queensland industry's competitive advantage from low-cost energy, and further support a gas reservation policy or similar legislative framework as a mechanism for restoring Queensland industry's competitive advantage particularly in processing and manufacturing.

Last week I counted up that I have spoken about this issue in parliament 12 times, which is probably a record on any issue for me. It is a very acute issue in the north-west minerals province. We have a massive problem—and that is just a case in point out there—nationally and in the gas industry in Queensland. The domestic economic activity associated with this industry is hampered by a market that is broken. The LNG industry was painted as being the saviour of the Queensland economy. In 2010 the Bligh government predicted that the LNG sector would deliver $850 million a year in royalties. In May 2012 the honourable treasurer and now Leader of the Opposition said that 'growth for Queensland's forecasts remain upbeat, driven for the time being by record investment in LNG projects'. In May 2015 the Premier said, 'There is no doubt that the establishment of the LNG export industry in Queensland is a generational achievement.' There is validity—except maybe the first point by the Bligh government—in these comments.

We must acknowledge some of the benefits of this industry, but we must also weigh up the costs against the benefits of this industry. Since the birth of the Queensland LNG industry there have been a number of stakeholders talking about the risks. In 2012 a report by the National Institute of Economic and Industry Research outlined the risk as follows: 'The benefits from exporting LNG should be weighed against the benefits of ensuring competitive supply to the domestic gas-dependent manufacturing sector.' 'Even a temporary period without secure access to domestic gas would have significant unintended consequences, as would a shift to LNG-linked gas pricing.' 'For each dollar gained in LNG export, $21 is lost from domestic industries.'

That was the forecast then. People in the mines in the north-west minerals province were used to paying $3 to $4 a gigajoule before the onset of this industry. I know of one mining company which made an offer of $12 a gigajoule. It could not even get supply at $12 a gigajoule. They said that they could not afford that anyway, but even if they could they could not get supply. That is because they built three LNG plants. There should have been only one. Now they are ripping every bit of gas that is available in through those plants to make them viable. It was left to the open market when it should not have been, and now we are picking up the pieces. The Prime Minister is saying that he is going to do something now. It could be too late, but we should still be acting. As I said, I have outlined the risks to local industry in this House on at least 12 occasions since 2013. There have been numerous calls from major user groups and individual businesses. Perhaps they do not have pockets as deep or a voice as strong as these large multinational gas companies.

In 2015 the government had to slash its royalty forecast from LNG by $400 million. In 2016 the chairman of the ACCC, Rod Sims, said that there is something perverse about an environment where international oil and gas prices have plummeted but domestic gas prices have been rising. Here we are in 2017 with domestic gas prices at least doubling in the last five years from $4 a gigajoule to $10 a gigajoule, and there is anecdotal evidence from large industrial users in North Queensland that prices are up to $15 a gigajoule on month-to-month contracts.

There is no doubt that the LNG industry has provided some benefits to Queensland, and I do not want to downplay that. Hundreds of millions of dollars in royalties flow to the government and significant infrastructure has been developed, both of which are positives. However, the policy priorities have been mismanaged and short-term gains were preferred over long-term economic benefits. The north-west minerals province alone offers $310 million a year in royalties and in the order of $3 billion, I think it is, in economic activity every year. That is all at risk because of the price of gas. The north-west minerals province is an isolated energy supplier which is 100 per cent reliant on the price of gas. Since we did not build the transmission line, we have an undersupply of gas and an oversupply of generation on the coast which could have been turned around by that. It is absolutely paramount for economic development in this state that we have a gas reservation policy.

Hon. AJ LYNHAM (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (6.07 pm): I move the following amendment—

That all words after 'gas market' be deleted and the following words inserted: 'risking the loss of Queensland industry's competitive advantage from low-cost energy, and further supports a domestic gas tenure policy which provides a legislative framework for Australian supply supporting Queensland industry's competitive advantage particularly in processing and manufacturing.'

The gas industry is a very important industry to Queensland and Australia. The development of the CSG to LNG industry in Queensland has been an incredible effort—one supported by both sides of this House, and that is acknowledged. This has been one of the keys to the success we have experienced here as opposed to the political games played in other states. There is good reason to be concerned about what is happening with regard to gas supplies and prices in the eastern Australian gas market, but it is a mistake to seek to attribute all of those problems to the LNG industry alone.

When the LNG projects were being proposed and developed, there was an expectation that gas resources in other states would come online during the past seven years. For instance, the Santos Narrabri project had the capacity to supply half of New South Wales's annual demand. Nevertheless, there is a problem and this government has been acting to deal with the twin problems of supply and price. We have released a gas action plan discussion paper that seeks to achieve greater supply and some reduction in the cost of exploration and production—costs which will affect the price level.

What much of the price debate misses is the point that the cost of finding and producing this gas is rising. As the gas is more difficult to procure, it is more expensive. Any reservation policy would not—and could not—change the fundamental costs of this production. We have sought to release new acreage in the Cooper, Surat and Bowen basins to encourage exploration. We have also moved to release 58 square kilometres of land in the Surat Basin which has attached to it an Australian market supply condition. This acreage was released on 10 February and tenders will close on 20 April.

This release was a very deliberate act to send a message to the market that the government is concerned about the situation in our gas market. We will be very interested to understand how various petroleum companies and also gas users offer to develop this acreage and use this gas. A significant part of the success of this pilot will depend on how a successful tenderer is able to access existing infrastructure, such as the processing plants, water plants, compressors and pipelines. This access will be important to ensure the speedy development of this acreage and to keep the cost of production as low as possible.

The government will be watching these negotiations very carefully indeed. This pilot release of acreage dedicated to the Australian market is an important initiative. The federal Minister for the Environment and Energy has described it as creative. This pilot is an allocation of vacant acreage for development for the Australian market. It is not reservation. Reservation is when the government takes back gas after the acreage has been granted to a gas exploration and production company. The difference with our policy is that, if a gas company is not interested in producing gas from this acreage for the Australian market, they simply need not bother, they do not have to participate. Reservation of gas after the land has been granted and after a company has invested very large sums of money in finding gas and developing infrastructure for its sale is very dangerous.

We have not stood idle. We have released this acreage. We have the Gas Supply and Demand Action Plan. We have the pipeline coming in from the Northern Territory resources to supply the Queensland gas sector. Our policy sends a message to the market and provides a practical means of producing more gas for the Australian market because, as I have said time and time again, this is a government that is focused on business growth and focused on jobs—jobs for Queenslanders now and into the future.

Mr PYNE (Cairns—Ind) (6.12 pm): I speak in support of the motion moved by the member for Mount Isa. I was surprised recently to read that we are in a gas crisis. After all, I regularly hear in this chamber how well our gas boom is being handled in this state, how effectively the government is managing it and how it is underwriting the economic vibrancy of Queensland, not to mention Gladstone, which from all accounts is turning into an economic industrial powerhouse the likes of which the world has never seen.

How can there be a gas crisis when we are mining more gas than ever before? About six years ago, the Queensland and Australian governments entered into agreements with three huge gas consortiums to give massive approvals to build three giant terminals in Gladstone. They promised huge supplies of gas in contracts with foreign countries, contracts nobody else has ever seen. Our governments have in effect linked the local gas market to the international gas market. How crazy is that? Of course it has massively pushed up the price for gas that people have to pay here in Australia. The result is that Queensland people and businesses are paying through the nose for something that occurs naturally here in vast quantities. In fact it is not only vast quantities; Australia is poised to become the world's greatest gas exporter.

It reminds me of the line from *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*, which goes something like 'Water, water, everywhere, but not a drop to drink'. In this case it is more like 'Gas, gas, everywhere, but none to keep Australian pensioners warm this winter'. I am also reminded of the lyrics from the Skyhooks song *Ego Is Not A Dirty Word*. I would hope 'ego' is not a dirty word in this place, because there is a lot of ego in this chamber. Another word that should not be a dirty word is 'regulation'. Regulation exists to protect consumers; regulation should be used to protect Australians. We know that regulation works. We see it working in Western Australia. It is simply a matter of saying to these companies that if they want to export they need to reserve 15 per cent for domestic use for the domestic economy.

People are left scratching their heads about gas prices, but one thing they are not scratching their heads about is the growing evidence of the damage this industry has done in Queensland and New South Wales. There are industrial gas fields imposed on regional communities that are damaging farms and damaging the environment. We know of farmers whose livestock has died. I have spoken to parents outside this chamber who live close to gas wells and who have said that their children are bleeding from the nose. We have seen the tragic consequences here in Queensland with people like Mr George Bender taking their own lives after a lengthy struggle with this massive gas industry. When an individual farmer is dealing with a multinational company of such power and influence, how can they be expected to compete with that influence? I have always believed that governments should be there to help the little guy but, no, governments here in Queensland are helping the big multinationals, not the little guy.

We all know that opening this country up to more damaging fracking will not help push down the price of gas—not while the price is linked to the international market. Who is to blame for where we are today? There are only two parties to blame—one, the greedy multinationals that come here with no other goal than to maximise profits while sucking this nation dry and, two, the governments of this state and country that failed to reserve Australian gas for Australian consumers.

Mr BUTCHER (Gladstone—ALP) (6.17 pm): I rise to support the amendment that is before the House tonight. I acknowledge the member for Cairns saying that Gladstone is the industrial powerhouse of potentially the world because it possibly could be. There is no stronger supporter of the $70 billion CSG-LNG industry in this chamber than me. Obviously, with three big fridges right across the harbour in Gladstone, I am a proud member for Gladstone who actually supports this wonderful industry and the employment that it has provided to the people of Gladstone for the last five years, including 15,000 people in the construction of that industry.

We are struggling a little bit in Gladstone now at the downturn of that, but we do know of the benefits across Queensland from this industry. As a local, I have seen firsthand the development of this industry in my own town. I have seen firsthand how families throughout Gladstone and wider Queensland have come to rely on this industry to provide employment, growth and opportunity and how we have all come to benefit from this wonderful industry. The future is good for the coal seam gas industry in Queensland. We are proud as a Labor government to have been the ones who brought this into Queensland, particularly back when the global financial crisis was smashing Queensland and Australia. Bringing on these three facilities in Gladstone was what was absolutely needed at the time.

Queenslanders will increasingly benefit from our growing liquefied natural gas exports from Queensland through increased royalties to fund budget initiatives. This is why the Palaszczuk government continues to support and build this vital industry here in Queensland. It was a massive boon to hear that Shell was investing $500 million in Queensland to continue to send gas through to the QCLNG in Gladstone in my very harbour. That will deliver jobs that we need in Gladstone so much at the moment. We have the experience and expertise in Gladstone to send them out to develop that. The government is also developing skills for Queenslanders and funding services that we need here in Queensland.

The coal seam gas industry in the last financial year contributed an estimated $247 million to a wide array of community infrastructure and services. These included hospitals, community centres, airport upgrades and schools. In my electorate of Gladstone, we have seen the announcement of a $40 million upgrade to the A&E and upgrades to our schools, including $4 million to Rosella Park School, $6.5 million to Calliope State School and $60 million to the future Calliope state high school. The coal seam gas industry has also contributed approximately $260 million to road infrastructure in regional Queensland, and we know that many of those opposite have been asking for that for many years to try to make sure that infrastructure funding goes into regional Queensland.

Even though the LNG construction is well and truly behind us in Gladstone, the industry still directly employs over 5,000 people in the Surat, in Gladstone, in Toowoomba and right here in Brisbane. From its first export of LNG in December 2014, the LNG industry has gone from strength to strength.

Export volumes have maintained strong momentum with 2016 export volumes totalling 17.5 million tonnes. This export industry directly contributes $12.8 billion to the Queensland economy, spending $5.3 billion in the last financial year with over 3,000 local businesses in the area. We expect that this industry is here for the long term. We know this industry will be growing our liquefied natural gas exports and will increasingly deliver important royalties to fund budget initiatives. Major destinations for recent cargos in 2017 have been Japan, China and Korea to name a few. Based on import data from December, 40 per cent of China's imports, 28 per cent of Japan's imports and 14 per cent of Korea's imports came from Australian LNG products.

The minister also advises me that the skills of the welders who built the LNG trains in my patch are of a standard to allow them to work on the new submarines in South Australia. While it may be disappointing we cannot use those skills here in Queensland, particularly in Gladstone, it is a contribution from this industry to the wider Australian community. This government understands that gas helps fuel our homes, our businesses and our industries, and Queenslanders need this gas. That is why I am proud to be part of a government that is actively supporting measures to increase the supply of gas into Queensland.

The announcement earlier by the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines of a pilot exploration project in the Surat Basin has been widely applauded, and so it should be. It is an innovative and considered approach from a government committed to the real issues that Queensland homes and businesses face every day. While other jurisdictions squabble about how to increase domestic supply, the Palaszczuk government is getting on with the job.

(Time expired)

Mr DICKSON (Buderim—PHON) (6.21 pm): I rise to contribute to this motion that the House acknowledge the market failure in the gas market precipitating the loss of the Queensland industry's competitive advantage from low-cost energy, and further support a gas reservation policy or similar legislative framework as a mechanism for restoring the Queensland industry's competitive advantage, particularly in processing and manufacturing. Let me commence by saying the only gas reservation policy that matters to this Labor government is the one that they will be trotting out sooner rather than later. That is the one they will be trotting out around election time. The framework of their gas reservation policy is more Labor hot air for voters—and it is free; that hot air is absolutely free. I heard the Premier yesterday say in this House—

> Where other states have moratoriums on gas development, we have a rigorous policy that has promoted the sustainable development of the LNG industry.

The Premier quoted her new political friend Dr Alan Finkel, who said, 'Tighter gas supply translates to higher gas prices.' There is the clanger from the Premier: tighter gas supply translates to higher gas prices. In other words, the Premier obviously has no intention of tightening gas supply—formulating and regulating a policy, legislating to reserve even a single gigajoule of gas for the domestic market here in Queensland. The Premier went on to wax lyrical about the meeting with Mr Smith from Shell regarding a new project in the Surat Basin. The Premier quoted Mr Smith as saying—

> We are proud to be investing in regional Queensland, creating jobs and securing gas supply for domestic and export customers into the future.

I have a question for the Premier. What precise percentage of domestic to export ratio has the Premier agreed to with Mr Smith? There is more. Apparently, according to the Premier—

> We can have the broadest possible energy mix: we can have coal, we can have renewables and we can have gas.

I have a second question for the Premier: what is Mr Smith seeking in terms of a precise gigajoule price to the customer for maintaining that domestic product here in Queensland? I have a third question for the Premier: what is the precise percentage of the energy mix? The last I heard her Labor government here in Queensland were fierce advocates of jackbooting their way to renewable energy targets of up to 50 per cent. I ask the Premier to please be up-front with the people of Queensland as to the percentage of gas to be reserved. I ask her to legislate it and/or make it a condition of their licence.

I say to Queenslanders: roll up; the big top down the road is open for business. Premier Palaszczuk and her circus government are all about performing a big pea-and-thimble trick. In the shadow of the looming election, the Premier is seeking to lay gifts upon the altar of campaigning paid for on the Queensland taxpayer's credit card. How is the Premier going to make this happen? The

answer is Labor will not. It is the Premier trying to be all things to all people when it comes to energy but adopting a small target strategy everywhere else. She knows nothing; therefore, she does absolutely nothing.

The Premier does, however, have a political master to answer to, and that is the ACTU. How does the Premier hope to make this energy project up north a goer when the new ACTU Secretary, Sally McManus, advocates that the unions should break the law? They are lawless and they bankroll Labor, so watch out Queensland! A vote for Labor in any form is a vote for Sally McManus, the advocate of lawlessness who is on her way to the Senate ably assisted by Premier Annastacia Palaszczuk.

Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (6.26 pm): I joined the speaking list for tonight's debate very keen to support the minister's amendment to the proposed motion and to be part of a debate on a very important issue for this state and for this nation. That issue is our energy security and the balance that is needed between delivering part of a global energy market and supporting our great industries here in this state.

I really appreciated and welcomed the contribution made by the member for Mount Isa. I am going to reflect on it and give some guidance about why I think the minister's amendment is better going forward on this issue. I do want to reflect on the other speakers from the non-government benches we have heard from so far tonight. They did not really speak about the issues of gas policy and energy policy. We heard them speaking against the gas industry here in this state. In fact, they are supporters of moratoriums and other things that have been failed policies in other jurisdictions that have afflicted our energy market mix in this country.

In this state over a long period we have seen a bipartisan commitment to the development of a fantastic gas industry, a $70 billion gas industry that is delivering for Queenslanders right across the length and breadth of this state but most particularly for Queenslanders in the west, the Surat Basin and the Bowen Basin. That of course has flowed on, quite literally, to the development of fantastic export industries based out of Gladstone Harbour. I also want to acknowledge the contribution made by the member for Gladstone in this debate.

Through the foresight, I acknowledge, of previous Labor governments in establishing this industry, we have seen a great industry established for the state of Queensland that plays an important role in the world's energy demands. It continues to get the balance right while we keep an eye on it in supporting our domestic industries as well. Successive governments in Queensland have been supported in getting that balance right. I do want to acknowledge that the LNP when in government handled themselves very well in relation to supporting the industry and its continued development. I do think they got a few things wrong—and I will make mention of that along the way—around getting the balance right. Getting the balance right in all of these issues of developing a new industry is something that we need to do. It is very important. It has been fantastic to see the achievement of the development of this industry in this state, going from the development of the coal seam gas industry through to the creation of LNG exports. It has been a huge commitment and a great effort made by government more generally. I particularly want to acknowledge the work that has been done by previous Labor governments in that space.

I hesitate to invoke the wrath of the member for Buderim by mentioning that one of the great champions in policy in this area in protecting and making sure that we get the balance right has been the Australian Workers' Union, a union that I am proud to be a member of. The Australian Workers' Union has been a great advocate in the space of getting the balance right for industry, and the export industry includes many of their members. In 2010 it was in fact the Labor government that appointed a gas commissioner to monitor and guide the development of the state's gas market in the context of the then emerging LNG industry, and that was something which set these measures up quite well. It was the gas commissioner's role to work closely with industry and government agencies to identify any issues for the domestic gas market which may arise during the development of the LNG industry.

In support of that, as the minister for mining at the time I introduced the prospective Gas Production Land Reserve through the Gas Security Amendment Bill in 2011. That set up the framework to implement a prospective gas production land policy if domestic markets became supply constrained. We are now seeing another Labor government deliver on that measure through the pilot that has been referred to by the minister which was brought into action in the Surat on 10 February. That shows the way in which you can get the balance right to support our important industries that supply and rely upon gas, such as G James Glass on the north side of Brisbane.

(Time expired)

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

AYES, 79:

ALP, 40—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

LNP, 39—Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

NOES, 5:

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Dickson.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne

Pairs: O'Rourke, Smith; Kelly, Barton.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Mr SPEAKER: I propose that any further divisions be of one minute's duration.

Question put—That the motion, as amended, be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Motion, as agreed—

That this House acknowledges the market failure in the gas market risking the loss of Queensland industry's competitive advantage from low-cost energy, and further supports a domestic gas tenure policy which provides a legislative framework for Australian supply supporting Queensland industry's competitive advantage particularly in processing and manufacturing.

Sitting suspended from 6.38 pm to 7.40 pm.

VICTIMS OF CRIME ASSISTANCE AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

BAIL (DOMESTIC VIOLENCE) AND ANOTHER ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill resumed from 1 December 2016 (see p. 4866) and Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill resumed from 14 February (see p. 43).

Second Reading (Cognate Debate)

Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (7.40 pm): I move—

That the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill be now read a second time.

On 1 December 2016 I introduced the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill into this House. The bill was referred to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee for consideration and report by Monday, 27 February 2017. The committee tabled its report on 27 February and recommended that the bill be passed. I would like to thank the committee for its timely and detailed consideration of the bill. I would also like to thank those individuals and organisations who provided submissions and also those who gave evidence before the committee.

Tonight we will be debating two bills: the victims of crime assistance bill and the private member's bill. I want to acknowledge those in the gallery, particularly family members, for whom I know this is a difficult time. It will be difficult to listen to the details in this debate, but I hope that this debate can be carried out in a civil and bipartisan way and that those in the gallery understand that we are all here for the same outcome, which is to see an end to domestic and family violence in this state.

The bill before the House has three main objectives: (1) introduce a sexual assault counselling privilege in Queensland; (2) give victims of a sexual offence automatic status as a special witness when they are to give evidence in a criminal proceeding against the accused; and (3) make amendments to the Victims of Crime Assistance Act 2009 that will implement the 15 recommendations of the act's statutory review, streamline processes and improve operational efficiency, and extend the victims of crime financial assistance scheme to all victims of domestic and family violence.

Sexual violence is the second most prevalent form of violence against women after domestic and family violence. This is a sad indictment on our society. Currently in Queensland, communication between a victim of sexual assault and a counsellor can be disclosed in court without the consent of the victim. These communications can then be used to discredit and retraumatise the victim. Stakeholders who appeared before the committee highlighted the serious and detrimental effect this can have on victims.

While models vary, all other states and territories have introduced statutory protections to restrict the disclosure of sexual assault counselling communications in legal proceedings. In line with recommendation 130 of *Not now, not ever: putting an end to domestic and family violence in Queensland*, the report of the Special Taskforce on Domestic and Family Violence in Queensland, the provisions in the bill before the House establish a sexual assault counselling privilege based on the New South Wales model. This model aims to strike a balance between the right to a fair trial for an accused person and the public interest in preserving the confidentiality of counselling communications between a victim of sexual assault and a counsellor and minimising harms to victims.

As noted at page 317 of the *Not now, not ever* report, the existence of a sexual assault counselling privilege may encourage victims of sexual assault to seek counselling by only allowing access to or disclosure of protected confidences in certain legal proceedings with court approval. This important reform is long overdue. The privilege recognises that a person's private psychological and physical boundaries are invaded during a sexual assault and acknowledges that counselling services play an integral role in providing support and assisting people to recover.

In a committal and bail proceeding an absolute privilege will apply, and a party will not be able to access the victim's counselling records. In other criminal proceedings and proceedings for a domestic violence order under the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012, a qualified privilege will apply. This means that in these proceedings a person will need to apply to the court and show why they should be able to get access to the counselling records. In general, for leave to be granted the court must be satisfied that the material will have substantial probative value and that no other evidence concerning the matters to which the communication relates is available, and the court will consider the harm the victim is likely to suffer if access is granted.

I would like to now address some of the key concerns raised by stakeholders before the committee about the sexual assault counselling privilege amendments. The definition of protected counselling communication does not extend to communications made by or to a health practitioner in the course of the physical examination as the examination takes place in a clinical and non-therapeutic context. Importantly, however, this exception is limited to a communication made to or by a health practitioner about a physical examination in the course of an investigation into the alleged offence. Outside of this very limited scope, there would be instances where there is communication between the victim and the health practitioner that amounts to a privileged communication.

A concern was also raised, during both the consultation undertaken on the bill and through the committee process, about the application of the privilege in domestic violence proceedings, where it is more common for both parties to be unrepresented, which may mean that a perpetrator can directly inspect counselling communications. The amendments provide protection to unrepresented victims by specifically requiring that where the court considers that a person may have a ground to object to the release of a counselling communication the court must satisfy itself the person is aware of the relevant provisions and has had the opportunity to seek legal advice. Also, importantly, the sexual assault counselling privilege legal service, being established alongside the legislative amendments, will allow victims and counsellors access to independent legal assistance should they wish to claim the privilege. Provision will also be made for legal representation to the accused seeking disclosure of the sexual assault counselling material, acknowledging that there may be growth in requests for legal support. This assistance will not be limited to criminal proceedings.

When the privilege has been found to apply in a criminal proceeding or a proceeding under the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012, the privilege will continue to apply to that evidence in any civil proceeding on the same fact, for example, in civil proceedings against the offender for sexual harassment. This approach ensures consistency in how courts deal with protected counselling communications and it maintains the integrity of the privilege.

Other concerns were raised before the committee about the risk of inadvertent disclosure of communications otherwise subject to the sexual assault counselling privilege and the absence of sanctions for noncompliance. The provisions explicitly prohibit a person from using evidence that is a protected counselling communication in the legal proceeding. Accordingly, no criminal sanction is

necessary. A range of supporting processes and procedures for the privilege are also being developed by the Department of Justice and Attorney-General to ensure compliance with the privilege. This includes examination of the wording and the material that is attached to subpoenas.

Further, drawing on the experience in New South Wales, the dedicated sexual assault counselling privilege legal assistance service will assist to mitigate inadvertent disclosures. The service will develop and disseminate education material about the privilege to assist legal practitioners, key stakeholders including a range of government and non-government organisations that provide counselling services, and the public to ensure general awareness and an understanding of the privilege.

In recognition of the vulnerability of a victim or alleged victim of a sexual offence, the bill also contains amendments to section 21A of the Evidence Act 1977 to provide that those victims who give evidence in a trial against the accused will automatically be recognised as a special witness. The court may then make a range of different types of directions and orders to support a special witness when giving evidence in the criminal proceeding. This amendment will mean that a victim of a sexual assault does not need to initially satisfy the court that they fall under another element of the definition should they wish to give their evidence in a way that differs from the usual practices and procedures. Together with the introduction of the privilege, these important and beneficial reforms will provide increased support to victims of sexual assault. These amendments help ensure that as much protection and privacy as possible is given to victims and the impact of the justice process on these vulnerable persons is minimised as far as practicable.

I am heartened by the views expressed by the Centre Against Sexual Violence representative in her oral submission to the committee, noting the fact that her ability to advise clients of the bill's introduction has contributed to the healing process of survivors. It is my hope that once enacted the amendment will, to the extent possible, remove obstacles that currently inhibit a victim's therapeutic relationships and recovery process and interfere with their right to give unintimidated evidence. This government is committed to addressing violence in all forms. The amendments in this bill form part of the broader Violence Against Women Prevention Plan. The plan aims to address the great costs that violence against women have on those who experience it, their families, the community and the economy. It is intended to guide positive change in the Queensland community, challenge negative attitudes about women and their experience of violence, and work to strengthen the support and protection women receive.

I will now turn to the provisions of the bill which amend the Victims of Crime Assistance Act 2009, known as the VOCA Act. As explained in my explanatory speech for the bill, the bill includes a number of amendments that improve how victims of crime are treated in the criminal justice system. Importantly, the bill expands the financial assistance scheme to victims of non-physical domestic and family violence by expanding the definition of 'act of violence' to include domestic violence as defined under the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012. This amendment ensures that all victims who have suffered injuries as a result of domestic and family violence, not just personal violence, are able to access financial assistance, including those who have suffered non-physical violence—for example, victims of elder abuse. This amendment implements recommendation 95 of the *Not now, not ever* report.

The bill enhances the rights and treatment of victims of domestic and family violence. Under current sections 15 to 15B of the VOCA Act, only victims of personal offences can give a victim impact statement to a court during a sentencing proceeding for a convicted offender. The bill expands the operation of the victim impact statement provisions to allow victims of any criminal offence involving domestic and family violence to give a victim impact statement to the court hearing the sentencing proceeding. This will ensure that all victims of domestic and family violence have the opportunity to inform the sentencing court of the harm that the convicted offender's conduct has had on them. Giving a victim impact statement is not mandatory and if the victim chooses not to give one this does not give rise to an inference that the offence caused little or no harm.

The bill inserts a charter of victims' rights into the VOCA Act which replaces the current fundamental principles of justice. The charter is written in a simple, easy to understand language and will importantly require relevant agencies to proactively provide information to a victim without the victim having to ask for the information, when it is appropriate and practicable to do so. Included in the charter is the responsibility for agencies such as the Queensland Police Service and the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions to proactively provide information or victims with details about each major decision about the prosecution of the person accused of the crime. It is important to note that the charter provides that a victim will be informed about the outcome of a bail application made by the accused and any arrangements made for the release of the accused, including any special bail conditions that

may affect the victim's safety or welfare, and I will be moving amendments in consideration in detail that further clarify that, as part of those major decisions about prosecution, the victims will be notified of an application for bail.

The bill extends the charter to apply to non-government entities funded by Commonwealth, state or territory governments to provide services to victims of crime to ensure victims receive consistent treatment across services. The bill also amends the VOCA Act to allow the Victim Services Coordinator to be more involved in the complaints process and help victims resolve complaints if the victim is dissatisfied with the response from an agency. The bill also simplifies the amounts of assistance that can be granted and also increases some maximum amounts of assistance. For example, the bill replaces the current maximum amount of $6,000 payable for funeral assistance with a new maximum amount of $8,000. The applicant must show evidence—for example, receipts or a quote—to receive the assistance.

The bill simplifies the special assistance payments payable under the act. Special assistance payments are one-off, lump sum payments made to a primary victim to recognise the impact of the harm caused by an act of violence. As the Centre Against Sexual Violence noted in its submissions to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee, special assistance payments of themselves may be insufficient to help victims of serious and violent sexual offences such as rape recover from an act of violence. The amounts of special assistance form part of the $75,000 maximum amount of assistance for each primary victim, meaning each victim can, in addition to the $10,000 special assistance payment, seek up to an additional $65,000 in financial assistance for services to help them recover from the act of violence. Amendments through the bill remove pools of assistance for secondary and related victims, easing the complexity of the application process and ensuring that each secondary and related victim's application is considered on its own merits rather than being considered as part of a pool. These amendments also ensure that victims who do not immediately make an application for assistance—for example, a child—can still obtain assistance at a later date without fear that the pool will be exhausted at the time their application for financial assistance is made.

The bill also amends the VOCA Act to provide that the state may only recover a grant of assistance from an offender if action to recover the assistance is started within six years after the day the offender was convicted of the relevant offence or the day the application for the grant of financial assistance was made, whichever is later. The decision to pursue an offender to repay financial assistance to the state is discretionary for Victim Assist Queensland. If a victim has a concern about their security, Victim Assist Queensland is able to assist the victim through a grant of assistance to improve the victim's security. For example, Victim Assist Queensland has assisted victims to relocate to states where they have family to provide support, improve victim's home security and assisted victims to change their name.

A number of provisions contained in the bill will help to improve decision making by providing greater flexibility for government assessors to defer deciding an application for assistance in certain circumstances, clarifying the relationship between other schemes for financial assistance or compensation and the victim's financial assistance scheme, and enhancing access to relevant information. The bill makes a number of amendments to the VOCA Act to improve operational efficiency and to give victims relief from procedural requirements in the act. The bill removes the requirement that an application for financial assistance be verified by statutory declaration and that the victim provide a medical certificate with their application for assistance, easing the burden on victims when first applying for assistance. The bill also amends the act to allow the scheme manager to extend the time for a person to make an application for funeral expense assistance if it is appropriate and desirable to do so, having regard to clear criteria. This amendment relaxes the three-year time limit to apply for assistance for people who, for example, can demonstrate they have impaired capacity or who have suffered psychological effects as a result of the act of violence committed against their deceased loved one.

I again thank the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee for its consideration of the bill and acknowledge the very valuable contribution of all those who have made submissions on the bill and assisted the committee during its deliberations. The victims of crime bill represents this government's commitment to ensuring victims of violent crime are treated with dignity, respect and fairness during the criminal justice process.

I want to take the opportunity now to speak on the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2017, which was introduced on 14 February 2017 by the Leader of the Opposition. The private member's bill was referred to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee for consideration and the committee tabled its report on 17 March. The chair's foreword to the report confirms that, although it was clearly apparent that all committee members and those who lodged

submissions or appeared before the committee want to stop domestic and family violence, the committee was unable to reach a majority decision to recommend that the bill be passed. I would like to take this opportunity to thank those individuals and organisations who provided submissions and also those who gave evidence before the committee. In particular, I acknowledge the contribution made by the family members of domestic homicide victims who spoke in their personal capacity about their heart-wrenching experiences.

The statistics on domestic and family violence deaths are shocking and indisputable. The Domestic and Family Violence Death Review Unit reports that, during the period from 1 January 2006 to 31 December 2016, in Queensland, 248 women, men and children were killed by a family member, or by a person with whom they were, or had been, in an intimate partner relationship. The private member's bill proposes amendments to the Bail Act 1980 and the Corrective Services Act 2006 regarding perpetrators of domestic and family violence. Although the *Not now, not ever* report by the Special Taskforce on Domestic and Family Violence in Queensland did not recommend changes to the bail arrangements, the Palaszczuk government has committed to considering improvements to the bail arrangements in Queensland. However, close consultation with those people at the front line and careful consideration is required to ensure that we have the right solution that will achieve the best outcomes.

In September 2014, the Special Taskforce on Domestic and Family Violence in Queensland was established to comprehensively examine Queensland's domestic and family violence support systems and make recommendations on how the system could be improved and future incidents of domestic violence could be prevented. The task force conducted extensive statewide community engagement and consultation. This government has accepted all of the recommendations of the task force and made significant progress towards implementing them—actions that have already seen a significant change in the attitudes of our community and awareness around this scourge on our society. Previously, I mentioned that I have noticed in my own community that at just about every event or forum for any age group it is an issue that is first and foremost in people's minds and it is being openly discussed. I am now having victims of domestic and family violence openly coming up to me and admitting for the first time that they are a victim and wanting support. The fact that they now feel that they can come forward and seek support from the police and seek support from the justice system means that we have come a long way, but we have a long way to go.

The Palaszczuk government remains committed to leading a program of reform to end domestic and family violence in Queensland. Achieving our vision is a long-term endeavour requiring focused and sustained commitment from the whole community. Any deviation from the recommendations made by the task force requires very careful consideration and consultation. Based on the submissions lodged and evidence provided in the hearings before the committee, the government members of the committee were of the view that the bill requires more consultation and significant amendment.

Although the bill is supported in principle, the government members of the committee noted the potential for unintended consequences. It was also noted that the bill has considerable overlap with some of the provisions of the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, which the committee has recommended be passed.

To this end, on 8 March 2017 I convened a roundtable consultation meeting to discuss proposals regarding bail issues. This round table was attended by various legal, community and government stakeholders. This government is committed to addressing this scourge on our society. We are all committed to addressing this scourge on our society. That is why we have taken a bipartisan approach to this issue and seek to work with all sides and levels of government to do what we can to stop domestic and family violence.

Although we support the fundamental policy underpinning the private member's bill to improve community safety for victims of domestic violence and hold perpetrators to account, it is clear from the consultation on the bill that, in its current form, there are areas that are not workable in practice or may have unintended consequences. For that reason, we will be wanting to strengthen the bail laws to make our community safer by moving a number of amendments during consideration in detail of the cognate debate to deliver strong, workable laws for Queensland.

These amendments aim to give effect to much of the policy behind the private member's bill while recognising and better dealing with a number of the fundamental concerns with the approach taken. The government will move amendments to the Bail Act to explicitly require consideration of the risk of further domestic violence by the defendant whenever bail is considered for a domestic violence offence or for a breach of a domestic violence order. This will ensure better consideration of the key risk factors

in each case from the outset and will allow for increased reliance by bail-granting authorities on evidence based risk assessments and other relevant information. This is a cornerstone change and will best support achieving the policy objectives of the private member's bill. It is something that came across very strongly with the stakeholders with whom I met.

The government supports reversing the presumption in favour of bail in the following circumstances: firstly, for defendants charged with a domestic violence offence where the substantive offence is punishable by seven or more years imprisonment, which will include, for example, the offence of strangulation in a domestic setting and other offences of violence such as grievous bodily harm. It will also apply where the substantive offence is one of a prescribed list of offences punishable by a maximum penalty of less than seven years imprisonment, but is offending of a type often associated with domestic violence behaviour—for example, threatening violence, the dangerous operation of a vehicle, stalking, deprivation of liberty and injuring animals—and, secondly, where defendants are charged with an offence of contravening a domestic violence order and one of the following scenarios applies: the contravention itself involved the use or threatened use of violence to person or property; or the defendant has previously been convicted of an offence of violence, whether against the victim or another person within the last five years; or the defendant has previously been convicted of any offence of contravention of a domestic violence order, whether the same order, or a different order, and irrespective of whether the order related to the same victim within the prescribed period of two years.

Although these amendments target a different category of offending than that covered by the private member's bill, by targeting this particular cohort of defendants, and in particular those persons charged with breaches of domestic violence orders, it better delivers the underlying policy objective. This approach is also aligned with that applying in a number of other Australian jurisdictions.

The government does not support the stay of release provision in the private member's bill on the basis of both legal principle and practical outcomes. The private member's bill fails to achieve its intended policy objective because it does not provide an immediate trigger for the automatic stay of release, but rather requires an application under existing section 19B of the Bail Act. This is a civil application to the Supreme Court and is not immediate. As such, a defendant would, in practice, be released on bail, pending the making of the application and the reviewing court exercising its power to issue a warrant to apprehend the defendant. The need for the stay proposal also significantly diminishes when the bail-granting authority is provided with key information to help assess the domestic violence risk factors in the first instance, which leads to better informed bail outcomes. In this regard, this is what will be achieved with the proposed government amendments. I note that, under the Bail Act, there is already provision under section 16 for a defendant to be remanded in custody where it has not been practicable to obtain sufficient information to enable a determination as to whether there is a present unacceptable risk.

The government does not support the approach in the private member's bill to provide for GPS tracking as a condition of bail, focused solely on domestic violence offending. The government's response to the task force report recommendation 123 committed to exploring options to monitor high-risk perpetrators of domestic and family violence, taking into account the full range of potential technological solutions, including the use of GPS monitoring, and then trial the most promising model to improve victims' safety. Although such a trial may take place in a bail context, there are significant operational and resourcing issues with the use of electronic monitoring technology that need further and more detailed consideration.

However, the government proposes to take this opportunity to make amendments to the Bail Act to set up an appropriate and effective legislative framework to allow for the future use of tracking devices as a bail condition at the discretion of the court and not limited to domestic violence offending. I want to emphasise this point. Currently, the private member's bill in relation to bail proposes to limit GPS tracking to just domestic violence offending. Our proposed provisions will extend a legislative framework for GPS tracking relating to bail across all offences. The court will have the discretion in a whole number of situations, not limited to domestic and family violence.

It is proposed to commence these reforms on proclamation to allow for necessary planning and operationalisation. The government does not support the amendments in the private member's bill regarding notification of bail information because they have been more appropriately addressed through amendments to the VOCA Act. The Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill contains the government's position on notification of information to victims, namely, that as far as practicable and appropriate a victim in the criminal justice system will be informed about a range of steps during the criminal justice process. We believe that is important because otherwise what we will have is the victims of crime legislation with a charter of victims rights obliging prescribed persons to

inform victims of major steps within the justice system in relation to their matters and at the same time we will potentially have conflicting provisions in the Bail Act and the Queensland Corrective Services Act. We believe one set of rights in one piece of legislation that goes beyond just domestic violence victims to victims broadly under the Victims of Crime Assistance Act is a better way and does not treat victims of crime in relation to domestic violence in a more limiting way than the broader charter of rights.

The amendments in the private member's bill are impractical and unworkable in this regard. However, the government does propose to move a clarifying amendment in the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill to make it clear that it does apply to applications for bail but will not extend the notification requirements to people unrelated to the offence being heard before the court.

The government does not support the amendments in the private member's bill to extend the eligible persons register. The Queensland Parole System Review conducted by Mr Sofronoff QC directly considered an extension of the eligible persons register, in particular in the terms included in the private member's bill, and did not endorse the proposal. However, the government does intend to take this opportunity to make an amendment to implement recommendation 82 of the parole report which was recommended by Mr Sofronoff QC in the context of his consideration of the eligible persons register as is now proposed under the private member's bill.

The amendment to be moved by the government will make it clear that for the purposes of the eligible persons register, a history of violence will capture domestic violence as it is defined in the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012. Together, the government's proposed amendments will provide a package of reforms that will improve safety outcomes for victims of domestic violence and better hold perpetrators to account. The government's proposed amendments have been informed by the views of a wide range of stakeholders and victims. They are proposed in the spirit of true bipartisanship and genuinely seek to provide the right outcomes. I hope the opposition can do what it sought from the government in its statement attached to the committee's report and support what is clearly in favour of victims, their families and the community generally.

It is important still for all members of this House to remember that legislation is only one small part of a multifaceted response to this complex and dynamic problem. While there is more to be done, the Palaszczuk government remains committed to leading a program of reform to end domestic and family violence in Queensland. Achieving our vision is a long-term endeavour requiring focused and sustained commitment from the whole community. As we know, there is no one quick fix, no matter how hard we try. Significant headway has already been made and in the majority of cases the justice system is responding appropriately. The number of domestic violence order applications lodged in Queensland has increased at a steady rate of about 15 per cent per year since 2011-12 when the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012 commenced. This is a sign that police and courts are acting efficiently and that Queenslanders have confidence in the system.

The Queensland government is also currently trialling integrated service responses for domestic violence in response to the recommendations in the report of the task force. A common risk assessment and management framework, including guidelines regarding the sharing of personal information, will support the integrated service response trials. Australia's National Research Organisation for Women's Safety was engaged to support the development of the framework for use by government and non-government community service agencies. It will articulate a shared understanding, language and common approach to recognising, assessing and responding to domestic and family violence risk and safety action planning.

Further to recommendation 76 of the task force report, the Queensland government has committed funding for the establishment of high-risk teams as part of an integrated approach to domestic and family violence. HRTs provide a forum for appropriate information sharing to ensure risk assessments are comprehensive, inform safety planning and risk management as well as enabling swift and flexible action across agencies in response to need. HRTs are required to mobilise quickly to respond to changing levels of risk and are critical to stop victims from falling through the cracks and to prevent domestic violence related deaths. The first HRT is operational in the Logan-Beenleigh trial site.

Another important initiative is the commitment made in the 2016-17 state budget for an additional just over $10.3 million over four years provided to deliver more perpetrator intervention programs. The new programs will operate as part of an integrated response to domestic and family violence, working closely with other domestic and family violence support services to keep women and children safe. Key recommendations for future attention include the rollout of the specialist domestic violence courts to other high need locations from 2017 to 2020 and enhancing the capability of community justice groups

operating in 18 discrete Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities to develop culturally appropriate domestic and family violence responses. Work in these areas will continue to drive important change.

I wish I could stand here and say that no matter what legislation is passed today we can guarantee that there will not be another tragic death. What we are trying to achieve here is the eradication of crime. If it was that simple we would have achieved it already. There is no reason not to do everything possible to achieve that aim. We are all absolutely committed to seeing an end to domestic and family violence. This House will do what it can to put in the legislative parameters to achieve that aim, but it requires a shift in our community and our culture, a shift in the way our children interact with each other, the respect they show to adults, the respect adults show to each other. This needs to go across the whole of society. Are we really going to get to a point, and are we almost there, where we start to accept that the way we treat each other—the disrespect, the contempt, the lack of respect for multicultural and diverse people in our communities, the way we talk to each other through social media, where we think we have some sort of autonomy to be abusive and offensive, which all flow into domestic and family violence—is just how society is now? We need to change the behaviour in our society. We need to say enough is enough, that this is not acceptable behaviour. We all need to call it out. We should all commit to respect. Whether it is in this chamber or the way we engage with our family and friends and other people in the community, we need to call out this behaviour, not turn a blind eye and say there is nothing I can do about it or this is just the way it is now in society. It will only get worse if we do not call it out.

Next time someone thinks that a family member or a friend may be in a bad, dangerous or violent relationship, call it out. Ask questions. Do not just ask the question of the person who you think is the victim—this happens too often: 'Is he hitting you?' Why are we not turning to the male and saying, 'Are you hitting her?' Males need to speak up and talk to other males and call it out. If we think this is just a problem for women to be fixed by women, nothing is ever going to change. I want to acknowledge that although the majority of victims are women we know men are also victims of domestic violence. We know that there is domestic violence in the LGBTI community. We know that there is domestic violence in our multicultural communities and because of their cultures they are even less inclined to speak up. We need to keep working on this. Do not ever let this momentum fade away. We have done so much in just two years but, as I said, we have so far to go.

I commend to the House the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the proposed government amendments to the bill and to the private member's bill to be moved in consideration in detail.

Mr NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (8.19 pm): I move—

That the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill be now read a second time.

As Dame Quentin Bryce noted in the foreword to the *Not now, not ever* report, published just over two years ago—

It is beholden upon all of us—every single citizen of this diverse, vibrant state—to take a stand against domestic and family violence; to commit to protecting the vulnerable; and to make it clear to those who would hurt another, within a relationship of intimacy and trust, that we will not tolerate, excuse, condone or accept their behaviour.

Fundamentally, this bill is about taking a stand against domestic and family violence and rebalancing the scales of justice in favour of community safety and the victims. I acknowledge all of the loved ones of domestic violence victims who contributed to the committee review of this bill and also those who are here in the gallery tonight. I particularly mention Dale Shales, Teresa Bradford's mum; Bonnie Mobbs, Shelsea Schilling's mum; and Sonia Anderson, Bianca Girven's mother. They are all here tonight. While they have spoken to each other a little in the past couple of weeks, for the first time all three of those very strong women are here tonight to see this debate take place in the House. I welcome you here. I hope, if you can last the distance, that you will be satisfied with the work of your parliament in trying to redress some of the damage and the imbalance that saw you lose your loved daughters in tragic circumstances.

I dedicate this legislation to the memory of Queenslanders who have been lost through domestic and family violence. Following the tragic murder of Gold Coast mum Teresa Bradford, the circumstances of which we know all too well, the community rightly expected that their political leaders would take a stand, that we would do more to protect vulnerable Queenslanders and that we would stop talking and start delivering on the promises that seem to have been made. We have a road map to make Queensland a safer place to live, work and raise a family and it is called the *Not now, not ever* report. That report was commissioned by the government in the previous parliament and delivered

shortly after this parliament was convened. Concerns have been raised that the progress on implementing the report's recommendations has been too slow. Earlier this month, when delivering the progress report to the government, Dame Quentin Bryce noted—

I am very pleased to be presenting this 12 month progress report to the Premier but I would have to say that I do have a sense of urgency about this.

There are a lot of priorities for government, in the community, everyone feels pressured about a lot of competing concerns but there is nothing more critical than looking after vulnerable citizens.

As of February this year, as is stated on the government's departmental website, the government had implemented only 46 of the 121 government recommendations that were part of the *Not now, not ever* report. Progress is slow at best. For vulnerable Queenslanders who are out there suffering through the extreme emotional and physical toll that is part of being a domestic violence victim, that can mean the difference between life and death. We have more to do as a parliament and as a community. We cannot just talk about the solutions to domestic violence; it is actions that speak louder than words and, sadly, those actions have been lacking.

What disturbs me about the debate on this legislation is the way that the government has not embraced in a bipartisan way the opportunity to tackle domestic violence in Queensland through this legislation. That disappoints me and I think it disappoints many Queenslanders. When we introduced the bill on 14 February, we saw the attempt by the Leader of the House, immediately after the bill was introduced, to claim that the bill infringed upon the same-question rule. He tried to have the bill thrown out from the start because of some apparent similarities between legislation already before the parliament, which we are debating tonight in this cognate debate. Members of the public gallery saw that for what it was. Sonia Anderson, the mother of a domestic violence victim who is here tonight and who was in the gallery on that day, gave a very straightforward quote to the *Gold Coast Bulletin*. She said—

I just can't believe that Stirling Hinchliffe or anyone from the Labor Party tried to stop this. There was no point in this.

This is a simple thing to save the lives of women. To me today, it shows the ego in the Labor Party.

It is disappointing that common-sense reforms were not supported by Labor through the committee process. We heard much from the Attorney-General about the report of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee. It is even more disappointing that, in the committee process, alternatives were never sought and amendments were never submitted. They were only raised as late as 4.30 this afternoon, after it was clear that the Speaker's ruling yesterday in relation to the same-question rule did not go the way that the government thought it would. Instead, we have seen the government try to draft amendments at the very last minute. In fact, amendments were received by the shadow Attorney-General at 6.30 this evening for a debate that was to commence at 7.40 tonight.

If the government and the Attorney-General had wanted a bipartisan approach, at any time they could have picked up the phone—it has been done before—and had a sensible and serious conversation with the shadow Attorney-General and myself about any concerns they might have had or amendments they might like to have raised, but that did not occur. That has happened in the past. From the moment that this bill was introduced, I invited the government to pick up the phone and to reach out and let us know where they thought it could be improved or made better, but that has not occurred. As I said, it only occurred late today when their amendments were received at 6.30 pm.

I have to say that the amendments that the Attorney-General has indicated she wishes to move in relation to this act do not appear in any way to be supported by any evidence of the committee. There are broad statements about the potential for unintended consequences, but there are no examples of what those unintended consequences might be—none whatsoever. There is not one example of where there may be an unintended consequence. I think that the government is good with words. They are happy to mouth the word 'bipartisanship', but when it comes to actively and constructively working with the opposition on a bill designed to protect victims of violence, they are found sadly lacking.

Something else of interest in relation to the committee report is that not one member of a government department bothered to attend. No-one from the Department of Justice or the Department of Communities and no-one with responsibility in this significant policy area sought to make a contribution to the full parliamentary committee inquiry into a matter that the government claims is so close to its heart—not once. There has not been one comment; there has not been one item of support. All we have heard is a bland statement by the committee chair that really does not advance the cause. The chair of the committee, the member for Stretton, said—

Based on the submissions lodged and the evidence provided in the public hearings, Government members were of the view that this Bill requires more consultation and significant amendment. Whilst some of the proposals in the Bill have merit, there is potential for unintended consequences—

he could not tell us what they were—

and it is abundantly clear that more work needs to be undertaken in relation to this very important issue.

He could not say what that 'more work' needed to be. He could not in any way back up that broad statement, which he made in the introduction to the report, and on close reading of the committee report there is none.

The bill is based on the recommendations of the *Not now, not ever* report that have yet to be adopted and also based on legislation that has been enacted in other jurisdictions in Australia. The bill has five specific objectives: it reverses the presumption of bail for an alleged offender charged with a relevant domestic violence offence; it establishes a special bail condition for a tracking device, sometimes known as a GPS tracker, to be imposed by a court or a police officer authorised to grant bail, against a person charged with a relevant domestic violence offence; it introduces a new system to alert the victim of a relevant domestic violence offence when the defendant applies for bail, is released on bail or receives a variation to a bail condition; it introduces a mandatory reporting provision to the parole system, the details of which are set out in the bill; and it introduces a provision to allow for an urgent review of a bail decision in a higher court—the original bail decision would be stayed for up to three business days ensuring that the alleged offender would not be released during that period.

Those five objectives are designed very simply with the credo of first do no harm. The first thing has to be the protection of the community and the protection of victims from either further harm or any harm. That needs to be the guiding light that people in this place consider tonight.

The committee had just over a month to consider the bill and received 32 submissions, as well as a written briefing from the member for Mansfield and a verbal briefing from the member for Mansfield, a verbal briefing from the member for Mansfield and the member for Mudgeeraba and responses to the issues raised by submitters by the member for Mansfield. The bill does not need further consideration and debate about the policy objectives. They are clear. That is exactly what the criticism has been over the last two years—too much talk and not enough action.

Policy objectives 1 and 2 are outlined in the *Not now, not ever* report. Objective 3 is a common-sense law reform that was recommended by the Australian Law Reform Commission in 2010—seven years ago. Objective 4 was strongly recommended by the Women's Legal Service to the Sofronoff parole review. Objective 5 has been implemented in New South Wales as part of changes made to the Bail Act in 2013 to strengthen the process of granting bail.

It seems that the provision in the bill that has gained the most amount of attention is the reverse presumption of bail. I want to reiterate an important point, which is that this by no way means that a defendant will not receive bail. It just means that the emphasis is on the defendant to show why they should receive bail as opposed to the prosecution proving why a defendant should not receive bail. It is exactly like the case is now for murder in Queensland and like the case is now for a number of other examples that are already outlined in section 16 of the act.

What is also clearly evident is that the government has failed to do its homework on this provision. As recently as February 2017—that is only last month—the State Coroner, Terry Ryan, acting as the chairperson for the Domestic and Family Violence Death Review and Advisory Board, wrote to the Attorney-General about a domestic violence case study they had reviewed. The board outlined the following recommendations following a case study into the death of a person identified as Kelly. He stated—

Based on a review of this death, the Board found that given the aggravating circumstances associated with domestic and family violence and the high likelihood of recidivism, this case highlights the potential benefit in reviewing the Bail Act 1980 to consider specific circumstances in which the presumption in favour of bail should be revoked.

reversing the presumption of bail. He went on—

The Board further identified that any such review should take into consideration the processes that should be implemented after a revocation of bail to reduce the immediate risk of harm, and the likelihood of future offending. Consideration should also be given to ways to enhance a victim's immediate and longer term safety needs while relevant criminal proceedings are ongoing.

The Board recommends that this report be tabled in the Queensland Parliament in accordance with section 91ZC(6) of the Coroners Act 2003.

That letter was dated 14 February 2017. That is the very day that this private member's bill that we are debating here tonight was introduced into the parliament. The changes in this bill regarding the presumption of bail were not only referenced by the *Not now, not ever* report but also referred to as part of recommendations made by the government's own Domestic and Family Violence Death Review and Advisory Board.

In the committee report the Labor members allege that there was considerable overlap in relation to the notification of victims with the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill which is currently before the House. We know that that is wrong. We know that is wrong because Mr Speaker came into this place yesterday and ruled that that was not the case.

We have to look at the substance not the form. The substance is that this is a very different set of circumstances from those in the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill—completely debunking the statements made by government members in the committee report and also addressing the matters that have been raised by the Attorney-General in her attempt to move amendments in relation to the Victims of Crime and Other Legislation Amendment Bill before the House in relation to the code of practice for notification.

This is just another example of how the government has had to be dragged kicking and screaming into supporting this particular piece of legislation, as much as they say they do, and also supporting victims of domestic violence. That is what people are sick and tired of. Get on with the job. If Labor were going to be constructive they could have tried to work through their concerns and bring forward amendments weeks ago or, as I said earlier, even as part of the committee's report.

If the government chooses to vote against this legislation then let us be clear about what that means. They are voting against common-sense reforms that favour community safety and give domestic violence victims and their families a better chance to protect themselves. They are not acting in the best interests of those who are the victims and their families.

I am proud of the work done by my team. We will continue to stand up for vulnerable Queenslanders and their families. I acknowledge the work of Ros Bates who has been a tower of strength for many people with her own heart-wrenching story, the work of Ian Walker, the shadow Attorney-General, who has put together this legislation, supported by people like the member for Gaven, who tells his own personal and harrowing story as well. The whole team has wanted to see this legislation debated.

I thank and acknowledge those people who have stood with us and championed the change. We could not have done this without your help as well. Thank you for your courage. I know how hard it was in those dreadful circumstances for you to stand up and to make the case for change to protect people. As I said when we introduced these changes, we are happy to do the work that this government is not doing and push for these reforms because they are important and they will help address domestic violence for victims and their families.

This is a chance for this parliament to stand together, to send a message to Queenslanders—not now, not ever; we must eliminate domestic and family violence in our community. That is a quote taken from the *Not now, not ever* report. If those opposite cannot see the way to support this legislation tonight then they should hang their heads in shame because the government is supposed to work for the people not the other way round. Queenslanders deserve a justice system, not just a legal system. This bill goes some way to achieving that and rebalancing the scales of justice in favour of community safety. For that reason I commend the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill to the House.

Let me touch briefly on the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. The LNP will not be opposing that legislation. We support good common-sense reforms. They do not have to be ours, they can be the government's. As we have done for the past two years in this place, we continue to support proper, sensible reform.

The genesis of the bill brought by the government was a statutory review that was commissioned by the LNP government in 2013 and supported the work that we did in government to better support victims of crime. I personally had many submissions, particularly from counsellors, in relation to the confidentiality provisions and privilege being granted to counsellors in that area. I am very pleased to be able to see that being brought forward. The work that we did also included greater funding for victims of crime advocates and legislating victim impact statements as and when appropriate. I will leave it to the shadow Attorney-General and other speakers on this side to further elaborate on the changes in that bill.

Before I finish, it has come to my attention that a Twitter post posted some time ago from the opposition account carried an image from parliament. I want to apologise to the House for this inadvertent breach and I have counselled my staff on this matter.

Mr WALKER (Mansfield—LNP) (8.39 pm): It is certainly a humbling experience, I think, for all of us to stand in the House tonight and debate these two pieces of legislation—the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act

Amendment Bill—and to do so in the presence of those who have been so cruelly and immediately affected by crime. It is always in some way easy for us to debate these matters in a somewhat remote way when we speak in this parliament but, as the Leader of the Opposition has said, meeting those who have been affronted by crime in only very recent times and to have them sitting here observing the debate I think puts into perspective our own contributions and the obligation we have here in debating both of these pieces of legislation to ensure that the community of Queensland gets the best service from this parliament that it can.

I will address both pieces of legislation and I will start with the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. In its thorough review of the bill, the committee looking at the bill did not propose any other recommendation other than that the bill be passed by the Legislative Assembly. As the Leader of the Opposition has just outlined, we support that recommendation. The bill implements recommendations made as part of a statutory review of the Victims of Crime Assistance Act 2009. That review was established by the LNP government in 2013. The VOCA Act was designed, firstly, to declare the fundamental principles of justice to underlie the treatment of victims; to implement the principles of justice and set out processes to make complaints about conduct inconsistent with the principles; and to establish a financial assistance scheme for victims who have suffered from an act of violence.

From the outset, I want to thank and acknowledge the review team in the Department of Justice and Attorney-General for their work and consultation undertaken. As is outlined in their report, which was finalised in 2015, the review team adopted a staged and targeted approach to consultation, engaging with stakeholders throughout the course of the review. A reference group of key government and non-government service providers included Victims Assist Queensland, Women's Legal Service, Bravehearts, DVConnect, Protect All Children Today and the Queensland Homicide Victims Support Group. I want to thank all of those organisations who contributed greatly to the reference group and the departmental review and therefore this legislation. These organisations are tireless advocates for justice and equality before the law and they make a significant contribution to protecting Queensland victims of crime and their families.

The bill as introduced by the government has three key objectives, as outlined in the explanatory notes. Firstly, it implements the recommendations of the *Final report of the review of the Victims of Crime Assistance Act 2009* and ensures that the Victims of Crime Assistance Act 2009 continues to provide an effective response to assist victims of crime. Secondly, it introduces a sexual assault counselling privilege. Thirdly, it gives victims of a sexual offence who are to give evidence in a criminal proceeding against the accused automatic status as a special witness. The bill implements all 15 recommendations of the review into the act which, as I said before, was established by the LNP government in 2013.

Recommendation 130 of the *Not now, not ever* report is implemented in the bill through the introduction of sexual assault counselling privilege in recognition that sexual assault survivors deserve to have their dignity respected if they choose to seek counselling and support to overcome all of the things they have had to endure. All other Australian jurisdictions have introduced some form of statutory evidentiary privilege to limit the disclosure of communications that occur when a survivor of sexual assault seeks counselling. It is time we in Queensland catch up, and we support the adoption of this important change. The bill also ensures that a sexual assault survivor is automatically granted the right to be a special witness. That is a witness who is able to give evidence in a protected way within court proceedings.

All of these changes build on the need for a review, which was commissioned in 2013. The former LNP government was a strong supporter of victims of crime. We increased funding for victims of crime advocacy groups. We introduced laws that enabled a victim to read their victim impact statement before a sentencing court if the victim so wished and it was reasonable to do so in the circumstances. Sadly, under this government there are more and more victims of crime who need support because, quite simply, crime is on the increase. While it is fundamentally important that we support those victims, the government also needs to work harder to prevent crime from occurring in the first place.

As I said earlier today in another context, I hear this firsthand from victims, from Rockhampton to Townsville to the Gold Coast, when I travel around the state. It is one thing to come in here and talk about the victims of crime, but unless we actually speak to them we do not get their full story. I was pleased in Rockhampton recently to meet with Janice Keys, who was having difficulty meeting with representatives of the government. She was the victim of a violent home invasion and assault, as was her husband. To hear her story firsthand, once again, reinforced the need for us to keep victims at the forefront of our thoughts as we legislate in this place. As the Leader of the Opposition said earlier, we will not be opposing the government's bill.

I turn now to the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2017, introduced by the Leader of the Opposition on 14 February this year. I will just explain how crucial the tragic circumstances surrounding Teresa Bradford's death were to our getting this piece of legislation moving. The Leader of the Opposition said to me on the day that news broke that we had to do something about this. Within 24 hours, I had met with shadow minister Bates and with shadow minister Mander and we had started to get the pillars of this legislation together. Within the next 24 hours we got together a team of lawyers who assisted us, because it is difficult from opposition to get legislation as complex as this together without that assistance. Then, of course, the Office of Parliamentary Counsel were able to put the finishing touches on what we think is an important and very substantive piece of legislation.

As the Leader of the Opposition said, we are disappointed that the bipartisan approach which has existed until now on domestic violence matters was broken when the committee was unable to agree and gave the rather unsatisfactory report, to which the Leader of the Opposition has referred, in giving us little or no guidance as to what the committee's real views on the matter were, rather I think taking a position which interrupted what had long been a course of bipartisanship on this matter since the LNP commissioned the *Not now, not ever* report.

The measures are quite clearly set out in our bill and they largely replicate measures already in place in other jurisdictions or recommended by the *Not now, not ever* report or by other recommendations of government instrumentalities—the Leader of the Opposition spoke today about a recommendation from the coroner. Firstly, there is the reversal of the onus of proof in bail applications for serious domestic violence offences—not putting bail out of the reach of a person charged with that offence but tipping the scales, or the balance, rightly towards the victim and not towards the accused. I think that is an important step that we have to take.

There is the provision of allowing magistrates to require those on bail, if it is appropriate, to wear a tracking device—something that assists the police in determining where offenders are and protects victims who are given a device themselves to warn them of the approach of a victim. It is not a failsafe mechanism but one which, put together with others, can only help.

A very important measure in the bill is providing warning to those who are likely to be affected if a person is being let out on bail or parole with respect to these matters. It is something that is a very simple thing to do, yet it probably gives victims as much ability to protect themselves as possible—the simple knowledge that the person who has attacked them before or who is alleged to have attacked them before is taking that step.

All of these measures, together with the immediate ability to freeze an application and have a person held in custody while an appeal on bail is made, are all strong and sensible measures for us to take. I hope that the government thinks carefully about simply introducing tit-for-tat amendments rather than looking at the substance of what we are doing and trying once again to regain the bipartisanship that has been so important in this House in dealing with this very sensitive matter.

(Time expired)

Mr PEGG (Stretton—ALP) (8.49 pm): I rise to speak to this cognate debate on the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 and the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2016. At the outset, I want to acknowledge the families of the victims of domestic violence who are here tonight and who also contributed to the consideration of this bill, and their courage in speaking about the tragic loss of their loved ones. I know that is definitely not an easy thing to do. As was stated in the foreword of the report in relation to the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill, it was very clear to me that during the committee process all those who appeared before the committee and made submissions were clearly committed to putting a stop to domestic and family violence, which is a terrible scourge on our society.

We have heard in this House with other bills that have been presented in relation to addressing this issue, in the course of the committee process and throughout the media and in the public some really tragic stories about experiences in relation to domestic and family violence. Every time I hear those stories I realise how fortunate I am not to be someone who has been directly affected by domestic and family violence, but I did have an experience that really hit home to me when I was 20 years old, studying at Griffith University and living in the residential college. I recall one night when a friend of mine, a mature aged student, called me in distress. There was a lot of noise going on in the background and she said, 'Can you come and help me?' I immediately grabbed a friend, jumped in my Mazda 323 and drove to her house. The door was open. The house was completely empty. It had been ransacked and we were looking for her. We did not have mobile phones in those days. Fortunately, we ultimately found her on the street and took her back to the residential college where she spent the night with her

young son. This is a very emotional issue for a lot of people, particularly for those who have experienced domestic violence firsthand. As I said, I am very fortunate and I realise how fortunate I am not to be someone who has experienced domestic and family violence firsthand.

The Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill was introduced on 14 February by the Leader of the Opposition. It was referred to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee for consideration and tabling of the committee's report on 17 March 2017. I want to thank all stakeholders and submitters in relation to both bills. I also want to thank the other committee members for their hard work. We have been quite a busy committee, but we have been dealing with very serious and very important issues. I want to thank the deputy chair, the member for Coomera; the member for Pine Rivers; the member for Capalaba; the member for Beaudesert; and the member for Currumbin. I also want to recognise the hard work of the member for Ferny Grove, who was the previous chair of this committee. I want to acknowledge the hardworking committee staff—Ms Emily Booth, Ms Kelli Longworth, Mr Gregory Thomson, Ms Carolyn Heffernan and Ms Janette Van Den Berg.

We all agree that tackling domestic and family violence is a priority, and everybody wants the same outcomes which is strong, workable laws which protect the victims of family and domestic violence. We have a blueprint for laws in relation to domestic violence—the Special Taskforce on Domestic and Family Violence in Queensland's report *Not now, not ever: putting an end to domestic and family violence in Queensland*. It is important to note that the Palaszczuk government accepted all of the recommendations of the special task force. This government has made significant inroads in implementing these particular recommendations and the special task force made their recommendations after extensive consultation with stakeholders. It is also important to note that any consideration of making laws that deviate from the blueprint need very careful consideration. It is important to strengthen bail laws and increase powers to protect victims of domestic violence. However, it is also equally important that stakeholders are consulted closely to ensure that we have effective laws.

I did want to respond to some of the remarks made by the member for Clayfield in relation to the committee report when he said that some of the conclusions were not clear. He clearly has not read the report, in my view, because the views of the various submitters were made quite clear throughout that report. If he had read the transcript, read the submissions and read the report, that would be readily apparent to the member for Clayfield.

There is some overlap with this private member's bill and the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016, which the committee recommended be passed. It is important to note that the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 contains rights that ensure victims of domestic violence have the right to be informed about the progress of an investigation of a crime; each major decision made about the prosecution of a person accused of committing the crime including when a perpetrator is applying for bail; and their being released from custody or any other matter that is before the court that affects the victim.

The government response to recommendation 123 of the task force report made a commitment to exploring options to monitor high-risk perpetrators of domestic and family violence, and it is important to note that recommendation 123 of this task force report proposed that the Queensland government trial the use of GPS monitoring of high-risk perpetrators of family and domestic violence.

I do want to speak to the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. The main policy objectives of this bill are to implement the recommendations of the *Final report on the review of the Victims of Crime Assistance Act 2009* and to ensure the Victims of Crime Assistance Act continues to provide an effective response to assist victims of crime. The other policy objective of the bill is to introduce a sexual assault counselling privilege and to give victims of a sexual offence who are to give evidence in a criminal proceeding against the accused automatic status as a special witness.

The bill proposes to make amendments to remove requirements that an application for financial assistance be verified by statutory declaration and also that the victim provide a medical certificate with their application for financial assistance. I think this is very important because it is removing procedural impediments for victims to get access to some redress, and I think that is a very important thing. It is important to note that the application form for financial assistance will still have a requirement for the applicant to declare that the information provided in the application is true and correct. The application form will also include a warning to the applicant that providing misleading or false information is an offence and will also have the potential to adversely affect the outcome of their application. Once an application is received by VAQ, the assessor will work with the victim to obtain necessary information about the treatment and injury needs of the victim including obtaining information from hospital records, with the victim's consent, or police reports.

I did want to speak briefly about how the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill will enhance the rights of victims and how they are treated, because I think this is very important. The bill proposes to enhance the rights of victims and how they are treated by ensuring the charter applies to all victims of domestic and family violence; renaming and redrafting the current fundamental principles of justice for victims in the VOCA Act to create a new charter of victims' rights; ensuring that rights under the charter are consistent with other legislation; placing a proactive duty on agencies to provide information to victims if appropriate and practicable to do so; extending the charter to apply to non-government agencies that are funded to provide a service to victims to recover from a crime; and expanding the role of a victim services coordinator in the VOCA Act to help victims resolve complaints.

The charter is divided into two parts. Part 1 of the charter is in relation to the general rights of victims, rights relating to the criminal justice system and making complaints, and it applies to victims as defined in amended section 5 of the act. Part 2 of the charter relates to offenders who have been sentenced to prison or detention and also applies to eligible persons.

The other important aspect of this particular bill is the introduction of a sexual assault counselling privilege. This type of privilege is generally referred to as a sexual assault communications privilege. In relation to this bill, the explanatory notes state—

> When considering an application for leave, the court may consider an oral or written statement provided by the victim outlining the harm they are likely to suffer if the application for leave is granted. 'Harm' is widely defined and is not limited to harm suffered as a direct result of the sexual assault.

In conclusion, I once again want to thank all of those involved in the committee report who made submissions, particularly the families of victims of domestic violence. As I said, they showed tremendous courage in speaking to us and coming before the committee.

Ms BATES (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (9.01 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2017. Today is a proud day to be a member of the LNP opposition. Today we debate our legislation that will balance the scales of justice towards victims of domestic and family violence. As members know, I stand in this House as a survivor of domestic and family violence. I, like those who will be protected by our legislation, know what it feels like to be scared in your own home, to feel helpless, to be beaten and to fear the retribution that may follow. I know what it feels like to finally make a decision to leave an awful situation, because I did so almost 40 years ago. I know that we need to support those who make that same decision today and we need to keep them safe.

These laws will work. This is a bill based on working laws in other states. It is a bill based on ideas from the domestic violence sector. The legislation we are debating today reverses the presumption for bail in domestic violence related crimes such as serious assault, grievous bodily harm, deprivation of liberty, strangulation and kidnapping. It introduces a DV alert system to ensure victims and families are notified when someone charged with domestic violence crimes is being considered for, or who has been granted, bail. This DV alert system will notify victims and families when someone with a DVO is being considered for parole, even if the reason they are in prison is not related to domestic violence. Our laws introduce urgent appeal rights to the bail application process, meaning bail decisions will be stayed for up to three business days and referred to a higher court for urgent review. Importantly, our laws will allow GPS trackers to be fitted to an alleged offender as a bail condition by the court to ensure that victims of crime are better protected throughout the trial process, which can be lengthy.

I was heartened by the support of the families of the victims of domestic violence and non-government service providers during the committee's consideration of this bill. I told a story in this House about my domestic violence. Tonight let me try and do justice to some other brave women and their stories. Let me introduce to the honourable members in this chamber Dale Shales, Teresa Bradford's mother, who is sitting in the gallery tonight. Dale is a wonderful woman who has fostered many children in her life and now has the unenviable task of bringing up three grandchildren who no longer have a mother. Those opposite have not met Teresa Bradford's children. They have not listened to their heartfelt anguish over the death of their mother. These children were in the house when their father murdered their mother in cold blood. These children have all said time after time that they believe that if their father was never given bail then their mother would still be alive today. They knew their father was dangerous. They knew it was inevitable that he would hurt their mother again. Their little lives have been torn apart and they want justice for their mother too. They want to make sure that no dangerous offender who has been charged with indictable offences is let loose into our community.

You can argue bureaucratic tripe tonight about unintended consequences all you like, but the fact remains that the unintended consequence of Teresa Bradford's dangerous husband being given bail is the reason these children no longer have a mother. So, Attorney-General, turn around and face

Dale Shales, Teresa's mother, who is in the gallery and explain to her why you believe that this bill would not have saved her daughter and how you plan to protect another woman from the same fate as Teresa.

Tonight in the gallery is Bonnie Mobbs, the mother of Shelsea Schilling. Shelsea was the beloved daughter of Damien and Bonnie and loved sister of Chloe. Shelsea lived her young life in fear. She was terrified of Bronson Ellery and she tried to change her entire life to get away from him. She became a virtual prisoner at home because he stalked her and the family relentlessly. Bronson Ellery was in jail for an unrelated offence. Bronson Ellery was given bail and no-one in that entire family was notified of his release. Every member of Shelsea's family was part of that DVO, and not one of them was notified that he was out on parole. He was living two blocks from that family. He accosted a terrified Shelsea at Australia Fair. What short life she had was lived in fear. Her family still live in fear. Her family will never get over the loss of their beautiful daughter, and they are the ones with the life sentence. So, member for Stretton, turn around and face Bonnie and tell her why it is all too hard to have an alert system—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Elmes): Through the chair please, member for Mudgeeraba.

Ms BATES: Sorry. Through the chair, member for Stretton, turn around and face Bonnie and tell her why an alert system to save another family will not work. Explain to her, this grieving mother, why this government will not listen to her pleas tonight.

Tonight I also want to tell the House about Tara Brown. Her mother, Natalie Hinton, could not be here tonight because she is looking after her granddaughter—the daughter who will grow up without her mother. Tara was another woman who was let down by the system. She was known to DV services on the Gold Coast for 12 months and she was sent to numerous shelters and motels. She drove herself to her death, not knowing that her murderer was tracking her every movement. We have all heard the terrifying last moments of Tara's life, frantically trying to outrun her killer, frantically making calls to triple 0 and then finally being forced off the road, hanging helplessly upside down in her car, pleading for her life whilst Lionel Patea beat her to a pulp. Yesterday would have been Tara's birthday. Yesterday she should have been celebrating with her little girl. I know that the staff at the Gold Coast University Hospital are still traumatised by the injuries that Tara was admitted with. Those nurses who cared for her—and I know some of them—will never forget what they saw, and nor will Tara's parents.

Lionel Patea was a dangerous and violent man. If Tara had had a GPS alert or a DV alert system when he was bailed, then she may still be alive today. So, through the chair, I say to the member for Capalaba as another government member: turn and face these mothers who are asking for nothing more than that you honour their daughters and pass this legislation tonight. Tell Tara's daughter why doing nothing will save another child like her from growing up without her mother.

Tonight I want to pay special respect to Sonia Anderson, someone I am proud to call a friend, and all that she is doing to honour her daughter, Bianca, and Bianca's little son, Ziggy, who is growing up without his mother. A failed system failed Bianca. A failed system did not warn Bianca or her family. A failed system is still not working for Sonia and her remaining family members. Sonia is a rock of support for these new mothers who are in a club which none of them wanted to join. Membership of this club was not of their choosing. Terrible people did terrible things to their children. Terrible things continue to happen to Sonia's family, and we have an obligation to make it right tonight for these families.

Again I ask: when you had the opportunity to amend this legislation and do the work through the committee process, why are we now looking at lastminute.com? Turn around and tell Sonia that she wasted her time by giving evidence to a committee where the government members were already given their riding orders to try and stop this legislation. Tell Sonia why, when she was in the gallery, the government tried to have the legislation thrown out on technical grounds on the same question rule.

I say to the Attorney-General: you can make a difference tonight; you can give these mothers what they desperately crave and that is justice for their daughters, a legacy that they can hold on to, so that this does not happen to anyone else ever again. I am proud to be part of a party that is standing up for victims and making the changes we desperately need. The actions of those opposite in refusing to support victims and their families have been nothing short of shameful. I urge all members to support these reforms because, as Sonia Anderson said when she gave evidence, if we save just one life these laws will have worked.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Elmes): Order! Before calling the member for Nanango, can I just remind honourable members that your comments should be through the chair and not directed to a member opposite.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (9.12 pm): After sitting in this chamber today and listening to the speech that preceded mine, I am extraordinarily proud to be an LNP member and to be taking up the fight for domestic violence victims and family violence victims all across this great state. The work that has been done by the shadow minister, Ros Bates; the shadow Attorney-General, Ian Walker; and the opposition leader, Tim Nicholls, has been incredible in terms of bringing in this piece of legislation, the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2017.

When we were in government we initiated the *Not now, not ever* report. Two years have passed since we have been on the government benches. If it takes an opposition to bring about change as we have had to do before in this House, then that is what we have to do. We do not have the resources of the government. We do not have the abilities of the government. We are in opposition. However, I am proud to be part of an opposition that wants to bring about change, that wants to assist people and affect people's lives.

As I sat in this chamber today it was so disappointing to hear from the state Attorney-General that there were unintended consequences, but there was no explanation for those unintended consequences. There was absolutely no explanation. Had there been an explanation that one could understand, we would all take that on board, but none was given. Along with the opposition leader and the member for Mudgeeraba, I would like to pay tribute to Dale, Bonnie and Sonia, along with their family members and friends, who are here in the gallery tonight.

We must tackle the growing scourge of domestic violence and family violence. We in the LNP make no apology for this bill, which, if accepted by those opposite tonight, will bring in tough new laws that stand up for the victims of domestic violence and the victims of family violence. As I have already stated, we led the way with the *Not now, not ever* report, but it is so disappointing to now be in opposition and see the slow pace of its implementation. We hear that only 46 of the 121 recommendations are being implemented, yet we heard from a speaker opposite just prior, 'This government accepts all the recommendations.' Why then are we not doing something faster about implementing them? That is what we are trying to do today.

Our bill has five key objectives. The first one is to reverse the onus of proof for bail; make it harder for bail to be granted for alleged offenders charged with DV related crimes. This means that the emphasis is on the defendant, on the perpetrator, to establish why they should be granted bail. We also wish to establish a DV alert system allowing for automatic notification when anyone the subject of a DV order is being considered for either bail or parole. This would give time, much needed time, for victims to prepare mentally and physically for their potential release. I understand from sitting in the chamber tonight that the government does not agree with this and I look forward to hearing the explanations for why because I simply do not understand that at all.

We also wish to implement GPS monitoring for high-risk offenders on bail. When the shadow minister, the shadow minister for education and I were at the International Women's Day breakfast, I am quite sure I heard the then acting premier say, 'We are a government that is implementing GPS trackers on domestic violence victims.' That is what we heard during that speech. Yet tonight in this chamber we have heard back-pedalling from that. We heard, 'We're going to put it across and have a trial or more consultation across a broader range.' How about we just start doing something for these poor victims of crime? Normally a perpetrator of domestic violence is an offender we want to have tracked because they often go back to the victim as they are aware of their situation. We need to start acting.

We also wish to introduce immediate appeal rights against the granting of bail, providing an urgent review of a granted bail application to a higher court. After listening to the debate tonight we also understand that this government does not agree with that, either. We wish to introduce mandatory reporting provisions to the parole system so that when a prisoner receives parole the victim of domestic violence can receive information about that prisoner. It is a common-sense piece of legislative change. I plead with those opposite to agree to these common-sense amendments.

Unfortunately, Queensland accounted for a quarter of all domestic violence related deaths in 2016. I have worked in the field of domestic violence as a solicitor in regional Queensland. I have worked with many women and men and their families who have been victims of domestic violence. I have spoken to the children; I have spoken to the grandparents; I have spoken to the aunts, the friends, the uncles, the people who are trying to help. This scourge of domestic violence needs to be stopped, so we should do whatever we can to assist these victims of both domestic and family violence. The people in the court systems need that assistance. The victims themselves need the reassurance.

A former magistrate in the South Burnett undertook research and reviewed 338 domestic violence applications across our region. We know that this is one of the biggest issues in the South Burnett court system. We understand there is a high prevalence of alcohol and drugs, but the most disturbing statistic that I heard from the magistrate was that 53 per cent of applications affected children.

We know that there is much work to be done to address any statistics in relation to domestic violence. That is why here in this House tonight we have a chance to pass some common-sense changes that will assist our court system, that will assist our police, that will assist the victims and that will assist the families of domestic and family violence. There are many agencies across my area such as UnitingCare Community, South Burnett CTC, Centacare South Burnett and the Salvos. They do all they can, but they need this legislation to support them. I have spoken to these people about this legislation and what they think. They support this legislation.

The objectives of our legislation are clearly in the public interest. We are trying to protect victims and their families. It is beyond belief and any understanding that the government members of the committee could not see past the politics and agree to the passage of this bill. If they had an excuse, we could understand. The legislation that the LNP are proposing is based on three things: laws and procedures already working in other jurisdictions; solutions offered by stakeholders on the ground; and, most importantly, recommendations of the *Not now, not ever* report which have so far not even been enacted.

I truly hope that members on the opposite side of the House realise the balance needs to be tipped in favour of victims and their families and the community in general. We urge you, as government members, to support the LNP's strong laws because the longer we wait, the longer vulnerable women and children will be put at risk.

Ms BOYD (Pine Rivers—ALP) (9.20 pm): I rise today to make a contribution to the debate on the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2017 and the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. I will refer to the bills as the bail bill and VOCA throughout the remainder of my contribution.

At the outset I thank the committee staff, committee members and those stakeholders who took the time to make written submissions and appear before the committee's public hearings. In total there were close to 40 individuals and interest groups as well as stakeholders across both bills. I want to specifically single out the families of victims who appeared before the committee or made contributions in the bail bill. In thanking them for coming to the bail bill hearing on 1 March I noted my appreciation for how extraordinarily tough it must be, but I hoped that they could receive some solace from knowing that the work they are doing will hopefully prevent other families from being in the same situation. I maintain that statement tonight. Regardless of the result of the passage of this legislation, these are conversations that cannot be unspoken and messages that cannot be unheard. While in this place we will differ on the best way in which to strike the balance between justice and protection, please know that the work you have done as advocates in this space in an effort to make our community a safer place has made a difference.

The committee unanimously recommended that the VOCA bill be passed but we could not reach agreement on the bail bill, as significant amendments would be needed before we could find middle ground. What is most underhanded are the public comments of the shadow minister for the prevention of domestic violence, who has gone public with scathing assessments of government members and the government on this bill. If you ever wanted a play out of the playbook for gutter politics, look no further than the member for Mudgeeraba. She has gone low on the attack. It seems there was not much of an appetite to pick up on her gutter politics though: I have only seen it in one outlet, *My Sunshine Coast,* who ran the lowest play in the playbook. For the purpose of posterity and to shine a light on the approach and the mentality of the shadow minister, I will further inform the House. The article is entitled, 'Labor abandons domestic violence victims' and it states—

> Domestic violence victims and mothers of murdered women have been abandoned by Labor members Duncan Pegg, Nikki Boyd and Don Brown in an act of pure partisan politics.
>
> …
>
> Labor's three members of the committee examining the LNP's tough new domestic violence Bill have refused to recommend that the new laws be passed—ignoring pleas of victims and advocates and choosing to side with civil libertarians and perpetrators.
>
> …
>
> "The Palaszczuk Labor Government has ignored and dismissed the views of victims and families who have lost loved ones to domestic violence," Ms Bates said.

"The Labor members of this committee think civil libertarians and the rights of perpetrators trump victims, which is simply offensive.

"It is nothing short of shameful of Labor to rip up years of bipartisanship on tackling domestic violence at the expense of cheap politicking."

Ms Bates said the Bill was based on working laws in other states, recommendations of the "Not Now Not Ever" report not yet enacted or ideas from the sector.

"Doing nothing is not a solution and Labor have offered nothing in the committee process to help this Bill pass," Ms Bates said.

"Labor's Annastasia Palaszczuk and her so called Minister for Women and Attorney-General should hang their heads in shame.

"It has been clear from the very beginning that Labor were never going to support this important legislation and today's committee report is further proof of that."

Well, there you have it. At a time when you would think you would see the shadow minister espousing the merits of this legislation and winning over stakeholder support—because there is still a large void with much of this legislation in terms of stakeholder support—instead you have the member for Mudgeeraba out there in the public smearing government members, the Premier, the Attorney-General and the Minister for Women. All members in this place enter into the committee process with enormous goodwill, and to allege otherwise and to besmirch members' reputations outside of this place while matters are still on foot is cheap, nasty and disingenuous. The only slap in the face here is to the committee process and the government members on the committee. The only cheap political points are the ones that the member for Mudgeeraba is trying to score.

There has been a genuine commitment to bipartisanship around these issues, and there should always be. Rather than seeking to do that and seeking to work with the departments, experts in the legislation and experts in the three relevant departments on this bail bill, we see the LNP rush off and, in the midst of a tragedy, pull together legislation that is rushed, ill-informed and has the ability to be downright dangerous, all the while conducting themselves through the committee process as though they and this poorly-put-together legislation were beyond reproach. We were belittled or attacked for asking questions or putting forward an alternative position and doing the things that the committee process was designed to do. While I will admit there have not been—

Mr Saunders interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Elmes): Order! The member for Maryborough will withdraw.

Mr SAUNDERS: I withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Pine Rivers, let me make this very clear. There are a lot of people listening to what is happening here today. I would ask that people making speeches be mindful of the content of their speech, and I would ask that people who seek to interject be mindful of their interjections. Amongst all the debates that we have in this House, this should be one that is conducted in a very sober manner. I hope I make myself clear on both sides of the House. I call the member for Pine Rivers.

Ms BOYD: While I admit that I have not been in this House for long, I have heard that multiple members—too many to name—from all backgrounds and all points of view regard the committee process and its role as the foundation for good policymaking. I still attest to that. Judging by the behaviour exhibited from those opposite, I hold grave concerns that they do not.

Let us examine where this committee process got us. One of the resounding concerns heard throughout the bail bill committee process was the consultation that had been undertaken prior to the committee process and the short length of time available to committee members and stakeholders to properly and fully understand the proposal and the impact of such policy implementation. From my position as a committee member, I think it is fair to say that the opposition was still largely figuring it out as they went, with commentary light on detail and heavy on rhetoric. Bill Potts from the Queensland Law Society stated that the consultation process was very short. He voiced the concern that, 'With such a short time of turnaround there may be some unintended consequences which we simply have not had time to consider.' His colleague Christine Smyth stated—

We note that this is a brief consultation period. It is unfortunate considering the important nature of the subject matter and the significance of the proposed amendments.

Professor Heather Douglas stated—

I simply have not had time to make a submission so I imagine there are plenty of people in my position. I would say we need more than the several days or whatever that we had.

Dr Samantha Jeffries followed on from Professor Douglas and said—

I would agree with that. I think more time needs to be provided.

When asked about costing Mr Potts remarked—

Given the very short time frame and turnaround, we have not been able to assist this committee by providing those sorts of fully researched details ...

Dr Ted Flack from the Queensland Homicide Victims' Support Group stated that, while they had spoken to proponents of the bill and other organisations in the field along with their New South Wales counterparts, they did not have the opportunity to solicit the support of a legally qualified and well-informed commentator on the issues. Given more time, they would have done that.

Carly Bolhuis from Micah Projects said that, given more time, Micah would want to consult with the women they are specifically supporting to gather their feedback. Betty Taylor from the Red Rose Foundation attested to very limited consultation and reiterated that it 'needs to be really broad to capture marginalised groups'. Angela Lynch from the Women's Legal Service stated that they 'support a more public and transparent approach, which would be through a public review'. Di Macleod from the Gold Coast Centre Against Sexual Violence remarked that they would have liked more time so they could 'take on board more voices and particularly unpack unintended consequences'.

The opposition held a differing view, with the member for Mansfield going as far as to say that he was quite satisfied that there had been sufficient inquiry and review, almost ad nauseam, on this issue. I must put on record that facts, inquiry and review outcomes, figures and costings—I could confidently say just information broadly—were sorely lacking from the contributions made by the members for Mansfield and Mudgeeraba. I found myself in the strange position where I went back and had a look through the meeting papers and other materials. I double-checked all of the attachments in my inbox to see if there were pages missing. I read and re-read materials. Had I missed something? Was there an oversight somewhere?

If there was this evidence, research, trials and consultation, where was the information that supported, substantiated and legitimised this bill? Sadly, this was sorely missing. Without it, committee members cannot in good conscience be expected to appreciate the ramifications and support the legislation upon reporting, yet in doing so we are held up as destroyers who love a little bit of cheap politicking.

When it came to the committee's duty to examine each bill and item of subordinate legislation and consider the policy to be given effect, the application of fundamental legislative principles and the lawfulness of subordination, we had the VOCA bill pass without issue but the bail bill littered with infringements of civil liberties and rights—pages upon pages in the report. It was quite astounding, and as a first-term MP I have never seen so many issues with the breaching of fundamental principles underpinned by the rule of law. It is very dubious indeed.

The member for Mansfield and so many on the other side of this House attempt to insult or degrade the government with unimaginative slogans like 'review not do'. However, the contrast of these bills highlights how absolutely essential reviews are. Compare the VOCA bill, where reviews provided clear, concise and precise action, with the bail bill, which was thought-bubble legislation with a thumb sketch of costings. Informed, considered and carefully examined policy derives the best outcomes, and I for one find the reactive policy on the run from those opposite concerning in the highest order.

I have carefully read the foreshadowed government amendments and have had discussions. I think these informed amendments are a must for all members of the House to consider here this evening. We are in vehement agreement that tackling domestic and family violence is a priority. We all want the same outcomes: strong, workable laws that protect victims of domestic violence. The Palaszczuk government has accepted all of the recommendations of the *Not now, not ever* report and has made significant inroads in implementing those recommendations. Laws that deviate from the blueprint must be carefully considered.

We want to strengthen laws and protect victims of domestic violence. However, we need to ensure we consult closely with stakeholders to ensure we have the most effective laws. So many of the submitters to the inquiry into the bail bill raised concerns around unintended consequences and lack of consultation.

There is a considerable overlap between the bail bill and the VOCA bill. That came as a bit of a surprise to the member for Mansfield, however, during the public hearing. First I asked the member for Mansfield for figures on the potential cost. The member for Mansfield was found wanting. I then said—

My second question goes to the VOCA Act that is currently before the committee—

Mr Crandon: Why don't you quote what he said?

Ms BOYD: I am quoting what I said right now.

Mr Crandon: Why don't you quote what he said?

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton): Order! Member for Pine Rivers, I ask that you not have conversations across the chamber—

Government members interjected.

Mr Dick interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, Minister. If one would allow me to finish what I was saying, rather than reflecting on the chair—and if the member for Coomera would also stop having conversations across the chamber. As the previous Deputy Speaker reminded all members of the House, comments must be directed through the chair, not across the chamber.

Ms BOYD: I asked the member for Mansfield during the public briefing—

My second question goes to the VOCA Act that is currently before the committee—the victims of crime act. In that there is a charter of victims' rights. I just wondered how the proposal for new alerts in your bill differs from the bill that is already before the House.

The member for Mansfield, in a direct quote, for the benefit of those who request it, said—

This would, of course, relate specifically to domestic violence cases more particularly than the VOCA Act. I have not looked at the way in which those two would interact. I think the committee's report on VOCAA has only just come out. Clearly, I do not think that there is any way in which they would cut across each other.

The House had already highlighted to the opposition leader and to the member for Mansfield that there was legislation before the legal affairs committee that contained some of these provisions. The legal affairs committee had released a report around the VOCA bill, yet the member for Mansfield had come to the committee not only with no information, no answer and no understanding around how those would interplay in order to provide the committee with that understanding and that comprehension but also with no explanation around potential cost or figures. We had to receive that information from other community submitters throughout the process.

Specific recommendations were made regarding the VOCA bill—recommendations that were unanimously passed through the committee. It ensures that victims of domestic violence have the right to be informed about the progress of an investigation of a crime and each major decision made about the prosecution of a person accused of committing the crime including when a perpetrator is applying for bail or being released from custody or any other matter that is before the court that affects the victim.

The committee heard of the significant operational and resourcing issues with the use of GPS tracking—snippets from other jurisdictions, struggles in implementation and cost restrictions. Recommendation 123 of the task force report *Not now, not ever* is committed to exploring options to monitor high-risk perpetrators. The work needs to be done, carefully considered over time and entered into in a way that is informed. Many of the submitters made comments around how implementing these types of costly initiatives in the bill would strip funding away from other essential services in the system—wraparound services, prosecutions, money going into magistrates. The list goes on.

Everyone in this House comes into this role—to this calling—with an understanding that they will need to have a thick skin and an understanding that often criticism will come from all places. However, what I find entirely disingenuous is the way that members of the opposition conducted themselves throughout this committee process and the way that they have squarely levelled attacks at government members and, indeed, the Premier, the Minister for Women and the Attorney-General.

More work needs to be done in this space. That is very clear; it is very evident. The bail bill was in no way able to be passed through the committee. Opposition committee members had conversations in which they understood the position of government members that the change that would be needed to reach agreement would be so significant—so significant—that we could not do it in the time that was afforded to us by the Leader of the Opposition given the way that this bill has been rushed through.

We in this place need to ensure, taking on board all of the points of view, that we pass fair and balanced legislation—legislation that ensures that the principles of democracy are actually upheld. I, for one, as a committee member could not in all good conscience accept the proposal that was being put forward based on the information that was provided to us—the very little information provided—by members of the opposition.

Mr CRANDON (Coomera—LNP) (9.41 pm): I think the first thing that I need to do is remind the member for Pine Rivers that not once—not once—did the government members come up with an alternative position, so let us not try and reinvent the past. I also note that the member for Pine Rivers cherrypicked comments and not once did she mention the costings that were referred to by the shadow Attorney-General, and in the meantime people die.

Firstly, I need to acknowledge the families of those who have lost their loved ones—those who now live with the scourge of domestic violence in our community—and I want to tell them that I share their pain. My wife and her sisters lost their mother to domestic violence and I know firsthand what those people in the gallery are going through. I know what the other family members of those women who have lost their lives are going through. I live it every day.

I rise to contribute to the cognate debate on the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill and the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. There are those in our prisons and juvenile detention centres who should not be there, and I want to carry on from something that the Attorney-General alluded to whilst she was making her contribution. Many are victims of the circumstance of their birth, of the environment they live in, the experiences they had as young people. How much more difficult would it be to focus on your education and of enjoying your young life if virtually every day you are exposed to physical abuse or sexual abuse; witnessing drug and alcohol addiction and the effects it has on those you have no choice but to live with; witnessing the mental health issues that lead to drug and alcohol abuse, or as the result of drug and alcohol abuse; and of course experiencing domestic violence, sometimes every day? These situations and experiences are the breeding grounds for those young people who find themselves for the first time in our prisons and juvenile detention centres. On release they find themselves returning to those same environments, so is it any wonder that they are back in our prisons and juvenile detention centres in no time at all? Coming back to my opening comment, we have people in our prisons and juvenile detention centres who should not be there. Simply put, our society is at fault and that is something that the Attorney-General alluded to.

For far too long the focus has not been on the issues I have mentioned above. The focus has not been on the causes of recidivist behaviour. The focus has not been on the causes of antisocial behaviour. We need to look at the issues of mental health, drug and alcohol dependence and antisocial behaviour from an entirely different perspective. What we have been doing and how we react as a society to these issues is just not working. From what I have seen in my investigations, the reason we have prisons that are overcrowded is that we have failed to implement programs—programs in our schools, alternative school programs, drug and alcohol programs that are effective and timely. It is not good enough when someone comes to a drug rehab centre, having decided they are ready to get help, to tell them they are on a waitlist for a month or three months. Even waiting for a week is too long. We need to provide the intervention programs virtually immediately. If not, is it any wonder that they go back to using drugs and committing crimes to fund their habit? That is the reason we see recidivism rates of around 60 per cent in our criminal justice system. In effect, we have set up our young people to fail, so we should not be surprised to see such high rates of recidivism. That is also one of the reasons we see domestic violence rates spiralling out of control.

I now turn to the issues relating to the substance of the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill. At the outset I have to say that I am disappointed about the manner in which the government members approached the bill or whether the bill should be passed. In short, the position they took was left wanting. The Leader of the Opposition brought this bill to the House two weeks to the day after the tragic death of Teresa Bradford at the hands of her estranged husband at her home in Pimpama, which is in the state seat of Coomera. Indeed, it came to this House on the day of her funeral. As the Leader of the Opposition stated in his introduction, Teresa's attacker was released on bail just weeks earlier following an unsuccessful attempt on her life in late 2016. The Leader of the Opposition made this point: it was not an isolated case. As he said, Queensland accounted for a quarter of all domestic violence related deaths in Australia in 2016—that is, 18 Queensland women died in Queensland in 2016 at the hands of her partner or former partner, so it is time to do something.

The objectives of the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill are very simple and are clearly in the public interest. The bill seeks to reverse the presumption of bail for an alleged offender charged with a relevant domestic violence offence; establish a special bail condition for a tracking device, or GPS tracker, to be imposed by a court or a police officer authorised to grant bail against a person charged with a relevant domestic violence offence; introduce a new system to alert the victim of a relevant domestic violence offence when the defendant applies for bail, is released on bail or receives a variation to a bail condition; introduce a mandatory reporting provision to the parole system for when a prisoner applies for and receives parole so that a victim of domestic violence can receive information about a prisoner, even if the offence that the prisoner was convicted for is not a domestic violence offence; and of course introduce a provision to allow for an urgent review of a bail decision in a higher court. The original bail decision would be stayed for up to three business days, ensuring that the alleged offender would not be released during that period. In short, the bill seeks to

protect victims and their families. We here have it in our power to protect those victims, and we should do everything possible to protect those victims of domestic violence. This proposed bill offers reasonable, workable solutions.

It is important to note that this bill is either based on laws and procedures working in other jurisdictions, or draws on solutions offered by stakeholders on the ground in the area of domestic violence support, or draws on the recommendations of the *Not now, not ever* report that have not been enacted to date. The non-government members of the committee listened to the submitters who were pushing the libertarian views. We agree that the rights of the alleged offender are important, but these rights have to be balanced against the safety of the victims of domestic violence, including the children of affected families.

While we are considering this bill, I urge members to consider one of the effects that this bill will have on victims of domestic violence. Perhaps it might be regarded as an unintended consequence of the bill. However, it is a very important effect. It will go some way towards convincing victims of domestic violence to report it in the knowledge that there are stronger protections in place. So often we do not even know the domestic violence has been occurring and the woman involved loses her life.

As well, members should consider the potential deterrent effect of the policies in the bill on perpetrators of domestic violence. We have heard comments about the consideration of the rights of the alleged perpetrators—a balancing, if you like. Surely, when considering the concept of balance, that balance should be in favour of victims, their families and the community in general, not the perpetrators where the balance seems to have been for far too long. To reject this bill would not only let down the victims and families who have already lost loved ones to domestic violence but also make it difficult for those who failed to support the bill from ever facing future victims or their families knowing that something could have been done now to stop their loss.

As I mentioned earlier, we have heard a lot about unintended consequences from some members who would like to see this bill fail, yet we have seen nothing to prove why we should not pass this bill. For example, we have seen no evidence from other jurisdictions. Are we to throw our hands in the air and say, 'It's all too hard to save a life because of some abstract unintended consequence that could happen?' That is not what we on this side of the House intend to do.

There have been suggestions that the reversal of the presumption of bail would somehow see more people refused bail, thereby spending more time on remand and thus clogging up our remand centres. If holding a person in custody because they have failed to prove that they are not a risk to the alleged victim or victims saves lives, then so be it. In fact, if this legislation saves the life of just one domestic violence victim, it will have been worth it. That was stated in the hearings by one of the witnesses.

It is not just the LNP opposition members who are arguing this position; it is also the view of the Domestic and Family Violence Death Review and Advisory Board in its system review, which was handed to the government the same day as this bill was introduced, as was alluded to by the Leader of the Opposition. The chair of the board and State Coroner, Terry Ryan, said in relation to the case study, Kelly—

> Based on a review of this death, the Board found that given the aggravating circumstances associated with domestic and family violence and the high likelihood of recidivism, this case highlights the potential benefit in reviewing the *Bail Act 1980* to consider specific circumstances in which the presumption in favour of bail should be revoked.

This report was withheld from the committee prior to it holding its public hearings and thus, as we were not aware of Terry Ryan's view, denied the committee the opportunity to call the chair of the board as a witness in our public hearings to enable us to question him on his views in further detail. Terry Ryan had just conducted a review on behalf of the government and we were denied knowledge of that document.

I mentioned earlier that no evidence has come from other jurisdictions. I make the point that Victoria, Tasmania, South Australia, the Northern Territory and even the ACT all have their own provisions for the reversal of the presumption of bail for violence and domestic violence related matters. People are already having an experience with this reversal of presumption. Let me also make it clear that the provisions before the House do not stop people getting bail. Once again, that has been alluded to by the Leader of the Opposition and others in this place. This bill simply shifts the onus to the alleged offender to prove why they should get bail, allowing the court the opportunity to satisfy itself that the alleged offender is not a risk to alleged victims rather than the prosecution having to prove the opposite.

Just last year we came into this House and voted as one in favour of lifting the maximum penalty for breaches of police protection notices from two to three years imprisonment. At the time the government did not raise the issue of how this change would impact jails and sentences. Why are the

members opposite now reticent? Is it because the bill was not introduced by them? Is that why the government members of the committee could not agree that the bill be passed? The government members of the committee did not outline any issues to the non-government members as reasons they could not recommend that the bill be passed. This fact is confirmed by the lack of any recommendations in the committee report that the non-government members suggested that we could put forward.

That the government members of the committee had some issues, as confirmed by the chair in his foreword, is absolutely clear. Sadly, the government members chose not to expand on those concerns—not even in a statement of reservation. There is not one word in a statement of reservation, which is an option that both government and non-government members can use to at least inform the House of their concerns.

After going through the committee process, we have no notion of the views of the government members on this matter. What were they thinking? We would not know, because we could not have the conversation. I have been here for eight years and one day. It seems that, when it really matters, those opposite drop the ball. When it really matters, when we are right up against it and we have to make some tough decisions, those opposite drop the ball. In those eight years, I have never seen no discussion in a committee. The members for Pine Rivers, Capalaba and Stretton should hang their heads in shame.

As such, the House has no notion of what compromises could have been reached until this afternoon. Did I hear it right? Was it 6.30 or something like that this afternoon?

Mr Walker: That was when the amendments came through.

Mr CRANDON: The amendments came through to this side of the House at 6.30 this afternoon. As I said, the House had no notion of what compromises could have been reached until late this afternoon. These are very important points, because the lack of interest in engaging in discussion or outlining concerns in an endeavour to come to a compromise puts at risk a bipartisan position that this House has held on domestic violence reform in this place. Do the members opposite really think that they can be wreckers of years of bipartisanship on domestic violence reform now? At a time when we seem to be seeing an escalation in the incidence of domestic violence and deaths, I call on all members of this House to once again come together for the sake of every victim of domestic violence past, present and future, for the sake of our society, and vote for this legislation to be implemented without further delay.

I personally want to thank those people and groups that made submissions in favour of the bill. I am deeply saddened that the committee has not been able to reach agreement to recommend that the bill be passed, but it is not over yet. The Labor members of the House can still fully support this bill. As I said earlier, if this legislation is passed and saves one life then it has been worthwhile. If this legislation is rejected and one life is lost, then who of those that vote against it will be able to look in the eye of a survivor? I commend the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill to the House.

I would like now to turn to the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill to make a few brief points. In her explanatory speech the Attorney-General stated that the bill will advance the way in which victims of crime are treated in Queensland. The explanatory notes state that the policy objectives of the bill are to implement the recommendations of the final report on the review of the Victims of Crime Assistance Act 2009, which is a review report, and ensure the Victims of Crime Assistance Act 2009 continues to provide an effective response to assist victims of crime, introduce a sexual assault counselling privilege and give victims of sexual offences who are to give evidence in a criminal proceedings against the accused automatic status as special witnesses.

In the last 40 seconds that I have I would just like to say that my view in relation to those last two points is simply why did we not do it some years ago? Why has it taken us until now? I am absolutely on board with those. Having experienced aspects of the Victims of Crime Assistance Act personally with my wife and her sisters I can understand the confusion and the complexity of it. I also commend the bill to the House.

Mr KRAUSE (Beaudesert—LNP) (10.01 pm): I am a member of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee that reviewed the two bills we are debating here tonight. I do not intend to make any comments about the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill other than to note that our side of the House is supporting the passage of that bill.

In relation to the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill I have heard from a number of government members tonight, and also I believe it is in the chair's foreword to the committee report, words along the lines of 'any deviation from the blueprint laid out in the *Not now, not ever* report

must be very carefully considered'. I have heard it said in much the same words every time it has come out of people's mouths. It is quite clearly the strong view of the government that would have been circulated to all members in their contributions here tonight and evidently through the committee process as well. The government says we should not be deviating from the blueprint laid out in the *Not now, not ever* report and any deviations need to be carefully considered.

In the case of the bail bill that we are talking about here tonight, that type of reasoning is, quite frankly, a sick joke because it is abundantly clear to everybody who understands what is in this bail bill that the bill is designed to protect victims of domestic violence. One can argue about its effectiveness and whether it will actually do that, but those opposite have not done that at all. Members opposite have just said we need to stick to *Not now, not ever* even if what is being proposed—they have not said this, but it is taken to be understood—will actually protect DV victims and go further than the report. This bill does protect victims of domestic violence and it will make it easier for those victims to escape the horror of domestic violence. Those opposite can argue against the bill if they like, argue against the reversal of a presumption of bail, argue against the 72-hour stay to appeal to a higher court because someone has been granted bail, argue against GPS trackers, argue against victims of domestic violence being notified when people are released on parole, go out in public and argue that and see how you go. Those opposite have not done that here at all. I think it says a great deal about the government that it is taking that approach—all form, no substance; all talk, no action.

We are dealing with issues that can be matters of life and death. Sadly, people are dying as a result of domestic violence and the proposal in the bail bill is a proposal to try to stop that cycle. It is a proposal that will enable victims of domestic violence some space to get out of the situation. On a regular basis in my community people talk to me about this. A common theme that comes through is that there is no opportunity for people to escape the situation they are in, either because of relationships or monetary concerns or because they are simply too scared. Reversing the presumption of bail and actually removing the alleged offender from that scenario in domestic violence situations gives them that space and opportunity to get out of a domestic violence situation.

We have criminalised, through acts of this parliament, the act of non-lethal strangulation because it seemed to be a marker of domestic violence. That was a good move. If we have an allegation that domestic violence is occurring in a relationship in a scenario where someone is brought before a court, is that not an even greater marker that more domestic violence is going to occur after that point? There is a good case for reversing the presumption of bail in this scenario. This is a way that the whole community can actually say no to people who are engaging in domestic violence. We are saying no to domestic violence and we are saying no to people getting another chance to go back home and commit more domestic violence. We need to say no to people getting that opportunity where there is an allegation that they have been beating up their partner, withholding money, or whatever form domestic violence takes. The opportunity for that to occur again has to be taken away. We have to say no to the opportunity for people who are involved in domestic violence to take somebody else's life. This bill is a way of doing that. It will make it harder for people accused of domestic violence to get bail. It does not mean that there will not be bail ever, but it will certainly place the onus on people seeking bail to prove that they deserve it. I think we owe it to the victims of domestic violence to make alleged offenders prove that they deserve bail.

We need to give courts and police the tools to protect victims and to get the offenders away from victims. That is another common theme that comes through from the community when we talk about domestic violence. It is about empowering the courts and the police to protect victims. This is a tool for the courts and police to protect victims. The reversal of the presumption of bail is the key provision in this bill. It does not mean no bail. Although it was not a formal recommendation in the *Not now, not ever* report, it was referenced in the report as a proposal that would enhance the system to protect victims of domestic violence. To say that it is not recommended is just not true.

Ms Fentiman: It's not in the recommendations.

Mr KRAUSE: I will take that interjection. It is not in the recommendations, but it is in the report as a good proposal to protect victims of domestic violence. It is not without precedent. In Victoria there are provisions that reverse the onus of proof. In Tasmania they have reversal of the onus of proof.

Dr Miles: You're just reading it out.

Mr KRAUSE: No, I am not reading it out. In the ACT they have a similar reversal of the onus of proof. We should be enacting similar provisions—that is, a tool for the police and the courts to protect victims of domestic violence. That is one aspect of the bill. The other issue that I want to touch on is the system to alert victims of domestic violence when people are released on parole and the proposal in

the bill to enable that to happen. I want to reference the contribution that was made to the committee by Mr Schilling and Ms Mobbs, the parents of Shelsea Schilling, who was killed by her ex-partner who had been released on parole. Ms Mobbs said—

We just needed 24 hours. That is all we needed and she would have been alive today. We would have sent her away.

That is one of the proposals in the bail bill and it is supported by the Women's Legal Service. I commend that provision in the bill to the House tonight and I understand that it may also be dealt with in another piece of legislation. It is a tool to support and protect victims of domestic violence, not just at the time of the offending but also into the future

One of the other arguments that members of the government prosecuted in committee and I believe will raise in the debate tonight is the cost of implementation, particularly for holding people on remand if bail is denied. Obviously it is very difficult to quantify how much it will cost to hold people on remand, because until people are actually brought to court you do not know how many people will be held on remand and you do not know what the decisions of the judiciary will be. It is very difficult to calculate that, but so it is with many other aspects of the criminal justice system. It is very difficult to know how many offenders will be brought before court, for how long they will be imprisoned and whether they will be granted bail. To argue against a proposal about reversing the onus of proof on the grounds that the costs cannot be definitively quantified is a bit disingenuous.

Finally, I want to touch on a comment from the Women's Legal Service in relation to the broad issue of domestic violence and the possibility of creating a specific criminal offence related to domestic violence. I asked Ms Angela Lynch from the Women's Legal Service what their view was on creating that specific offence. I think the answer points us in the right direction to a certain extent. Ms Lynch referred to provisions that have been put in place in the United States to reform the criminal justice system in a way that is specifically tailored to dealing with domestic violence, recognising that it is unique in its characteristics. It is a unique offence because of the nature of the relationships that are involved with domestic violence, so we need to treat it in a different manner. Ms Lynch points us to provisions where there are different rules for the gathering of evidence and provisions for trials to be undertaken with only the evidence provided by police and not evidence from the victims, recognising that on many occasions it is very difficult for victims of domestic violence to give evidence at trial. She acknowledges that it is not perfect. She said, 'I do think that it is time that we look at the criminal justice system as a whole and how it responds in these matters.' Isn't that the truth, and not just in relation to trials but also in relation to the first response to domestic violence.

Our proposal reverses the presumption in relation to bail, providing a tool to enable the courts and the police to protect victims. I recognise that that goes against the longstanding legal tradition that people are presumed to be granted bail while awaiting trial. Ms Lynch points at the way that they are doing things differently in other jurisdictions and we need to think differently about domestic violence. I urge all members of the House to think differently about the presumption of bail and the other contents of our bill, and to support it in its entirety this evening.

Ms HOWARD (Ipswich—ALP) (10.15 pm): Tonight I rise to speak in support of the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. I am not going to say too much about the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2016, other than to say that I know that this government will be making some amendments to the private member's bill to ensure that the outcomes are effective and workable. I support that, because the issue of domestic violence and protecting victims is far too important to play games or politics with. As a government, we have a duty of care to the communities that we represent. It is our responsibility not only to represent the interests of our constituents but also to ensure that there are systems in place that will assist people in their time of need. Victims of crime, particularly sexual assault, are such people. They are placed in an incredibly difficult situation and need the assistance of the state to ensure that the best outcomes are available to them. I am very proud to be speaking on this amendment bill, as it will assist in ensuring that our citizens are protected in times of need and have a simplified system at their disposal.

The bill as represented here has three main objectives. The first is to implement all 15 recommendations of the final report on the review of the Victims of Crime Assistance Act 2009, the VOCA Act, and ensure that that act continues to provide an effective response to assist victims of crime. The second objective is to implement the government's commitment to establishing in Queensland a sexual assault counselling privilege, a SACP, in response to recommendation 130 of the special task force on domestic and family violence in Queensland report. Finally, the bill will provide that the victims or alleged victims of a sexual offence who are to give evidence in a criminal proceedings against the accused will be automatically classified as a special witness.

Many victims of a sexual offence are reluctant to seek assistance after experiencing such a cruel act. It may be that it was caused by a close friend, a relative or a complete stranger, but the pain is neither worsened nor lessened depending on the perpetrator. Unless one of us here has been the victim of such an act, it can be almost impossible to know the trauma that they have undergone. As representatives, we need to ensure that we take every step possible to assist victims in coming forward. Even if we cannot punish the perpetrators, we have a responsibility to people to ensure that they can come forward to seek assistance.

I am pleased that we have made the decision to implement a sexual assault counselling privilege. As it stands in Queensland, when a victim of sexual assault seeks counselling regarding quite possibly the worst event in their lives, that communication can be disclosed to the court without the victim's consent. This is a massive slap in the face to those victims. Already they have experienced a violent attack that has irreparably damaged their right to consent and, as a state, we cannot condone that action any further. Encouraging a victim to seek counselling following a sexual assault is important to the recovery process, providing an invaluable safe space that ensures victims can express the hurt and pain that they may be suffering, while developing the skills and the tactics they need to come to terms with and to defeat the act. I am very proud to be a part of the Palaszczuk government and I make particular mention of the Attorney-General, Yvette D'Ath, and Minister Shannon Fentiman who have taken this important step in ensuring Queenslanders seek and receive the assistance they need.

The amendment to the Evidence Act will ensure, among other things, that the SACP will apply to an oral or written communication made in confidence by a victim to a counsellor, by the counsellor to or about the counselled person, or by a parent, carer or other support person. This privilege will be an absolute privilege, so a person will not be able to access the protected counselling communication unless the privilege is waived or lost. In other criminal proceedings, be it a trial or sentence and proceedings under the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012, a qualified privilege will apply.

This means that if a privilege is not waived or lost, the accused can access the protected counselling communication if the court grants leave having regard to specified criteria. If the victim so chooses, the SACP can be waived to ensure that if they are comfortable their confessions can be used to assist courts and police. Finally, in civil proceedings the SACP will apply where a court has determined that it applies in a criminal proceeding and the same facts are in issue in the civil proceedings. This rigorous framework will ensure that our constituents are provided with an initial stress free environment and will hopefully encourage them to come forward and find the assistance that they may require.

I would also like to bring attention to the change that will allow victims and alleged victims of a sexual offence who are to give evidence in a criminal proceeding against the accused to be automatically classified as a special witness. To me this is one of the strongest elements of the bill.

Every type of trauma affects people differently and it should never be the responsibility of the victim to prove that this incident has affected them more greatly than it has any other. By providing these victims with an automatic classification as a special witness, those who live daily with the deep and undying fear of the perpetrator can come forward and provide the critical evidence needed to hopefully prosecute these individuals.

We as a state have been saying for years that sexual violence is not on, that it is one of the most heinous acts that can be committed. With one in five Australian women reporting having experienced sexual violence it is imperative that we get as many women as possible coming forward and telling their stories and getting the assistance that they desperately need.

This bill has provided the foundations necessary to ensure that no matter the case, victims can feel safe and secure coming forward with information that they may never have wanted to share. We can be proud today as Labor politicians and members of the Palaszczuk government to have fought for these individuals and potentially ensure happiness and wellbeing for generations to come.

Mrs STUCKEY (Currumbin—LNP) (10.21 pm): I rise to contribute to the cognate debate on the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016, VOCA, and the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2017. The Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill was introduced into the House on 1 December last year by the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice, referred to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee, of which I am a member, and reported on by 27 February 2017. The Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill was introduced into the parliament on 14 February 2017 by the Leader of the Opposition and member for Clayfield, referred to the same committee and required to be reported on to the Legislative Assembly by 17 March 2017.

The Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee almost certainly has the most legislation referred to it of all the parliamentary committees. I acknowledge fellow committee members and our secretariat staff. I have to say that I am deeply disappointed the committee could not reach agreement that the bail bill be passed. We investigate and deliberate upon some legislation that regularly exposes the dark side of certain individuals' behaviours—behaviours that inflict heinous atrocities upon other human beings.

The harrowing testimonies and stories put forward to the committee as part of this process and our considerations are commonly of a deeply sensitive and personal nature, occasionally told by the victims of horrid crimes or the dedicated organisations that represent them in a legally representative or advocacy role. Our committee members recognise the indefatigable courage and strength required by these traumatised individuals to come forward in a somewhat sterile atmosphere and not only recount their shocking ordeals but also tell them to complete strangers.

The policy objectives of the VOCA bill are threefold: to implement the recommendations of the *Final report on the review of the Victims of Crime Assistance Act 2009* and ensure the 2009 VOCA Act continues to provide an effective response to assist victims of crime; to introduce a sexual assault counselling privilege; and to give victims of a sexual offence who are to give evidence in a criminal proceeding against the accused automatic status as a special witness. It is important to note here that it is not only victims of crime of a sexual nature this bill provides for but others including elder abuse.

The VOCA Act, which first commenced in December 2009, replacing previous criminal compensation schemes, has already provided $59 million of financial assistance to victims of crime through the financial assistance scheme. Provisions of the act were to be reviewed within five years. This review commenced under the former LNP government in 2013 with completion in December 2015. The final report was tabled 12 months later, in December of last year, by the Acting Attorney-General and Minister for Justice. The review made 15 recommendations and the bill implements all of them.

Of particular interest to witnesses during the public hearing was the introduction of a sexual assault counselling privilege as well as automatic status as special witness for victims who give evidence in court. Currently, it is possible in Queensland for communications between a victim of sexual assault and a counsellor to be accessed and utilised for cross-examination of the witness. By introducing statutory protections, it is hoped more sexual assault victims will be encourage to report these heinous crimes to police and also seek therapy to assist with their recovery, without fear that notes taken during those sessions could be subpoenaed for use in court.

Ms Katrina Weeks from the Centre Against Sexual Violence supported the changes saying—

> For a traumatised survivor of sexual assault to benefit most from counselling, the counselling relationship must be based on trust, safety and confidentiality. Currently, all sexual assault counselling is given with the proviso that the counselling notes may be subpoenaed ... As a counsellor I write my notes accurately and with a view that they will help the therapeutic process. It is unfortunate that I also need to have in mind, 'What if these notes are subpoenaed? Could they be twisted to help the alleged perpetrator or in some way further harm the client?'

These sexual assault counselling privileges will extend to any counselling communication a victim of any sexual offence has had at any time with a counsellor. However, communication made to or by a health practitioner about a physical examination during a sexual assault investigation is not included in such privilege. As such, the amendments establish an absolute privilege and a qualified privilege.

Amounts paid to victims has also been simplified, with increases to the maximum amounts in some categories, including the maximum amount of funeral assistance payable from $6,000 to $8,000, better reflecting the higher cost of a funeral service and increasing the support provided to victims who have lost a loved one as a result of an act of violence. While no amount of compensation could possibly remedy the pain and abuse experienced by victims, this funding is an important factor in ensuring victims are provided with an avenue to seek the professional support and assistance they require into the future. That is why the LNP is very happy to be supporting this bill.

I move now to the objectives of the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2017. They are to: reverse the presumption of bail for a person charged with a relevant domestic violence offence; allow for an urgent review of a bail decision in a higher court, staying the original bail decision for up to three business days to ensure the alleged offender would not be released during that period; establish a special bail condition for a tracking device to be imposed against a person charged with a relevant domestic violence offence; introduce a new system to alert the victim of a relevant domestic violence offence when the defendant applies for bail, is released on bail or receives a variation

to a bail condition; and provide the victim of domestic violence with information about a prisoner who receives parole, even if the offence for which the prisoner is incarcerated is not a domestic violence offence.

During deliberations on this bill committee members were privileged to hear from some incredibly brave and determined mothers and a father during our public hearing. I recognise that they have been in the gallery tonight and are still here. It is not common practice for victims to present to the committee in person, and when this does occur we know it is deeply upsetting for them.

This is a critically important bill. I am proud to belong to a political party that is prepared to step up and act on the scourge that is domestic violence. I commend the Leader of the Opposition, the honourable member for Clayfield, for introducing this bill. In doing so, we on this side of the House are showing the people of Queensland we have been listening and we are prepared to act.

I am also proud to belong to a political party that got the ball rolling with an investigation that led to the *Not now, not ever* report—a report that made a number of recommendations included in this bill. I acknowledge the honourable member for Aspley in the House tonight who drove this in government. I thank the honourable member for Mansfield and the honourable member for Mudgeeraba for their powerful yet measured statements at the public hearing and for their concerted efforts to combat DV.

While listening to witnesses during the 1 March public hearing, most of whom acted in a supporting role to victims, failure of the system was echoed time and again as they spoke of the terrifying, life-threatening experiences of the clients who came to them for counselling after experiencing the chilling personal effects of domestic violence. It was the raw and painful testimonies from mothers of slain daughters that brought home the heartbreaking reality of the devastating effects of domestic violence. Listening to Ms Sonia Anderson, whose daughter Bianca Girven was strangled to death by her partner in 2010, and Bonnie Mobbs and Damien Schilling, parents of Shelsea Schilling murdered by her ex-boyfriend late last year, really spoke volumes of the need to act now.

The frailty of many DV sufferers was brought home—raising grandchildren who are the image of their deceased mother and being reminded of their collective loss on a daily basis. Then there are the heartbreaking questions asked by children who are too young to comprehend what has happened or, worse still, those who witness shocking violence directed at their mother and suffer nightmares and flashbacks continually.

Granted, views were mixed on certain aspects of this bill and cost was mentioned several times by witnesses. However, the words of the honourable member for Mansfield in his reply to our committee strikes at the very heart of domestic violence protection and prevention. He writes—

> As I mentioned at the public briefing, there will be a cost to government as a result of the bill's being enacted, but the cost of doing nothing is far greater—both in terms of the impact on the lives of victims of domestic violence and their families, and in cost to the government and the community.
>
> This shouldn't be an issue of penny pinching. It's a pressing issue of community safety and protecting victims and their families. The deterrent effect of these laws may well save lives and family heartache—and if there are fewer offences of this kind as a result of these protective measures the community saves long term on the substantial costs of incarceration, payments to victims of crime, and substantial counselling and community welfare costs.

Those opposite sitting on the government benches should literally hang their heads in shame for not showing bipartisan support on this bill. They bang on when the LNP do not agree with them on legislation that we believe is truly bad for Queenslanders. They climb onto their high moral horses when it comes to anything that has a whiff of a social compass but, when it really comes to the crunch, they weaken and show their true colours, as did the honourable member for Pine Rivers in her bitter tirade and character assassination of the honourable member for Mudgeeraba. The honourable member lashed out for a long time at a member who was not present in this House, and it was an absolutely appalling piece to listen to.

In this case though Labor have shown that they are prepared to play politics with people's lives. I concur wholeheartedly with comments from the Leader of the Opposition, the honourable member for Clayfield, that exposed Labor's agenda well and truly. I recall our non-government members' statement—

> The Legislative Assembly should do everything possible to protect the victims of domestic violence and this proposed Bill offers reasonable, workable solutions.

This proposed bill offers reasonable, workable solutions. This bill is based on laws and procedures working in other jurisdictions, or draws from solutions offered by stakeholders on the ground, in the domestic violence support area, or draws on the recommendations of the *Not now, not ever* report that have not been enacted to date.

It was wonderful to see the hard yards being put in by the Gold Coast Domestic and Family Violence Task Force, recognised in the weekend *Courier-Mail* on 18 March. The officer in charge of the task force, Detective Inspector Marc Hogan, said, 'I've got no doubt a number of women are alive today because of the work we're doing,' and 'Our main aim is identifying the lethal few and preventing a homicide.' Since the new non-fatal strangulation laws came into force in Queensland last April, more than 60 Gold Coast men have been charged with the offence. The dedicated task force, formed a year ago, is believed to be an Australian first and works closely with other government agencies. Sadly, the scourge of DV is escalating with reports of breaches soaring from 1,516 in 2015 to 2,456 last year.

Here is the scenario: perpetrators go to prison on remand, are not engaging in programs and are still calling their partners on their phones. These are men who have committed rape, deprivation of liberty, starvation and removal from personal contacts and they are still controlling these women. It makes a huge difference if women can be notified of their perpetrator's release as they know they will need to re-engage with support services. Why aren't there more dedicated DV task forces in Queensland? The Gold Coast leads the way. Why not start the use of tracking devices on the Gold Coast as it is the perfect place to begin, with a dedicated DV court in Southport?

Having listened to the submissions pushing the libertarian view and recognising that there are several FLPs raised here, the LNP believes the rights of the alleged offender have to be balanced against the safety of the victims of domestic violence, including the children of affected families, the need to convince the victims of domestic violence to report domestic violence, and the deterrent effects of the policies in the bill on the perpetrators of domestic violence. For way too long the odds have been stacked the other way.

During the public hearing I asked witnesses Professor Heather Douglas, Dr Samantha Jeffries and Mr Bill Potts, the immediate past president of the Queensland Law Society—

... what do you say to the victims' families who fully support the provisions in this bill? They want to see some action. They do not want to hear that we have no money, we have no resources and diversionary projects take years. What do you say to those families of the victims?

There was broad agreement from these professionals that the system was failing women—and not just the victims but their families including children, many scarred for life. What cost is that to us all? There was talk about evidence based research and broad-ranging programs, and, whilst important, there is a pressing need to close existing gaps swiftly.

We heard about risk assessment teams and the need to expand them. Why hasn't this progressed sooner? How do we know other agencies will work collaboratively and buy in and not as silos of the past? It is all very well to say we need more early interventions, but women are dying or being strangled within an inch of their lives all too often. It is paramount that we act now; hence the time line of this bill.

I have often said over the years in this place that legislation must be sound and more than an emotional reaction, but the overemphasis on cost really bothered me. This is not some feel-good attempt at legislation. It has the potential to restore some confidence in a system that has failed the very people it is supposed to protect and it has the potential to save lives. We simply cannot sit on our hands and postulate any longer. Mr Mark Lance, from North Queensland Domestic Violence Resource Service, who has 40 years in the Police Service and 16 years in domestic violence, put it like this when he said—

... it is about time we actually did something. I have been working in this sector for well over 20 years. Everything that has been mentioned here was discussed 20 years ago. If we do not actually start it, it is never going to start. I am sick of reviews.

Ms Enoch interjected.

Mrs STUCKEY: I think it is a bit rude of ministers to interrupt when I am quoting a very respected former police officer who has simply been a witness before the committee. This is exactly what happens. They absolutely try to subvert what has been going on in our committees by trying to make out that this witness's statement is not worthwhile.

Well, here we are with a vehicle for change in the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2017. I urge government members and crossbenchers to support this bill. I echo the sentiments of those on this side who have put a lot of work into this and have gone the extra mile for those victims. I would like to leave you with the words of Di Macleod, the Director of the Gold Coast Centre Against Sexual Violence, when she says, 'When there is doubt don't let them out.'

Mr BROWN (Capalaba—ALP) (10.38 pm): I rise tonight in support of the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. I want to start by saying that I took the advice of the member for Mudgeeraba in her contribution and I went upstairs to meet the victims who are in

the gallery tonight. I was not at the public hearing that day. I apologised for that. I was at the hospital with my wife. Our next-door neighbour's house had just burnt down. I have since learnt that that house fire was an act of arson, an act of violence in a domestic setting that nearly took the life of one mother and five children and hospitalised my wife. I thanked them for their contribution and for their evidence to the committee.

I had a good discussion with them about how I think both sides are trying to do the right thing. Hopefully at the end of this process we will have steps that will go forward, whichever bill gets up tonight. I think there is goodwill in the House. I am a bit disappointed about the hanging your head in shame comments, because I genuinely did take into the committee process an open view of the bail bill and the process within it. Unfortunately, there were time constraints and I was hearing from a lot of submitters as well that we were constrained. That is not to say that I would not have got there in the end, but where we got to within the time we had is the report that was given.

I thank the Attorney-General and the Minister for Women for going that extra step and, with the resources of their offices, coming up with amendments which I think go part of the way to address the concerns that I had in that process. Some of the comments made are a bit out of hand. We are trying to do the right thing in this place. I think both sides have the best intentions in this process. I think it is beneath speakers to make personal attacks on members just because they went through a committee process and came up with a different opinion at the end of it.

Mrs Stuckey interjected.

Mr BROWN: I take the interjection from the member for Currumbin. I think it is the responsibility of both sides to make sure that we come away from here tonight in a positive light, especially for those victims who are in the gallery here tonight.

I return to the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. The first objective of the bill is to implement all 15 recommendations of the *Final report on the review of the Victims of Crime Assistance Act 2009*, the review report, and to ensure that the Victims of Crime Assistance Act 2009 continues to provide an effective response to assist victims of crime. I think this bill does so in a manner which is flexible and which reduces the barriers for victims of crime. That is what the legislation should be trying to do. These victims have obviously gone through some harrowing experiences and we need to ensure that their ability to have this assistance is as easy as possible. That includes the notifications. I think it is an important part of this legislation that victims are notified in certain situations. I am glad that the Attorney-General has made amendments to the act to make it clear that it links in with what the opposition is doing with its bail bill tonight.

The second objective of the bill is the implementation of the government's commitment to establish a sexual assault counselling privilege in Queensland in response to recommendation 130 of the report of the Special Taskforce on Domestic and Family Violence in Queensland, *Not now, not ever: putting an end to domestic and family violence in Queensland*. I note that many submitters from women's counselling services and legal counselling services put forward very compelling evidence about how the process of counselling is so important for sexual assault victims, how it is a big concern in the back of their mind when they are making these notes that they could end up in a court of law or even earlier, how that is limiting in the process and how it takes away from the counselling process. I am happy that, as a government, we are taking measures to address that here tonight.

The third objective of the bill is to provide that victims, or alleged victims, of a sexual offence who are to give evidence in a criminal proceeding against the accused will be automatically classified as a special witness. No victim of a sexual offence should have to make the case to be a special witness. I am glad that we as a government are removing that barrier and making sure that we are giving the proper protections to those victims. We have special witness provisions for a reason, and that reason should not have to be argued before a victim appears before a court of law. I will leave my contribution to the debate of the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill there.

In regard to the bail bill, as I said earlier, I believe we went into this with open eyes. We did not reject it wholly based upon the evidence that we were given. I think we did run out of time. We would have liked to have heard from departments that were unable to provide us with submissions such as Corrective Services. I know that an issue for the police force in Capalaba is domestic violence and the call-outs they receive from that. We did not get a submission from them, but I did have feedback from my police officers on the ground in regard to this bill. I therefore support the victims of crime assistance bill and the bail bill.

Mr MANDER (Everton—LNP) (10.46 pm): I rise tonight to speak to the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill. Domestic and family violence in our community is a curse. I have to say, as some

other members tonight have said, that it is simply beyond my comprehension. I have not experienced it myself and I have not really had any engagement with it with anybody in my family. I am very thankful for that, but I have had constituents who have come to me about domestic violence issues.

I would like to thank and pay tribute to the member for Mudgeeraba and the member for Gaven who were courageous enough over the last few months to give us an insight into their personal experiences. There have been a couple of other members tonight who have touched on that as well. I cannot even imagine the pain and anguish associated with being involved with domestic or family violence.

I want to put on the record that any man who commits violence against a woman is not a man and, secondly, any man who commits violence against a woman is a gutless coward. When I hear about these incidents, they absolutely appal me. I cannot believe that men would be that low to stoop to that type of behaviour. I want to acknowledge on the record that domestic violence victims are not just female; they are male as well. I often get emails from men in my community who remind me of that, but there is no doubt that the overwhelming majority of domestic violence cases involve men against women.

Over the last three years, over two governments, there has been an enormous amount of bipartisan support in dealing with this domestic violence issue. It started with the commissioning by the former premier of the *Not now, not ever* report by Quentin Bryce. That report was delivered in this term of government. Although we have been frustrated at times by the speed of the implementation of that review, we are heartened that the government is continuing to do that and they have had our bipartisan support. That is why tonight we will be supporting the government's legislation because it makes a lot of sense.

We are asking the government, as many members on this side of the House have stated tonight, to keep that bipartisan spirit and support what we believe are common-sense policy initiatives that will protect victims of domestic violence. Sometimes there are events that occur in our community that are so shocking that they force legislators like us to take action and take action now. We remember the tragic killing of Beth Kippen in Townsville when her alleged murderer was released on parole. That shocked the state, and rightly so the government announced an immediate inquiry into the situation of that person being released on parole. The recent murders of women through domestic violence are similar issues—issues that cause us to act immediately.

Our whole motivation for this bail bill is to make sure that we can protect victims of domestic violence from those perpetrators. We believe that introducing the presumption of bail going against an alleged perpetrator and GPS trackers on alleged perpetrators who are out on bail is common sense and provides some comfort for victims. It is incredibly important that, when there is some doubt, the benefit of that doubt goes towards the victim.

I said earlier that I have no experience of domestic violence but one of the things that I have heard—and I think it has come out in some of the speeches previously and tonight—is the sheer terror of the unknown, the sheer terror of a woman and her family not knowing where their alleged attacker is. When they go and pick up the kids at school or drop those kids off, will that perpetrator, that domestic violence attacker, be at the school waiting for them? When they sleep at night, will this bloke break into their house and again subject them to absolute terror? I cannot imagine what that would be like—living with that terror and that sheer fright, worried about yourself and your kids, not knowing where the perpetrator might be.

That goes to the heart of the bill that the Leader of the Opposition has introduced into the parliament. We want to give some comfort, some safety, to those women, their children and their relatives against people who often are just simply out of control. It has been mentioned a couple of times tonight—and I totally agree with this—that domestic violence is a very distinct and unique crime. It evokes great passion and there is this great uncertainty about somebody coming back again and again and again.

I believe that the initiatives we have introduced to the House through the Leader of the Opposition are common sense. They do not need a lot more investigation. It is quite apparent that these things will be effective. Of course they will not eliminate domestic violence, but we believe they will greatly reduce it. We believe they will give great comfort to victims and secure their safety more than what is there at the moment. We are simply asking the government for bipartisan support to continue the spirit that has been apparent and present in this House for the last three years.

Ms DAVIS (Aspley—LNP) (10.54 pm): I rise to contribute to the cognate debate of the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2017 and the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. I will speak firstly to the LNP's private member's bill. In doing

so, I would like to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition, the shadow Attorney and the shadow minister for the prevention of domestic and family violence for their combined effort in bringing this important bill into the House. I would also like to acknowledge Bonnie Mobbs, Dale Shales and Sonia Anderson, who were in the gallery earlier. As a mother of a 24-year-old daughter, I just cannot begin to fathom the depth of pain that comes with losing a beloved daughter to domestic violence. Those women came here tonight to be here to see this bill progress through the House. They know firsthand what it is like to deal with the heartbreak of losing a beautiful daughter at the hands of a person who was supposed to love them. It was incredible to have that opportunity to catch up with them tonight.

I have known Sonia for a few years now. We met at a candle lighting ceremony at Kangaroo Point where she shared the story of her daughter, Bianca, who had been murdered at the hands of her former partner in 2010. It was quite sad to meet Bianca's little boy, Ziggy, who was just a littlie at the time. There was such love provided to that little boy by Sonia and their extended family and network of friends, and it gave me some comfort to know that this little boy would always remember his mother even though she was not going to be here in person to see him grow as a beautiful human being.

I met Sonia again in Parliament House when I was a minister and a number of women had come to participate in a Red Rose Rally outside Parliament House. These silent rallies are held following the announcement of a death that is related to domestic or family violence. When I met these three women in my office, we had a very powerful conversation because it gave stories to the statistics. It gave context to what is a most heinous crime in our community. At the end of that conversation, the ladies presented me with a rose and I still have that rose. It serves as a constant reminder to me that we as a community and a civilised society should do whatever we can to stop the scourge that is domestic violence in our communities.

Members on this side of the House are serious about community safety and ensuring that Queenslanders have a justice system that reflects community expectation. The Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill is very clear in its intent—that is, that the rights of domestic violence victims and their families right across Queensland outweigh those of the perpetrator. I am extremely disappointed that the committee could not reach bipartisan agreement on this bill. The government is very happy to use language of political bipartisanship in consideration of a government bill that seeks to deal with domestic and family violence, but it is very unfortunate that they are not very interested when it is an LNP bill. The member for Everton spoke very well and very clearly about how we should be looking at domestic and family violence in a bipartisan way. In the past we have extended a bipartisan approach to all things domestic violence in this House, and it is very disappointing that these common-sense proposals to deal with domestic violence are not being treated with that bipartisan regard that we have extended to the government.

As the Leader of the Opposition said in his introductory speech, one of the fundamental pillars of any government must be community safety. In 2016 Queensland accounted for a quarter of all domestic violence related deaths in Australia. That was 18 Queensland women dying last year at the hands of their partner. In the case of Teresa Bradford, we know that her attacker was released on bail in the short weeks before her death, and that is why this bill should be passed. The bill will reverse the presumption of bail for an alleged offender charged with a relevant domestic violence offence. It will establish a special bail condition for a tracking device.

The bill will introduce a new system to alert the victim when the defendant applies for bail, is released on bail or receives a variation to a bail condition. It introduces a mandatory reporting provision to the parole system for when a prisoner applies for and receives parole so that a victim of domestic violence can receive information about a prisoner even if the offence that that prisoner was convicted for is not directly related to domestic violence. It will introduce the provision to allow for an urgent review of a bail decision in a higher court. This government has an important opportunity to act now to support reforms that put community safety first and foremost. If it fails to do so it fails every community, every family and every victim of domestic and family violence in this state.

I turn briefly to speak to the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 which the LNP, as the shadow Attorney indicated, will not oppose because we do have a strong focus on community safety and putting victims' rights first. In 2013 the LNP established a review of the victims of crime legislation and I am proud to say that all of the 15 recommendations that came from this review will be implemented. The objectives of this bill include implementing the recommendations of the final report of the review of the Victims of Crime Assistance Act, ensuring that the act continues to provide an effective response to assist victims of crime. It introduces a sexual assault counselling privilege and gives victims of a sexual offence who are to give evidence in a criminal proceedings against the accused automatic status as a special witness.

With regard to the sexual assault counselling privilege, I am pleased to note that the changes in this bill will finally see Queensland offer statutory protections that stem from recommendation 130 of the *Not now, not ever* report. That will provide for an absolute privilege in preliminary proceedings and a qualified privilege in other proceedings. This will ensure our justice system can strike the appropriate balance in each case between the right to a fair trial and the public interest in preserving the confidentiality of counselling communications. Further, when in 2017 the jurisdictions of New South Wales, Northern Territory, Victoria and Western Australia automatically afford special witness status to victims of sexual offences, it is high time that the Queensland justice system provides that very same support.

As my colleagues have previously noted, we will not oppose the bill, but I again reiterate that this bill is in place today because of the LNP's unwavering commitment to safer communities for all Queenslanders. With those comments, I commend the bills to the House.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order! Before I call the member for Bundaberg, I ask members to keep their conversation to a minimum, please. This is a sombre subject and we want to be able to hear each of the speeches.

Ms DONALDSON (Bundaberg—ALP) (11.02 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution to the debate of the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. At the outset, I would like to congratulate the member for Stretton and the member for Ferny Grove on their work as chair of the committee and the other government members on the committee for their work as well as the secretariat for their ongoing hard work on this bill. I would also like to acknowledge those individuals who have shared their stories. We all know that these stories form the framework in which this legislation hangs. Without those stories, we would not be here debating this legislation.

I would also like to acknowledge the Attorney-General. As identified by the Attorney-General, this bill will ensure that the victims of crime will receive an effective response when requiring assistance by implementing the final report on the review of the Victims of Crime Assistance Act 2009. As mentioned by previous speakers, there are four key components of the bill: the fundamental principles of justice, the financial assistance scheme, recovering money from offenders convicted of an act of violence and the role of the Victim Services Coordinator.

Firstly, the bill ensures that vulnerable victims are not disadvantaged by being unable to receive the help they require by streamlining processes and addressing technical and operational issues identified during the review. It also makes amendments to the Victims of Crime Assistance Act due to the introduction of the National Injury Insurance Scheme to clarify the relationship between it and the Victims of Crime Assistance Act. It also simplifies the amount of financial assistance paid, increasing some of the maximum amounts. It expands the scope of the financial assistance scheme to include domestic violence in the definition of an act of violence as defined by the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012. It also allows victims of domestic and family violence to provide a victim impact statement at sentencing. Due to my previous work with families who have experienced domestic violence and families who have gone through the court system, I know that victim impact statements are very powerful. They can really assist families to feel that, even though it is a very dry and unfriendly court process, they have been able to have their stories heard by the court. I think that is really important.

The bill proposes also to create a new charter of victims' rights and ensures that this charter applies to all victims of domestic and family violence. I think it is really important and welcome that this charter is also extended to non-government organisations and places a proactive duty on those organisations to provide information to victims if appropriate. This bill also allows for the Victim Services Coordinator to be more involved in the complaints process. This is a really welcome amendment, too, because it is important for people who are involved in a process in which they may feel very disempowered in terms of dealing with agencies and navigating different service systems to have somebody with them who can assist them in having a complaint they may have resolved.

There are a number of other amendments to the act which relate to the Victims of Crime Assistance Scheme that are clarifying, ensuring consistency in terminology with other acts and removing redundant provisions. Throughout the committee inquiry there was extensive consultation. I would also like to thank those agencies and individuals who took the time to be involved. The committee only had one recommendation and that was that the bill be passed.

I would also like to briefly mention the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2017. I want to briefly state that, having worked in the area of child protection, which encompasses domestic and family violence, for almost two decades, I have seen many, many families who have had their lives destroyed by domestic and family violence. I have spent many hours myself helping women

and children find safety, support and advocacy. I think it is really important that we have sound laws that can really assist people through what can be a really difficult service system that at times is conflicting. People may not know where to get support, particularly at a time when they are experiencing incredible stress and incredible anxiety. It is really difficult for them to know where to turn.

I know that in terms of legislation, any jurisdiction needs sound laws that can stand up and do what they purport to do. Previous speakers have talked about the lack of time for other people who work in this area to really consider this legislation and reflect on what these new laws may mean and whether there are any unintended consequences. Finally, I think we owe victims an obligation to pass legislation that supports them and helps them. I think it is really important that we do not overegg things and make promises that we may or may not be able to deliver. I commend the government bill to the House.

Dr ROBINSON (Cleveland—LNP) (11.08 pm): I rise to make a short contribution to the cognate debate of the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2017 and the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. I will focus my brief contribution on the former bill. I want to start by commending the Leader of the Opposition and member for Clayfield, Tim Nicholls, for bringing this particular bill forward and, in doing so, continuing the record of the LNP of looking to lead the way in terms of justice and support for victims of domestic and family violence. It is now the beginning of my ninth year as the member for Cleveland. I have represented the victims of domestic and family violence in my electorate and beyond on numerous occasions—too many occasions.

I have stood in this place on several occasions to do what I can to represent victims of domestic violence in Redland City and elsewhere. Whether as a member of parliament acting on behalf of constituents, whether as a friend in connection with individuals who are victims or as a pastor, I have sought to speak out in support of victims, sufferers and survivors where possible. Unfortunately, I am old enough to have seen too much, whether that has been as an MP, friend or pastor. I have to say that domestic violence, being the insidious thing that it is, seems to get its tentacles into all kinds of places in our society, and as a pastor it is sad to say that it also finds its way into churches and church communities. In that regard my experience has been one of coming into contact with people—particularly women—who are suffering from forms of domestic violence who know somebody in the life of the church, and through that person an individual, often outside of the church, and has been able to find some support and care. I believe that is a good thing. In my earlier days, as a much younger man, as someone who was disconnected from the church, even in my most irreligious moments I always believed that it was very important for community groups and church groups to reach out to help and support people who are disadvantaged and find themselves in very difficult and traumatic life situations.

In those various ways my family, my wife and I, have come into contact with individuals who have needed help and support. One of the most disturbing things for me has been to see women go through not only physical and other forms of abuse but circumstances where somebody who once has been violent and is in jail is now facing the potential of coming out of jail. To be along on that journey with women and to see what they go through, wondering what is going to happen—and sometimes not even really knowing—and finding out from a third person that so and so is getting out of jail and worrying that he will come straight for her, I think that is an incredibly terrible situation that women find themselves in. It is terrible for them to have to go through that.

In this House I have spoken of various matters and I have challenged the government at times. There was a time when the Bligh Labor government cut financial court support for domestic violence victims in my electorate of Cleveland, and we had to come to parliament and talk with the minister and argue a strong case in order to get that funding reinstated. It is something that you would not believe could have happened, but it did happen. That should never happen again, and that is why I mention it on a regular basis in this House so that it never does happen again.

Working Against Violence Support Services, WAVSS, is a regional domestic and family violence service organisation in Logan and Redlands which does a fantastic job. We have groups that offer women shelter in the Redlands, and they do not always like to be named in this place. I have mentioned them from time to time; I will not mention them by name today. They know who they are. They do a fantastic job in our community and I commend them. I also want to acknowledge the work done by a group called Red & White Ribbon, a domestic and family violence support agency that helps all women. I have more recently become aware of them as another form of support agency out there which seems to be one of the most inclusive groups operating in Australia, and I certainly commend them.

The stated aims of the bill are: to reverse the presumption of bail for an alleged offender charged with a relevant domestic violence offence; to establish a special bail condition for a tracking device on a person charged with a domestic violence offence; to introduce a new victim alert system so that

victims are made aware when the defendant applies for bail, is released on bail or receives a variation to a bail condition; to introduce a mandatory reporting provision to the parole system so that domestic violence victims can receive information about a prisoner; and to allow for the urgent review of bail conditions in higher courts and ensure that offenders will not be released in that period.

Sadly, we have seen domestic violence permeate our society at every level, place and culture in so many different ways. The incidents seem to be on the rise. In 2016, 18 Queensland women were killed at the hands of their partner, accounting for 25 per cent of all domestic violence related deaths in Australia. Something more must be done. Stronger measures are needed now to protect victims and their families. I believe that this bill does that. It is about putting community safety first. Recent domestic violence crimes demand a stronger response from government. As the opposition leader has pointed out, a few weeks ago Teresa Bradford was tragically murdered at the Gold Coast in front of her children. Her attacker had tried to kill her late last year. He was released on bail and then brutally murdered her. Cases like Teresa's are extreme but occur all too often. Recent cases of domestic violence show that this scourge happens in many different ways with varying impacts, but all are harmful. Not all result in death, but all forms of domestic and family violence are harmful and must be more effectively addressed.

One recent report which shows the wide reach of this problem is that concerning the former girlfriend of disgraced NRL star Tim Simona, Jaya Taki. The report revealed how Jaya considered self-harm after being treated terribly by Tim Simona. Jaya said she remained traumatised by the relationship and called on the NRL to do more in the fight against domestic violence. In calling for tougher measures within the NRL Jaya said, 'If you so much as threaten a woman, you put your hands on her, you sexually assault her'—or, as in her case—'you force her into an abortion, you emotionally blackmail her, you're gone. It should be an indefinite ban.' With respect to the NRL, there is the recent Bryce Cartwright scandal in which Bryce is alleged to have tried to bully a 'Miss X' into an unwanted abortion. No woman should have to suffer this type of bullying and intimidation.

In consideration of the Pyne bill the health committee also heard the expert witness testimony of women who were victims of domestic violence and who were coerced and even forced into unwanted abortions—women like Deb, Madeline and Adriana. The stories of these women are just the tip of the iceberg when it comes to domestic and family violence and they illustrate the diverse forms that domestic violence takes. Domestic violence is like a cancer in our society. It takes many forms, but all forms are harmful and some are deadly. It must be treated much more seriously by community leaders like members of parliament and routed out if we are to clean it out from society. It is time to take stronger action to protect women and children. I support the Leader of the Opposition's bill.

Ms FARMER (Bulimba—ALP) (11.18 pm): I rise to speak in this cognate debate on the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 and the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2016. I would like to acknowledge the people here in the gallery tonight and the people watching online who have such a very, very personal interest in what we are talking about tonight. I would like to mention Rachel Kayrooz in particular, who is a very good friend of mine and was the victim of the most horrific domestic violence some years ago. She has survived and has raised a beautiful daughter, Faith, and I want to pay tribute to them for the positive life they lead and for being such great role models. I want to acknowledge all the people who have given so much in the consultation on these and a number of other bills that have been debated in this parliament to address the issue of domestic and family violence. Those people must be reliving every moment as they hear us speak to each one of these bills.

I am speaking in support of the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. Although every amendment contained within this bill is to be commended, it is those aspects which deal specifically with addressing the needs of the victims of domestic and family violence that I wish to speak about, just as I have spoken on every single bill that has come to this House which addresses the needs of those victims.

I continue to speak about domestic and family violence at every opportunity. I imagine that all of us are in the same boat. I speak about it at sporting groups, at schools, at seniors groups, at church groups—wherever I can. I know too well that we must make sure that everyone is aware of the extent of domestic violence in our community and how important it is that we do not walk past it and that we all see it as our responsibility to do something about it. I have said several times in this House that people often say to me, 'You wouldn't get much domestic violence in your area, Di,' as if there are some boundaries about levels of education or income that domestic violence takes notice of. That is just not true.

One of the reasons I talk about it so much is that I want those women in my local area to know that it is okay to talk about it, that if they are experiencing domestic violence it is not okay and that services and support are available. I address community organisations and tell them the statistics about one in four women over the age of 15 having experienced violence at the hands of a domestic partner at some point. I say to them, 'That means there are people in this room who have experienced domestic violence.' Every single time, at least one person—usually the person I would least expect, even knowing that there are no boundaries for domestic violence—comes up to me afterwards or messages me in some way to say, 'Yes, that's me you were talking about.'

I want to say to all of those people, to the people who have been watching and listening to the debate tonight, to all of the families of those who have suffered and/or died as a result of domestic and family violence, to the community—they are always horrified, as we should be, when they see some new incident of domestic and family violence—and especially to the victims and their families who just want it all to stop: even though I have never been in your place—unfortunately, some members in this House have been in your place—we are doing the best we possibly can at implementing the *Not now, not ever* report recommendations.

I believe that every person in this House is committed to implementing those recommendations. Some 121 of those were government responsibilities. Of those, 46 have been completed and the remainder directed at government are underway. These are not small things. We established the specialist court at Southport, employed court support workers, established a statewide duty lawyer service, increased penalties for breaches of DVOs, immediately funded two additional 72-hour shelters—one opened at Christmas 2016 and we went further to establish two more—amended the IR Act to introduce 10 days paid DV leave and created materials for workplaces to provide a safe place for people experiencing DV. We established the Domestic and Family Violence Death Review and Advisory Board so any lessons that can prevent further deaths are learned. We have improved the access to and uptake of perpetrator programs to change behaviour and prevent further offences and changed eligibility criteria so offenders in custody for less than 12 months for DV related offences are able to access them. The list goes on.

I was disappointed that the opposition leader, in promoting the opposition bill tonight—it is important that everybody who is involved in fighting domestic and family violence and the victims feel confident that we are all doing the best we can—said that nothing is being done. I went back to the debate of the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and looked at what some of the stakeholders said about what the government had done to date. The Queensland Law Society applauded the government's commitment to rapid action on the issue of domestic violence and initiatives being undertaken. The Australian Christian Lobby said it was encouraging that the government was taking strong action. The Anglican Church, Queensland Churches Together and UnitingCare all talked about the government's agenda. I include in that the bipartisan support of this House. I think it is just so important that we engender confidence in the community that significant things are being done. Tonight is one more rung on that ladder.

Tonight we debate the implementation of recommendation 130, which is aimed at improving support for victims of sexual assault during the legal process by introducing a sexual assault counselling privilege. We are ensuring all victims of domestic and family violence can access financial assistance. We are allowing victims of offences involving domestic and family violence to give a victim impact statement at the time the offender is sentenced. We are ensuring that victims of domestic violence have the right to be informed about the progress of an investigation of a crime, with each major decision made about the prosecution of a person accused of committing the crime including when a perpetrator is applying for bail, being released from custody or any other matter that is before the court that affects the victim.

Tonight we are also debating the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2017. I want the people who are watching and reading this debate to know that none of this debate is about who in this House is a better person or a better MP. It is not that someone is a deliberately bad person if they vote against the bail bill or another bill. I cannot—nor can any of us—make the pain go away for the families of the victims of domestic violence. What I as a legislator can do is make sure I am as confident as possible that the things I support in this House will be right in the longer term. I need to be confident that the people who work in this space can say to me, 'There are not going to be any loopholes.'

I refer to some of the people who gave evidence to the bail bill inquiry. These are people who have been working in the area of domestic violence for a long time. They understand the loopholes. They understand how the perpetrators can get away with things. I am talking about the Law Society,

the Queensland Homicide Victims' Support Group, the Queensland Indigenous Family Violence Legal Service, the Caxton Legal Centre, Micah Projects, Professor Heather Douglas and Ms Angela Lynch from the Women's Legal Service. These are not inconsequential people, and they are saying to us, 'We need more time. We cannot be sure that if we support this it will be done properly.' For me to keep faith with the people who trust me to do the best thing for them, I need to know that people like that do have confidence in what they are doing.

This is not an auction about who has the best bill. It is not even a competition. It is just about us doing the right thing. That is why I am supporting the government's bill. It is why I will support the amendments the Attorney-General will move. I congratulate her and the committee members who looked at both bills. I commend the government's bill to the House.

Mr CRAMP (Gaven—LNP) (11.28 pm): I rise to contribute to the cognate debate of the Victims of Crime and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 and the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Bill 2017. For any functioning society to truly feel safe it must protect its most vulnerable, including victims of domestic violence, sexual violence and sexual offences. Such crime should never happen to people in the first place; however, the victims of these crimes have the right not to be violated by their perpetrator once again, especially as a result of the legal and justice system. I will briefly address my views on the Victims of Crime and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016.

Community safety is something I have relentlessly pursued since becoming the member for Gaven. The pendulum has swung in the favour of the perpetrator for far too long, and the scales of justice must be balanced back in favour of community safety. The LNP has long been fighting for Queenslanders to have a justice system and not a legal system. That is why when in government the LNP introduced law changes and ensured victims were better protected and crimes prevented. Every other state or territory in Australia has introduced some form of statutory evidential hearing, so for Queensland to do nothing will only be to the detriment of those most vulnerable in our community. Sending the message to sexual assault victims that anything they say may be used against them, not just the person who committed the crime, is not acceptable. We must encourage victims to seek justice, not create an environment where that is something that they are fearful of doing.

Allowing for a victim to be given automatic recognition as a special witness will assist to minimise the significant impact that the criminal justice process can have on vulnerable persons. During my 14 years as an ambulance officer I can attest to the devastation and fear that victims of sexual violence experience right from the outset of their immediate contact with emergency services. This will only exacerbate every time they approach an obstacle or situation where they believe or feel that their safety is being compromised. It is incumbent on this chamber therefore to ensure that we have done all we can to make the justice process as protective and as safe as possible to seek justice for an indefensible crime that should never have happened to them.

I will now move to the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2017. I want to start by saying it is unfortunate that the vitriol and denigrating commentary towards LNP members from the member for Pine Rivers was nothing short of disgusting and showed an absolute disrespect to the seriousness of this issue. It is heartening, however, to hear other members like the member for Capalaba highlight that not all members opposite share her disrespect. Like many members in this chamber, I was subjected to domestic violence as a child, so to have the opportunity to protect others from this devastating and indefensible crime is something that I am truly passionate about.

The LNP has a strong record of standing up for victims of domestic violence in government and in opposition, but we can always do more. Eighteen Queensland women died in domestic violence incidents in 2016. The tragic murder of Teresa Bradford, which sparked this bail system review, is a heartbreaking example of a legal system that has failed to protect these people and the LNP is proposing a bail and notification system that would have protected victims like Teresa Bradford. It is incumbent on us for every Teresa still out there and their families to ensure that this cannot happen again. We can no longer fail to protect these victims and their families, and the community is demanding action. There is no need or time for further consultation, no need or time to ponder the details. This bill can save lives.

Since speaking about my own experience with domestic violence, I have had the opportunity to meet so many courageous people who are either victims of domestic violence themselves or are family members, including mothers and fathers, of victims who died at the hands of their partners through violent acts. I want to take this opportunity to acknowledge the incredible mothers of domestic violence victims who were here in the gallery tonight. Bonnie, Dale and Sonia: I thank you for your courage in working with us to help stop any more mothers losing their children. My heart breaks at the pain that is

clearly evident in the voices and faces of the parents of multiple domestic violence victims when I have heard them speak about their children who have died at the hands of their partners over the past year alone. As a very proud father to three children, including two beautiful girls, I want to do all that I can to make sure that they are protected from such cowardly and despicable acts. We as a legislature have the responsibility to ensure there is a legal framework that our courts and our police can utilise to help stop this scourge on our communities.

I had been heartened with the bipartisan approach prior to this particular bill to ensure the perpetrators of domestic violence are brought to justice and, very importantly, that the victims of domestic violence are protected from those perpetrators, especially when they have the courage to leave situations, in many cases for both the safety of themselves and their children. I cannot believe that we will waste this opportunity in this chamber to provide such a comprehensive level of protection for domestic violence victims and their families when, as I stated earlier, there are so many on both sides of this chamber who have experienced the devastation that is domestic violence in some form or another. I say to those opposite, especially to those who have spoken about their own experiences, to look inside themselves and understand that this bill is not about politics; it is about protecting those who are unable to protect themselves. It is about saying that we as representatives of this Queensland community do not accept that domestic violence is okay under any circumstance. I implore all members to come together and support this bill in its entirety as it was introduced.

Hon. LM ENOCH (Algester—ALP) (Minister for Innovation, Science and the Digital Economy and Minister for Small Business) (11.34 pm): I rise to make a very short contribution to the debate of the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. I want to start by acknowledging the Attorney-General's hard work in all of this and also the passionate advocacy of Minister Fentiman, the Minister for Women, who has been an absolute champion in terms of the implementation of the *Not now, not ever* report. It is clear from the stories that we have heard tonight and over the last few years that there would be few members in this House who cannot recount a personal story of a family member, friend, colleague or constituent whose life has been directly affected by domestic violence.

We have heard very personal stories from a number of people in this House. I, too, shared my own story last year when we were debating various areas in terms of domestic and family violence: in the dead of night your partner twice your size in a drunken rage attacking you with full force of fists to your head and escaping in your pyjamas to get in your car and get to the police station to find support. That is my story, but we have heard so many other stories that are just like that and I think we are all touched by that. We all understand it. We have shared these stories here and we have seen families who have been in the gallery tonight. I think about my mother when she saw me bruised and battered and stitched up and swollen and the pain and the fear that was on her face and then the anger in my dad's eyes to see his only daughter bashed like that. I understand where the parents are coming from when they are trying to protect their children at the other end of the violence that has occurred to them in one way or another.

For all of these stories that we know and see, there are many more that remain untold. It is also important to remember that behind every statistic about domestic and family violence is a family who has been impacted. Statistics do not tell us about the desperation that a mother who has had to flee a violent relationship must be feeling, of her children who have had to leave behind not just their favourite book or toy but things as simple as their pyjamas and toothbrush. Statistics do not tell us about the interruption to work. For me, I was a first-year teacher. How did I explain to my principal why I looked like I did and why I could not come to work? Those statistics do not tell us all about that sort of stuff. They do not tell us about that long-term effect of domestic and family violence and that years later you are still working through the damage that it has caused, not just physically but emotionally. Statistics do not tell us about bank accounts that are cleaned out by an abusive partner, about how it feels to go to the shops and see 'no available funds' as the reason for your card being declined when you try to buy groceries despite knowing that you just got paid. Statistics do not tell us about the loss of confidence, about the fear, about the emotional control that an abuser wants to exert on their partner, ex-partner or their children. They do not tell us that moving on can be so difficult. There are far too many stories just like these, and that is why each and every one of us in this House must strive not just for the idea of winning on this but for what is right.

I am proud to be part of a government that, in consultation with the community, law enforcement agencies and the sector, has taken a strong and public stand on this issue. We have not shrunk from our responsibility as political leaders or as community leaders when it comes to combating the scourge of domestic and family violence. That is why our bill before the House tonight puts in place important

support and protection for survivors in these situations. Importantly, it provides access to financial assistance to all victims who have suffered injuries as a result of domestic and family violence, including those who have endured emotional and economic abuse. Our bill also helps to give a voice to victims by affording them the opportunity to provide that victim impact statement.

These additional provisions for victims of domestic and family violence provide important support to Queenslanders who are putting their lives back together after incredibly traumatic experiences—experiences that all of us in this House have shared in one way or another and who now know something about it. With those few words, I commend the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 to the House.

Mr McEACHAN (Redlands—LNP) (11.39 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 and the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2017. I note that these bills are to be debated in cognate. As such, I will deal with each individually.

The Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 is the result of a review undertaken in 2013 by the former LNP government. The review of the Victims of Crime Assistance Act 2009 made 15 recommendations, all of which are implemented by this bill. One of the matters considered by the report was the current situation with regard to the disclosure of sexual assault counselling communications. Currently in Queensland, it is possible for documents and communications between sexual assault victims and their counsellor to be accessed by the other party in a legal proceeding. These documents can then be used to assist with trial preparation and for use during the cross-examination of witnesses. I note that all other Australian jurisdictions have introduced some sort of statutory evidential privilege to limit such disclosure during legal proceedings.

It is vital that we protect victims of sexual assault who are seeking therapy while also maintaining an appropriate balance for the right to a fair trial. Currently, section 21A of the Evidence Act 1977 enables a court to make a range of orders or directions in support of vulnerable special witnesses called to give evidence before them. This bill proposes to automatically recognise sexual assault victims as special witnesses and will not require them to further satisfy the court that special witness status is required. This change will see Queensland courts reflecting procedures in other states such as New South Wales, Victoria, Western Australia and the Northern Territory. This is a common-sense approach to supporting victims of sexual assault.

I note the submission to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee by the Brisbane Rape and Incest Survivor Support Centre. It states—

> Given our experience working with survivors of sexual violence, we acknowledge the current special witness provisions do not accurately reflect how survivors can be impacted by trauma and intimidation. Allowing all survivors of sexual violence special witness provisions would better acknowledge the various ways trauma can manifest for survivors of sexual assault. It would also reduce perpetrator intimidation and lead to more witnesses being willing to testify.

A key objective of the bill that we are considering tonight is ensuring that the Victims of Crime Assistance Act 2009 continues to provide an effective response to victims of crime in Queensland. The current victims of crime scheme provides victims with financial assistance and support to help them recover from acts of violence. This assistance is intended to be implemented in a timely manner, rather than the victim receiving a lump sum payment after a lengthy court process. It is proposed that the Victims of Crime Assistance Act be expanded in its scope to ensure that all victims of domestic and family violence, including victims of elder abuse, are able to access financial assistance. I note that the 2015 report on the review of the scheme found that the financial assistance scheme works well in assisting victims of violent crime. Fifteen recommendations were made to enhance the current statutory framework, including redrafting the principles of justice in the scheme to provide for a new charter of victims' rights, placing a proactive duty on agencies to provide information to victims, if appropriate, and expanding the role of the scheme to help victims resolve complaints. These are common-sense recommendations in support of victims of violent crime and sexual assault and I am pleased to support this bill.

I would now like to address a bill before the House of great importance for our community, the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2017. The LNP has a strong record of standing up for victims of domestic and family violence. It is one of the reasons I am proud to be a member of this party. The LNP is serious about standing up for victims of crime and it is serious about taking action to keep Queenslanders safe.

The subject of this bill has significant personal meaning for me. In 2015, I stood in this House and delivered my maiden speech. That day was one of the first times I had spoken openly about my own experience of domestic violence during my childhood. Following my parents' separation, I moved

with my mum and my sister, Jackie, back to Queensland. For a number of years that followed the move my sister and I were witness to the physical and mental abuse that my mum suffered at the hands of her partner. I recall distinctly one particular night when I watched mum's partner slowly and deliberately bend her finger back until it broke. I remember the look on his face. I remember trying to assist my mother and being flogged for my efforts. I remember running to a neighbour's place, because we did not have a phone, and trying to get them to help. They did not want to get involved. I know from personal experience the deep and long-lasting effects domestic and family violence has on Queenslanders.

I learned courage and determination from my mum who, with limited means, got us out of that violent situation and helped rebuild our lives. Like many children I had no voice or power to stand up against this violence. That is why I stand in this place tonight, proud to be a member of the LNP. I am proud to stand here with the determination that I learned from my mum all of those years ago and demand action on this important issue.

This bill seeks to reverse the presumption of bail for an alleged offender charged with a domestic violence offence. This bill proposes to rebalance the scales of justice in favour of community safety. Community safety should be a primary concern in this place. All Queenslanders have the right to feel safe in their homes and safe from harm by violent offenders.

This bill proposes to establish a special bail condition for a tracking device to be fitted against a person charged with a domestic violence offence. GPS tracking devices are already used for dangerous prisoners and reportable offenders on supervision orders. This is a common-sense extension of a program that is already in place. The *Not now, not ever* report recommended that the Queensland government trial the use of GPS monitoring for high-risk perpetrators of domestic and family violence. I am pleased to support this bill, which implements that recommendation.

A proposed new alert system would alert a victim of domestic violence when a defendant applies for bail, is released on bail, or receives a variation to a bail condition. This issue is often raised by domestic violence victims and their advocates. In its submission to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee, Micah Projects stated—

In our experience, women live with grave fear and this will enable them time to plan for their safety and any dependent children or at risk family members

A similar proposed reporting provision seeks to introduce mandatory reporting in the parole system when an offender applies for and is granted parole so that a victim of domestic violence can receive information about a prisoner. That provision proposes to provide that information even if the prisoner was convicted for an offence not related to domestic violence.

An important submission provided to the Sofronoff parole review was received from the Women's Legal Service, which identified what it considers to be a loophole in the current parole system. The Women's Legal Service stated—

... we advise women whose former partner is in prison on an offence unrelated to the domestic violence and are concerned about their safety upon his release. They are unable to obtain details about his release date as they are not the victims of the specific offence he was imprisoned about.

One of the most important amendments in this bill seeks to introduce a provision allowing for an urgent review of a bail decision in a higher court. Currently, a defendant is released from custody once bail is granted and remains at liberty while the prosecution or the complainant apply for the decision to be reviewed. The amendment proposes that if a prosecutor or person appearing on behalf of the Crown believes that there is sufficient need to urgently review a bail decision, then an urgent appeal process can begin. The bail decision would then be stayed for up to three business days and reviewed in a higher court. During that appeal, the defendant would not be at liberty. I note that New South Wales, South Australia and the Northern Territory all have similar provisions for a stay of bail release.

I have listened to those opposite defend their decision not to support this bill. They allege a lack of time and concerns about fundamental legislative principles. This defence is from a party that sought to reverse the onus of proof on farmers and gave 18 minutes notice when changing our democratic system. I hope that those opposite use their common sense and support this bill. To reject this bill would be to dismiss the harm that has already been perpetrated on victims and families who have lost loved ones to domestic violence. I am proud to support the opposition leader and this bill.

Hon. M FURNER (Ferny Grove—ALP) (Minister for Local Government and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (11.50 pm): I rise tonight to make a contribution in this cognate debate, but my focus will be on the private member's bill, the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2016, which was referred to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee for

examination on 17 March 2017. As stated in the chair's foreword of the report, committee members and those who appeared before the committee and made submissions were clearly committed to putting a stop to domestic violence. However, the committee was unable to reach a majority decision in recommending the bill be passed.

I commend the chair of that committee, the member for Stretton, also the member for Capalaba and the member for Pine Rivers for their detailed examination and contribution in delivering the report on this particular bill. I also acknowledge the families of the victims of domestic violence who contributed to the consideration of the bill and their courage for coming forward and telling their stories and speaking about the loved ones they have lost. I also acknowledge the many women who have attended my office over the last many years to explain their concerns about domestic violence. I have cried with those women in my office because it is something that is fundamentally important and precious to my heart. That importance and that concentration of passion comes from my position as a White Ribbon ambassador since 2008.

Notwithstanding that, I believe that all of us have a genuine passion in relation to this issue and agree that tackling domestic violence in our society is a priority. We should all come to this chamber with a position of being bipartisan in terms of making sure we get the best outcomes. We also need to have strong, workable laws that protect victims of domestic violence. Our benchmark for laws in regard to domestic violence stem from the special task force on domestic violence in Queensland and its report, *Not now, not ever*: *Putting an end to domestic and family violence in Queensland.* The Palaszczuk government has methodically, over a period of time, implemented legislation to deal with this particular matter, supported by the LNP opposition in this regard, to make sure that we provide protection for women in our society.

The Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill provides for the defendant to be remanded in custody in circumstances where it has not been practicable to obtain sufficient information regarding the risk posed by the defendant if released on bail. This was considered in detail by many submitters in the hearing. I want to refer to two of those submitters, Micah Projects and Sisters Inside. Representatives from Micah Projects made two fundamental points. They indicated that there needs to be a strengthening of the integrated responses and multiagency information sharing on domestic violence, including use of risk assessment tools, and to elevate and support the management of high-risk offenders through coordinated community responses that are emerging in Queensland. Micah Projects, in its submission, referred to the Queensland Law Society and a statement by the QLS president Christine Smyth who indicated—

The QLS is of the view the proposed reversal of onus of proof provisions touted by the state opposition when considering the release of an alleged domestic violence offender back into the community would not deliver the intended effect of improving public safety.

Micah Projects have been around for a long time. I remember them appearing before many of the committees I was on in the Senate. They are a competent and well-measured organisation that delivers real base evidence before committees. In their submission they went on to further state—

We share a concern raised by others that placing the onus of proof on offenders in applications for bail can disproportionately impact on disadvantaged people and substantially increase the prison population in Queensland, without achieving its desired effect of targeting and managing the high risk offenders.

I now turn to the other submitter I referred to, Sisters Inside. In their submission they indicated almost all women in prison are survivors of violence and abuse experienced both as adults and children. Recent data published by the Productivity Commission shows that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women are 30 times more likely to be hospitalised as a result of family violence than non-Indigenous women. Furthermore, they went on to indicate Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander woman are more likely to be in prison for violent offences against abusive partners and family members. Even though the proposed amendments are limited to violent offenders, we are concerned that reversing the presumption of bail will negatively affect women, especially Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women, whom those laws are designed to protect—women I am now responsible for under my portfolio as the Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships.

Ms Bates: That is not what the Aboriginal Legal Service said.

Mr FURNER: Listen to this! The member should listen to the evidence that she hears rather than sit across the chamber and snark and politicise this debate. Sisters Inside referred to data provided by Corrective Services, which showed that in 2014-15 and 2015-16 a breach of the DVP act was the 10th most common offence type for which women were in prison, either on remand or sentence, and in 2015-16 299 women were serving sentences of imprisonment for assault type offences and 36 women

were serving sentences for breaches of the DVP act as their most serious offence. They are the unintended consequences as a result of accepting this bill before us tonight that I believe those opposite have not really considered in their examinations.

As parliamentarians we all come into this place with an obligation and that obligation is that none of us should badge debate, badge circumstances in respect of these sorts of issues. I call on those people, regardless whether it be crossbenchers or those opposite, to leave their gutter politics at the chamber door. They should come into this place and have a real debate using the evidence before them but leave those politics at the door. They should come in here with respect and have an ethical discussion about what is best for our society, what is best for women in our communities, and leave their gutter politics at the door.

Mr ELMES (Noosa—LNP) (11.57 pm): I rise tonight to contribute to the cognate debate on the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2017 and the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. It is my view very definitely that there is no debate to be had. The LNP's bill should be passed tonight so that we can send, as a parliament, a strong message to the perpetrators of domestic violence to help to end family violence and its devastating effect on individual members of those families.

According to White Ribbon Australia, one in three women have experienced physical or sexual violence perpetrated by someone known to them and one in four children are exposed to it. While the majority of victims are women, the organisation also recognises that men and members of the LGBTI community are also represented in those statistics. The line that it is no big deal and all families have secrets can no longer cut it. There are many types of domestic and family violence. It is violent, abusive or intimidating behaviour by a partner, carer or family member to control, dominate or cause fear. It does not have to be physical abuse; it can be emotional, financial, sexual and many other types of abuse. It can affect anyone in the community regardless of gender, sexual identity, race, age, culture, religion, disability, economic status or location.

As many in this place know, I spent a great deal of my working life in commercial radio.

Ms Boyd: You've got a great voice.

Mr ELMES: Yes, a great voice. When I was about 16½, the radio network that I worked for sent me to a country town. Because I was only 16½, they insisted that I board with a family. The husband and wife that I boarded with were probably 23 or 24 years of age. The bloke was a very big and strong ex-military man. I can recall being in the house one night when the wife was accused of putting too much spice in the spaghetti bolognaise, which is the way that it was put. He hit her and she literally went from one side of the room to the other. Because I worked nights on air, I would come home in the morning and often, after a particularly violent episode, the husband, full or sorrow, would ask me to check on his wife as she lay in bed, with blackened eyes and bruises all over her. At the age of 16, I was supposed to try to soothe her and so forth. On one occasion, I came home in the middle of the day because I had a split shift. I found the woman in the bathtub, which was full of water, with slashes to her wrists. She was bleeding all over the place. That was my experience. I had never experienced that at home. I had a great loving family.

Tonight is the first time ever I have spoken publicly about that. I have always felt that I failed that woman; that I did not offer whatever support a 16½-year-old could offer to someone. Tonight, having spoken about this publicly for the first time and as one of the 89 members of this House, I have an opportunity to vote and, in some very small way, repay her for the things that maybe I should have done, or could have done, something like 40 years ago.

Tonight is the time to act. Tonight is the time to act swiftly and to act decisively with an incredible sense of urgency for all women and families. I do not want delays by this parliament to be responsible for lax laws that allow for another tragedy such as we witnessed on the Gold Coast when Teresa Bradford was murdered by her estranged husband in front of her children, just weeks after he was released on bail.

Those opposite are as aware as I am that Queensland accounts for one-quarter of all domestic violence related deaths in Australia. I cannot not for the life of me fathom why tonight this parliament would not take the opportunity, for just a second, to agree to pass legislation that would tighten bail laws that have already been enacted in other states. If this legislation had been in place, Teresa Bradford may still be alive, because there would have been no presumption of bail for her abusive husband and, in the event that bail was granted, an urgent appeal to the Supreme Court to have the decision reversed could have been made. In the event of his release, she or another family member would have been notified. He would have been connected to a tracking device and subject to mandatory reporting.

During 2015-16, in Queensland alone there were some 23,000 breaches of domestic violence orders that we know about. It is all very well to talk about statistics—to talk about 23,000 breaches—but everyone who has commented in here tonight knows that the statistics say one and the real numbers are over here. Those are the figures that we must concentrate on. According to the Queensland police, the number of DVO applications increased by 19 per cent between 2014-15 and 2015-16. Therefore, anyone who says that what we are doing is right and proper and that it is working is deceiving themselves, because it is not working. Tonight is the night we can do something that goes further than this parliament has ever gone before. We must do it. We cannot let this opportunity pass us by.

In 2005 in my electorate of Noosa, the local community came together to rally around victims of domestic violence. They donated all that was required to build three safe houses, the first of their kind in the local area. Businesses, tradespeople and the community generously donated goods and services, labour and time. In just over two weekends, with 150 workers on site at any one time, a place of refuge was built for victims of domestic violence in Noosa. With the recent increase in domestic violence, demand for emergency crisis accommodation is outstripping supply. Late last year, Sunny Kids CEO Chris Turner said that their DV high-security shelter in Noosa was full every night. At the same time, the Sunshine Coast police reported that they are engaging with 15 new domestic violence cases each week. Those are new families who have not been involved in domestic violence before. Those are some of the people who are not represented in the statistics that I talked about a few minutes ago.

Tonight it is vital that we all stand up for the victims of domestic violence and ensure that the scales of justice are balanced in favour of families and members of families. As the member for Redlands said, tonight I am incredibly proud to be a member of the LNP and to support the bill that the Leader of the Opposition has put before the House. I commend the bill to the House.

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) (12.06 am): I rise to speak in favour of the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the amendments moved by the Attorney-General to the private member's bill. I begin by thanking members of the committee for their consideration of these matters in what was a very short period. I particularly thank the people who gave evidence, including workers from the front line and the brave family members of women who have died at the hands of perpetrators, who told their stories in order to save others from experiencing the pain that they have had to endure.

We all recognise the urgency in this area and we know that not one group has a monopoly on good ideas when it comes to difficult public policy issues, such as tackling domestic and family violence. However, we are also required to responsibly and carefully consider the changes we make so that we can be sure that at all times we are strengthening our protection of women and children who experience violence in their homes and communities. It is imperative that we always strive for the best solution, that is, the solution that protects women and the solution that the incredible people working each and every day on the front line advise us will be the most effective. We cannot be tempted to fall into the trap of pursuing the politically expedient or popular solution. Up until recently, domestic violence reform had the support of both sides of this House and we had set aside our differences to create a better system.

I want to reiterate that the Palaszczuk government is absolutely committed to the full implementation of the road map for reform laid out for us by Dame Quentin Bryce in the *Not now, not ever* report. Work has begun on each and every one of the recommendations set for the Queensland government. Forty-six are already complete. We are privileged to have this comprehensive report available to us, because it provides a set of recommendations which, when fully implemented, will reshape the services and justice system dealing with domestic and family violence. It is no exaggeration to say that these reforms will change and save lives. We will never rest while there is more to be done, but we will not rush headfirst into changes that, while they seem simple, are complex and require caution. Therefore, we support the changes in the private member's bill in part, but seek to refine them so that they effectively target the people we are trying to capture. We are ensuring that changes are made in the context of broader reforms and that the chances of unintended consequences are minimised.

The government's amendments to the proposals regarding bail give justice to the community demand for better protection for victims against further violence from a perpetrator, whilst also hearing the concerns of experts from the front-line domestic violence services with decades of experience in dealing with increased violence. As one key service provider said, 'We know enough about what the predictors of homicide are in order to target the right offences when it comes to bail reform.'

The government's amendments are consistent with the outcomes of the review into the Kelly case by the Domestic Violence Death Review and Advisory Board. It is again worth noting that this board was established in response to a recommendation of the *Not now, not ever* report. Kelly, as she is referred to in the report, had been in a relationship characterised by violence and control. The violent history she described before her death was brutal and repetitive. Friends and family had tried to help, but she was too intimidated to leave. The perpetrator had a criminal history, including aggravated assault on a female. Like so many victims, Kelly knew he was going to kill her. Police opposed bail, but it was granted and months later he did kill her. The board in its report advised—

... given the aggravating circumstances associated with domestic and family violence and the high likelihood of recidivism, this case highlights the potential benefit in reviewing the Bail Act 1980 to consider specific circumstances—

and I say again, specific circumstances—

in which the presumption in favour of bail should be revoked.

They noted a lack of bail provisions which specifically account for domestic and family violence cases, unlike in some other states and territories. There can be no doubt that we all want the police and courts to very carefully consider the risk a perpetrator poses and act to protect the victim and the community more broadly. That is why we included the development of an evidence based common risk assessment in our priority actions out of the *Not now, not ever* report.

This important work is nearing completion and soon all participants in the network of people providing protection will all be working off the same assessment of the level of dangerousness posed by multiple risk factors associated with a particular person. We have also ensured that the voices of victims are considered in the court and that a person's history of domestic violence is properly recorded and available to the court. Both of those things also contribute to the court having a better understanding of the risk posed by a perpetrator.

Our amendments will allow for the presumption of bail to be set aside in cases where a person is charged with serious offences, commonly part of a pattern of domestic violence. These are the offences that we know are predictors of escalating violence. The government amendments set aside the presumption of bail for people who contravene a domestic violence order, use or threaten violence or have a sustained history of violence.

The presumption will also be reversed for people charged with a domestic violence offence, where the substantive offence is punishable by a maximum penalty of seven or more years imprisonment or the substantive offence is one of a prescribed list of offences punishable by a maximum penalty of less than seven years imprisonment but it is offending of a type often associated with domestic violence behaviour. These include: threatening violence, dangerous operation of a vehicle, stalking, depravation of liberty. They are all too familiar hallmarks of violence and control exercised over victims by relentless perpetrators.

Importantly, the presumption will also be reversed for those charged with our new stand-alone offence of strangulation, which we know is a devastatingly accurate predictor of a rapid and dramatic increase in risk of death. More than 400 people have now been charged with this strangulation offence. We believe this is a more targeted response, reducing the likelihood of unintended consequences while still ensuring that those identified as posing an ongoing risk must prove they are not likely to reoffend if granted bail.

This was the position of every key domestic and family violence stakeholder who gave evidence to the committee, in particular the Red Rose Foundation submission which was also endorsed by the peak body in this state End Violence Against Women Queensland and DV Connect. Our amendments tonight reflect the position of every domestic and family violence stakeholder who gave evidence to the committee.

Eminent researcher and academic Professor Heather Douglas gave evidence at the hearing and cautioned that a one-size-fits-all refusal of bail may end up with injustice and not achieve those things the committee wishes. While we are all in furious agreement that we need to look at bail provisions to improve safety, I suggest that members listen to the expert voices of those on the front line and support a reform that addresses unintended consequences.

In relation to provisions which ensure victims are advised when bail is sought or granted, there can be no doubt that knowledge is power and this information can rebalance power in favour of victims. Victims who become aware that their perpetrator is seeking bail can take steps to improve their safety with the support of wraparound services. It is a victim's right. That is why it was included in the victims of crime amendment bill before this House.

We will, however, clarify provisions to be absolutely clear that the right to be kept informed about court processes includes applications for bail made by the accused. It is important that we effectively support the person receiving the information and provide appropriate supports and practical assistance, such as access to home security upgrades.

In implementing recommendation 123 of the *Not now, not ever* report, it is proposed the Queensland government trial the use of GPS monitoring of high-risk perpetrators. We allocated $200,000 to research the cost and compatibility of GPS monitoring technology options in the last budget. With Commonwealth funding we are also trialling technology solutions to keep women safe in their own homes, including the testing of the use of CCTV, personal duress alarms with 24/7 monitoring and phone applications. In keeping with the *Not now, not ever* report recommendations—

(Time expired)

Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (12.16 am): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2017. Like speakers prior to me tonight, I certainly acknowledge those affected by domestic violence who have been in the gallery here but also those affected by domestic violence right across Queensland. At the outset I would like to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Clayfield, along with other shadow ministers, including the member for Mansfield and the member for Mudgeeraba, in bringing this important legislation before the Queensland parliament tonight.

This is a bill for an act to amend the Bail Act 1980 and the Corrective Service Act 2006 for particular purposes. This new legislation will reverse the presumption of bail for an alleged offender charged with a relevant domestic violence offence. It will also establish a special bail condition for a tracking device that will be imposed by a court or a police officer authorised to grant bail against a person charged with a relevant domestic violence offence.

The LNP has a proud and strong record for standing up for the victims of crime. We as a political party, both individually and collectively, have worked tirelessly to alleviate many of the weaknesses with respect to a number of the legal elements of the framework covering domestic violence here in Queensland.

I remind the House that when in government the LNP invested more than $25 million in domestic and family violence initiatives as part of our then 2014 budget. We introduced the new Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act and established major reforms to safety measures to help victims stay in their homes.

Another initiative that we, the Liberal National Party, on this side of the House are particularly proud of was our establishment of the then Special Taskforce on Domestic and Family Violence in Queensland, which delivered the *Not now, not ever* report. This task force, as people would be aware, was headed by former governor-general of Australia, Dame Quentin Bryce.

The *Not now, not ever* report made 140 recommendations based on the insights gathered from five months of engagement, with both communities and individuals. The recommendations of this report set the vision and direction for Queensland's strategy to end domestic and family violence and ensure those affected had and continue to have access to safety and support. Although we are proud of our past record, we understand that more needs to be done. The LNP is recommending five key changes via this legislation which we believe will strengthen the management of issues that have come to light in recent months.

The first key proposed change is to reverse the presumption of bail for an alleged offender charged with a relevant domestic violence offence. The task force recommended that a history of violence should exclude any presumption of bail for perpetrators arrested by police for domestic and family violence related offences. This bill implements this recommendation, which has yet to be comprehensively addressed by the Palaszczuk Labor government.

The second key change is to establish a special bail condition for a tracking device, or GPS tracker, to be imposed by a court, or a police officer authorised to grant bail, against a person charged with a relevant domestic violence offence. This policy allows for a court to impose a bail condition that includes the fitting of a GPS tracking device on a defendant charged with a relevant domestic violence offence. This is to enable police to better protect the community if a high-risk defendant is released on bail.

The third key change is to introduce a new system to alert the victim of a relevant domestic violence offence when the defendant applies for bail, is released on bail or receives a variation to a bail condition. One of the major concerns raised by domestic violence victims relates to a notification process to apply when defendants and alleged perpetrators charged with domestic violence offences are released on bail pending their trial.

The fourth key change is to introduce a mandatory reporting provision to the parole system for when a prisoner applies for, and receives parole so that a victim of domestic violence can receive information about a prisoner, even if the offence that the prisoner was convicted of is not a domestic violence offence. The Women's Legal Service Queensland provided a submission to the Sofronoff parole review about what they deemed to be a current loophole in the parole system regarding access of prisoner information to domestic violence victims.

The final and fifth key change is to introduce a provision to allow for an urgent review of a bail decision in a higher court. Under this provision, an original bail decision could be stayed for up to three business days, ensuring that an alleged offender would not be released during that review period. What this legislation is really about is seeking to further protect victims and their families, and this is very important for Queensland.

For many years we have enjoyed a bipartisan approach to tackling domestic violence, yet unfortunately Labor throughout part of this debate has sought to politicise this legislation which, I believe, is very unfortunate. Tonight I urge all Labor government members to honour the years of bipartisanship on tackling domestic violence and set aside partisan politics and pass the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2017.

For the benefit of the member for Ferny Grove, who I heard speak earlier, perhaps he should be aware that the Queensland Indigenous Family Violence Legal Service do in fact support the draft legislation, and I table a copy of their correspondence.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 27 February 2017, from the Queensland Indigenous Family Violence Legal Service, to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee, providing a submission on the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2017 [487].

Specifically, I refer to page 5 of the report, which states that the Queensland Indigenous Family Violence Legal Service 'supports the proposed reversal of the presumption of bail for an alleged offender charged with a relevant domestic violence offence'.

I would now like to move on to the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. The main policy objective is to implement the recommendations of the *Final report of the review of the Victims of Crime Assistance Act 2009* and to ensure that the Victims of Crime Assistance Act 2009 continues to provide an effective response to assist victims of crime.

A significant element is to introduce a sexual assault counselling privilege that gives the victims of a sexual offence who are to give evidence in criminal proceedings against an accused automatic status as a special witness. It is important to note that this bill is here for debate because of an LNP review which commenced in 2013. It is important to us on this side of the House that Queenslanders have a justice system and not simply a legal system. The Liberal National Party has a strong record of standing up for victims of crime and ensuring community safety is paramount, regardless of where people live. Over a number of years, the Liberal National Party increased funding to victims of crime support groups by $2 million, together with the introduction of victim impact statements that are read out as a part of sentencing if requested by a victim.

One of the key changes in this bill deals with sexual assault counselling privilege. There is a high occurrence of sexual violence in Australia, with more than one in five women having experienced sexual violence. I find this statistic extremely sobering. As a doctor in this parliament, the 55th Parliament, what I have heard not only in relation to domestic violence but also in relation to offences that have been committed against children I find shocking, disturbing and truly tragic. We must all collectively work together to address these problems in our community. A person's private, psychological and physical boundaries are attacked during a sexual assault, and harm inflicted at this time can have long-term impacts. This is when sexual assault counselling services play an essential role in assisting victims to recover.

The *Not now, not ever*: *putting an end to domestic and family violence in Queensland* report recommended, via recommendation 130, that the Queensland government introduce a sexual assault counselling privilege based on the New South Wales legislative model. In accepting this recommendation, the Queensland government has acknowledged the benefits of the New South Wales model as it seeks to ensure the appropriate balance in each case between the right to a fair trial and the public interest in preserving the confidentiality of counselling communications.

Another key change in the bill is the notion of special witnesses. Automatic recognition as a special witness will mean that a victim of sexual assault does not need to satisfy the court that they fall under that definition, which is another element of the definition—for example, that they are likely to

suffer severe emotional trauma if required to give evidence in the usual manner. It is important to note that already in New South Wales, the Northern Territory, Victoria and Western Australia witnesses are afforded special witness status.

This legislation achieves its policy objectives by making the application process in the Victims of Crime Assistance Act for financial assistance easier for victims of a crime. The scope of the financial assistance scheme has been expanded to ensure that all victims, including elder abuse, are able to access this financial assistance. This is certainly a very important measure.

Another extremely important inclusion is the one allowing all victims of domestic and family violence the ability to provide an impact statement at the time of sentencing of the offender. The LNP and I do not oppose the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 and, as stated at the beginning of this contribution, the changes come from recommendations of a statutory review that was established by the LNP in 2013.

As I stand here tonight, I remain hopeful that we can come to some bipartisanship support in relation to ending domestic violence in Queensland. We have certainly done that to date as far as other bits of legislation which have been implemented are concerned. We need to continue to do that. We need to continue to drive cultural change in our community to ensure that this scourge is ended once and for all in our community. Certainly I am hopeful that tonight we can come together again to significantly pass a piece of legislation which is vitally important in achieving some truly good outcomes for all Queenslanders regardless of where they live.

Hon. MT RYAN (Morayfield—ALP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services) (12.26 am): I rise to contribute to the debate. Firstly, I strongly support the measures that deliver better and safer outcomes for victims of domestic and family violence. Since the *Not now, not ever* report, the Palaszczuk government has worked collaboratively across departments and with service providers to implement the recommendations of that report. The report was emphatic in the need to protect victims and hold perpetrators to account.

Many of the recommendations of the report relate to improvements to the criminal justice system and challenge the way we as a community view domestic and family violence. It is undisputed in a lot of cases that the only way to ensure a victim's ongoing safety is to keep an accused perpetrator in custody. Current legislation provides avenues for the justice system to remand in custody those who present an unacceptable risk to the community. The decision about what is or is not unacceptable goes to the very heart of domestic and family violence to protect those in need and the cultural change that we as a Queensland community must effect.

Domestic violence takes many forms. Risks can rapidly escalate or de-escalate and assessing future risk can be challenging for all involved. We know and understand the distress that victims and families endure through pursuing justice. This is a burden acutely shared by those in the justice system and integrated response providers who strive to deliver support.

For matters of domestic violence, the risk of further domestic violence is at the core of deciding an unacceptable risk. Police are now, more than ever, working closely with other departments and the domestic violence sector to share information so officers can better understand the dynamics of domestic violence and how risk manifests itself in particular cases. The information held by service providers and the views of victims and their families can better inform decisions about assessing bail risk more effectively than a predetermined list of offence types.

While notification of a bail decision is an important component of providing support to a victim, it is not by itself sufficient to discharge a community's responsibility. Many people rely on mobile telephones or devices to stay in touch, but it is not unusual for victims of domestic violence to frequently change their address or phone numbers in an effort to avoid the perpetrator. Sending a victim an electronic message about a bail decision does not go far enough. This is why the victims of crime assistance bill creates a charter of victim's rights to ensure that victims are informed of bail conditions and, importantly, that arrangements and support services are put in place to ensure a victim's safety.

It is vital that the Queensland Police Service's responsibility to notify victims of bail conditions is part of an integrated response with other service providers which also include explaining options and providing assistance and support so victims can make decisions about their own safety. We all need to ensure that we continue to work collectively and closely together so that we can deliver workable and valuable safeguards to victims and families of domestic and family violence. While I have the opportunity, I acknowledge the good work of the Queensland Police Service and Queensland Corrective Services in assisting people who are experiencing domestic and family violence. Those

officers in both the Queensland Police Service and Queensland Corrective Services have a very tough job, and they work every single day to ensure they respond to the needs of people in our community, particularly people in our community experiencing domestic and family violence.

The Queensland Police Service is leading the way when it comes to ensuring that our officers have the best possible skills and training to respond to very difficult, complex instances involving domestic and family violence. Only a few weeks ago along with the Minister for Communities I was able to launch the vulnerable persons training package, which is the biggest training package being delivered to front-line police officers in the history of the Queensland Police Service. Over 11,500 police officers will receive vulnerable persons training to ensure they have the skills, knowledge and awareness to better assist people experiencing domestic and family violence. From the point of view of knowing that the Queensland Police Service not only has highly trained and highly skilled officers but also is a compassionate Police Service, we should be very proud of the work that the Queensland Police Service does every single day in responding to very challenging calls for service in respect of domestic and family violence.

I commend the work of the Attorney-General in respect of the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I call on all members of this House to continue the history of this parliament in having a bipartisan approach to responding to the very complex challenge of domestic and family violence here in Queensland. Only by working together can we truly have the cultural change that we need in our community to keep people safe and the best possible laws to ensure that people experiencing domestic and family violence get the assistance and protection they need.

Miss BARTON (Broadwater—LNP) (12.32 am): It gives me great pleasure to rise in the House this morning to speak to the cognate debate. I will confine my comments to the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill. At the outset, I acknowledge the great work that my parliamentary colleagues the members for Clayfield, Mudgeeraba and Mansfield have done. I think all on this side of the House would agree they have done an absolutely fantastic job in responding to what was a very emergent circumstance with the very tragic passing of Teresa Bradford. Whilst I am sure they have all gone to bed given that it is past midnight, I would like to acknowledge that Dale, Bonnie and Sonia were in the gallery earlier this evening. They have been so supportive of the work that the member for Mudgeeraba has done. I know that they look forward to seeing what the outcome of the deliberations and the debate is tonight.

I am sure we all agree that Queenslanders have said enough is enough. In this parliament we have had a great tradition of both sides coming together and working together to make real positive change in the area of domestic and family violence. In my community of Broadwater, and particularly on the Gold Coast, we have been very touched by the tragedy that is domestic and family violence. The member for Mudgeeraba and I have been to far too many Red Rose rallies. We were at the rally for Shelsea Schilling across the road from my office when the terrible news broke about the passing of Teresa Bradford. It is so tragic that we hear continued reports of domestic and family violence in our community which in too many cases end in someone losing their life.

When in government the LNP had an incredibly strong track record of working with domestic violence stakeholders and community organisations so that we could continue to provide the funding and support they needed. Importantly, we also had a very strong track record when it came to toughening laws and implementing strong laws. The legislation that I particular want to speak to tonight and which the member for Clayfield introduced is another illustration of the LNP's strong performance and our track record when it comes to tackling domestic and family violence.

It has been said many times in this House before, but the reason we have the *Not now, not ever* report is that the LNP when in government decided after a committee inquiry which I had been a part of that we needed to do something. It was the LNP which made sure that Dame Quentin Bryce did the report that she did and the task force was there. I acknowledge that there has been bipartisan support for the implementation of those recommendations, but we should never forget the track record that we had in government.

I am not seeking to make a long and detailed contribution to the debate tonight. I think it is important to note that the important reforms the member for Clayfield has introduced to this House have been introduced and implemented successfully in other jurisdictions around the country. There has been a lot of debate in the House this evening about how to strike the right balance between the rights and liberties of perpetrators and the rights and liberties of victims. I joined the Young Liberals because I believe in the inalienable rights and freedoms of the individual, but when it comes to making that judgement call—

Mr Minnikin interjected.

Miss BARTON: Thank you, member for Chatsworth. However, when it comes to making that call I have no doubt in my mind that we need to err absolutely on the side of the victim. It does not matter who they are, where they come from, what they believe in or what they do. No-one should ever be the victim of domestic and family violence. When I hear the contributions of members on both sides of this House—and I particularly acknowledge the member for Noosa and the contribution he made—it reminds me just how privileged I am that I have never been touched by domestic and family violence. My only experience of it is the voluntary work that my mother did when I was a little girl and I would stay with my grandparents at Paradise Point every second Saturday night when she would spend the night in a women's refuge helping women who were fleeing violent partners. I am incredibly privileged, but unfortunately so many in our community from so many walks of life are not.

Finally, I say to the member for Noosa: I have no doubt that that woman will be incredibly proud of what you have said tonight. You can be incredibly proud of what you have done not only tonight but also in your career as the member for Noosa to make real positive change. I do not think anyone can expect a 16½-year-old boy to have the answer to what are some very difficult questions. I have no doubt that it was very difficult for you to express that tonight, but we are a greater parliament for having heard your experience. I hope you feel comforted in the knowledge that you have made a real difference in people's lives.

I understand that Dale, Sonia and Bonnie are in the gallery. I would like to acknowledge the strength and courage that you have all shown. We are all so very touched by your circumstances and the tragedies that you have experienced, but your stories, your strength and your courage are what drive this parliament to make real positive change. As the Leader of the Opposition says, governing is serious business for serious people and that is what tonight is all about—doing the right thing to make positive change. With that, I commend the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill to the House.

Mr NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (12.39 am), in reply: In responding to the comments on the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2017, I thank all members for their contribution to this debate which has been about issues which can and do often invoke strong emotion and deep convictions, as they should. It is clear that there remains a strong resolve of the parliament to tackle domestic violence and do what we can to support victims and their families, but we have not heard any justified reasoning or compelling evidence presented by any members of the House as to why this bill in its current form should not be supported in its entirety. We have seen the last-minute amendments presented by the government, and I have to say that it is disappointing that, despite our invitation for any amendments or suggestions for improvement to be provided to us at a much earlier stage, they have been drafted and presented to us for consideration at such a late stage in this debate.

Tonight we have heard a lot of discussion about the apparent lack of consultation on the policy objectives put forward in the private member's bill, but I have to say that it is a hell of a lot more than the consultation and consideration that has gone into the amendments that have been circulated tonight by the government through the Attorney-General, of which there has been none at all. This issue is very important. It is far too important to just rush amendments through on the fly. It is disappointing that the issues canvassed by the Attorney-General in her opening comments and covered in the amendments were not put forward by government members of the committee or contained in the committee report. The whole purpose of holding these committees, having these open hearings and allowing people to make submissions is to present appropriate alternatives and suggestions for improvement or questions in relation to the operation of the legislation, but that has not been done in this case. As I said, despite the opportunity for that to occur, we have not heard anything from the department.

For example, I heard the member for Capalaba reference a domestic violence incident, in particular arson, which took place in his neighbour's place. I was sorry to hear about that, but the government's amendments actually remove the offence of arson, section 461 of the Criminal Code, from the list of offences that would be covered as a relevant domestic violence offence. We have a member talking about it, and then we have an amendment that removes the offence of arson as a relevant domestic violence offence.

In relation to GPS trackers, Labor's amendments also stray outside the recommendations of the *Not now, not ever* report and recommendation 123 which goes against the government's strong concern and caution contained in the committee report about any measures put forward that were outside the road map put forward by *Not now, not ever*. We heard from other government members who felt they

were not given enough time to consider all of these issues. Let us not forget the 18 minutes that this parliament was provided with to consider changes proposed by this Attorney-General to the entire way the state votes after 20 years. We had 18 minutes notice, and this government complain that they have not had enough time with a full committee process and a full reporting back process to consider the changes and the legislation that we put forward.

This law and the bill were flagged for weeks before it was actually introduced into the House. It was no secret. On top of that, the committee has had several weeks to consider the bill after its introduction, as I mentioned. Let us not forget the Premier allegedly moved the sitting week back to this week and used the justification that it would allow for this bill to be debated more quickly than it otherwise would have ben. On the one hand, they complain about the lack of consultation; on the other hand, they wanted to move the parliamentary sitting week and used the justification that the bill could be debated more quickly. There is no consistency in this government's arguments.

Many of the measures that are considered in this legislation are already in use elsewhere. They form part of the laws in states like New South Wales and Victoria where there is already effective evidence of their use. We have had months of consultation on *Not now, not ever* and that led to recommendations being adopted as part of this bill. There are other objectives that we have put forward in this legislation—the five key objectives that I mentioned—that have been around for years. As I said in my second reading speech, not one departmental representative gave evidence to the committee about why our proposals are ineffective and why government amendments are needed. One would have thought that if the government were so concerned about the changes that we made they would have sent someone from the department along to give evidence to the committee so that the committee could report back to this House before we had the debate on the bill suggesting the changes.

Mr Walker: They have a regiment of officers.

Mr NICHOLLS: I take that interjection from the member for Mansfield. They have a regiment of officers to be able to do this job. It is a bit rich now to claim that advice from the relevant government department says that our laws will not work or should be amended at the eleventh hour—indeed, at almost the 13th hour, now that we have this debate.

The member for Bulimba talked about this not being a competition about who introduces legislation and which side of politics is better. I simply say that, if that is the view of the member for Bulimba and if that is the government's view, then they should support this legislation. Do not run away from it. Support this legislation. If that is the member for Bulimba's deeply held view, then support the legislation because we have supported theirs. We have constructively and positively supported legislation, action and recommendations and we are doing so tonight again. I simply say that bipartisanship is not a one-way street, except it would seem with the ALP—

Mr Bleijie: When it suits.

Mr NICHOLLS: Only when it suits. We have had a look over the amendments that have been circulated by the Attorney-General in the short time—

Ms Fentiman interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Member for Waterford, your objections are not being taken. I ask you to resist interjecting.

Mr NICHOLLS: We have had a look over the amendments that have been circulated by the Attorney-General. While we will support a number of those minor amendments, particularly in relation to the commencement of the GPS tracking to allow the practical application—this is a sensible suggestion which we are happy to take up—and in respect of the monitoring role to be taken by the chief executive of the department for the time being responsible for the administration of the legislation as well as the police, we do not agree without due consideration that we should water down the strong measures that are in this legislation to better protect domestic violence victims. We cannot support these changes which are rushed, which have not been subject to discussion and which have not been subject to committee scrutiny. We cannot support changes in these circumstances, given that this legislation has been subject to scrutiny by a parliamentary committee with submissions from 32 other people and key stakeholders and public hearings and after it has been widely canvassed in public debate.

As a husband, as a father of a young daughter, as a Queenslander, I was absolutely shocked and sickened by what happened to Teresa Bradford. We do not need another review to tell us the system has failed yet another victim. We do not need to read another report of a family being torn apart and a life being lost because we failed to act in this place when we had the opportunity. Tonight is that

opportunity. Queenslanders deserve a strong response, strong bail laws, and that is what they will get with this legislation if it is supported tonight. As I have said before, we are proposing common-sense reforms that will rebalance the scales of justice in favour of community safety. Who can argue against that? We are proposing a simple rebalancing of the scales of justice, not tied up in legalese or arcane arguments but simply acting to tip the balance in favour of community safety.

I remind the House again that last year 18 Queensland women died due to domestic violence. With more than 22,000 domestic violence protection orders now flowing through the courts each year, we cannot afford not to have stronger laws to protect our victims. It is time for this parliament to act. It is time to do more and make a difference to these terrible statistics which despite everyone's best efforts seem to be getting worse, not better. I simply urge all members to consider this legislation, consider why it is that they come into this place, what it is they hope to achieve and perhaps when they leave this place what it is they will reflect on that has made the most difference to the lives of people here in Queensland, and to support this legislation here tonight.

Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (12.50 am), in reply: I would like to thank all of the honourable members for their contribution to today's debate on both the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 and the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill 2017. In response to the matters raised by the honourable members during the course of this debate, I am disappointed in some of what I consider cheap, ugly and disingenuous ways in which some of the comments have been made.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order! Member for Kawana, your interjections are not being taken. I ask you to please desist.

Mrs D'ATH: The Leader of the Opposition chose to spend half of his speech earlier this evening throwing mud at the Labor Party and criticising the time taken to implement the recommendations of the *Not now, not ever* report. This is a report for which we thought we had bipartisan support. These are substantive changes that this state has not seen before. These things take time to roll out. We have implemented an incredible number already; a third of them are already implemented and completed and many more are underway. Instead of throwing rocks at each other we should be working together on these issues. I promised at the start of this debate that I would call out where things are wrong and poor behaviour. I apologise, but I have to call out the Leader of the Opposition for what he has said tonight.

Mr Nicholls: Oh, rubbish! You are pathetic.

Mrs D'ATH: The Leader of the Opposition can say whatever he wants, criticise whomever he wants, but as the Attorney-General I cannot speak to this bill without those opposite criticising—

Mr Nicholls: Say it to the people up there.

Mrs D'ATH: I am speaking to those up there. We have a right to have a discussion in this chamber to ensure the best laws. Our job is to ensure that we provide the best laws for this state to tackle domestic and family violence. Is that not why we are here? I need to call it out when the Leader of the Opposition says he has always taken a bipartisan approach on domestic and family violence and it is us who are playing politics here. Does the Leader of the Opposition recall the domestic and family violence bill that Annastacia Palaszczuk as the member for Inala brought forward when in opposition in 2014? Do those members who were here in 2014 remember that bill? We brought it in as a very small opposition. We knew our numbers were not good in here, but we brought forward a domestic violence bill. We sought to increase sentencing, to create aggravating factors, to do what we are doing here in the victims of crime bill today in relation to ensuring that victims of crime assistance extends beyond physical violence to cases of non-physical domestic and family violence. We sought to do this and I want members opposite to reflect on the criticism that has been levelled against committee members today. In 2014 the government members rejected that domestic violence bill outright.

Ms Bates interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Mudgeeraba, if you persist with your interjections you will be warned and I will take the appropriate action. It is getting late. We want to hear the Attorney-General close and then we will get to a vote and the clauses.

Mrs D'ATH: I just want some honesty in this debate, Mr Speaker. In 2014 in opposition Labor brought forward a domestic and family violence bill which was opposed outright by every government member of the LNP.

Mr Rickuss interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Lockyer, you are warned under standing order 253A. If you persist, I will take the appropriate action.

Mrs D'ATH: Members opposite did not come in here and say, 'We're going to move our amendments because we think the bill can be done better.' They did not try to do that. They simply opposed the bill outright. What was the explanation given? 'We have a task force. Let's wait.' That was the explanation by the committee members. The Leader of the Opposition said tonight, 'We don't want to fail to act,' but in 2014 they were happy to make us wait, to make Queenslanders wait to see that legislation implemented. It took us coming back into government for those amendments that we sought to reflect in 2014 to finally become law.

Again, it was the opposition who last year actually opposed the retrospectivity of notations on criminal history files. Do honourable members know that to date there are thousands of notations for domestic violence offences on criminal files of people? These are people who right now come before the courts. In weighing up whether they are an unacceptable risk, the courts now know whether the offences that this person committed—they may have previously been convicted of assault or property damage or a motor vehicle offence—are domestic violence related. The opposition actually opposed the retrospectivity provisions which meant that history would not have been recognised on criminal records now. It was also the opposition who opposed domestic violence leave in the workplace. We did not take the cheap road on every one of those occasions and carry on the way the opposition has today.

Mr Hart interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Burleigh, you are warned under standing order 253A. This is the Attorney-General's response to comments that have been made during the debate. You are warned. If you persist, I will take the appropriate action.

Mrs D'ATH: I just want to make sure that we are all being genuine when we have this debate. None of us should be attacking each other on this issue. Sure, we all feel passionate about that issue and we will have a robust debate. That does not mean that it should be a mudslinging exercise. However, those opposite cannot come in here and say that the LNP are the only ones who have ever done anything when it comes to domestic violence and a bipartisan approach has always been taken when history shows that that is just not true. We are here today not opposing their bill outright, unlike what they did to us in 2014. We are not opposing their bill outright. We are here genuinely trying to make a difference.

We have had three weeks. The Leader of the Opposition said, 'You've had the full parliamentary committee time and reporting period.' It was three weeks; the normal is a minimum of six weeks. That is fine, but do not criticise us because over those three weeks we have gone out and consulted with stakeholders, we have worked through the bill, we have sought advice and we have come up with amendments. I hear the criticism that the amendments were not provided till 6.30. However, I rang the shadow Attorney-General earlier today and outlined that out of the four key areas we would like to move amendments on three because we believe that there are more workable arrangements and one we oppose outright. Then we sat down and we briefed the opposition. It does not normally happen in government that the opposition gets taken through the government's amendments before they are even introduced. However, I did that because this is not about who might get the votes or not tonight; this is about saying, 'Here's what we're proposing. Have a think about it. Ask us questions. Let us know if we can find a bipartisan approach here.' We circulated those amendments at the earliest possible chance. We gave it to the LNP, every crossbencher and external stakeholders. We are saying, 'Here it is. This is what we're proposing.'

It is not right to say that we have not reached out and the LNP had. The fact is that the courtesy I gave today was not given in relation to this bill. The LNP went out and conducted press conferences. They walked in here, introduced a bill but did not show us that bill before they introduced it. They did not offer a briefing like I did today. They did not take us through what they were proposing at all and did not give us any notice. They talk about a few hours notice; we did not even have one minute's notice. We saw it when it was introduced and circulated.

Regarding the last point about genuine comments and reaching out, the morning the bill was introduced I knew that the LNP were not going to show it to us but I reached out anyway. I phoned the shadow Attorney-General and said, 'Can we at least try to have a bipartisan approach on the timing and process for this bill, because we believe bipartisanship is important? Can we try to do that?' The shadow Attorney-General said, 'Thank you for that. I will go and talk to Tim Nicholls and give you a call back.' The next I heard was when we walked into this chamber, Tim Nicholls got up and said, 'The

government has done nothing to reach out to us.' The shadow Attorney-General did not even call me back before they walked in and introduced that bill. I have tried to talk to them about this. I have reached out in relation to these amendments. I really do appreciate that the Leader of the Opposition has said tonight that there are some amendments they will support. I thank him for that, because that shows that he is willing to reach out to us in some way to try to get the best laws possible.

The Leader of the Opposition referred to our amendments and the reverse onus. I do not think a lot of speakers on the other side had seen the amendments, because they were talking as if we were opposing the reverse onus. That just is not true. If members look at our amendments they will see that we are not opposing the reverse onus. We have reframed that reverse onus to apply where we believe the precursors for domestic violence and serious domestic violence offences are in the Criminal Code. Every single offence the Leader of the Opposition referred to in his reply speech is covered by the government amendment plus more. We were criticised and told that we have removed arson. That is not true because arson attracts life imprisonment, and we are covering every serious offence that carries a maximum penalty of seven or more years imprisonment that is in a domestic violence setting. It is just not correct to say that our amendment does not cover that.

I ask opposition members to consider the amendments. We owe that to the victims and their families and we owe it to Queenslanders. We should consider what is before all of us tonight on both sides. Let us try to get the best possible laws going forward. That is our job tonight. That is why we are all elected. That is our responsibility. Please let us make sure that the way we handle the rest of this debate tonight is civil, respectful and we do it in the best interests of Queenslanders.

Question put—That the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Question put—That the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail (Cognate Debate)

Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill

Clauses 1 to 92, as read, agreed to.

Clause 93—

Mrs D'ATH (1.05 am): I move the following amendment—

1 Clause 93 (Insertion of new sch 1AA)

Page 104, after line 14—

insert—

Example of a relevant court process—

an application for bail made by the accused

I table the explanatory notes to my amendment.

Tabled paper: Victims of Crime and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, explanatory notes to Hon. Yvette D'Ath's amendments [488].

Amendment No. 1 amends clause 93 of the bill which inserts a new schedule 1AA setting out the charter of victims' rights which, as far as practicable and appropriate, is to govern the conduct of prescribed persons in dealing with victims. The amendment inserts a legislative example under division 2, 'Rights relating to criminal justice system', item 3(c), to make it clear that an example of a relevant court process about which a victim will be informed of the details includes an application for bail made by the accused. This is to clarify an amendment made in response to clause 5 of the private member's bill.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 93, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 94 to 101, as read, agreed to.

Schedule 1—

Mrs D'ATH (1.06 am): I move the following amendment—

2 Schedule 1 (Legislation amended)

Page 121, after line 14—

insert—

1AA Section 320(5)—

insert—

history of violence includes a history of domestic violence within the meaning of the *Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012*.

Amendment No. 2 amends schedule 1 of the bill which sets out the other legislation amended by the bill. The amendment inserts the definition of 'history of violence' under subsection (5) of existing section 320, 'Eligible persons register', of the Corrective Services Act 2006. This is a clarifying amendment to put beyond doubt that the term includes domestic violence. This amendment implements recommendation 82 of the Queensland Parole System Review report delivered by Walter Sofronoff QC on 30 November 2016 and is made in response to clauses 11 to 13 of the private member's bill.

Amendment agreed to.

Schedule 1, as amended, agreed to.

Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill

Mr SPEAKER: I note that the Attorney-General's amendment 1 to clause 1 and amendment 2 relate to proposed amendments to other clauses; therefore, consideration of clause 1 and amendments 1 and 2 are postponed until all other clauses and amendments have been considered.

Clause 1 postponed.

Clause 2, as read, agreed to.

Clause 3—

Mr SPEAKER: I note that the Attorney-General's amendment 3 proposes to omit clause 3; therefore, the Attorney-General should oppose the clause.

Mrs D'ATH (1.08 am): I will speak to amendment 3, which omits clause 3. The reason we are seeking to omit clause 3 is that none of the new definitions proposed to be added to existing section 6, 'Definitions', of the Bail Act are necessary under the government amendments to be moved. In particular the government amendments rely upon existing definitions already uniformly applied across Queensland's domestic violence related and criminal law legislation terminology such as 'domestic violence offence', 'domestic violence' and 'associated domestic violence'. We believe it is extremely important not to create a new definition for domestic violence that is not consistent across the legislation that already exists in this parliament, and it is important to ensure that we have that certainty.

Mr WALKER: We would oppose that amendment and therefore support a vote in favour of this provision. It is a set of definitions which are central to the scheme of the bill as we have proposed it, and therefore we could not accept these provisions being removed from the bill.

Division: Question put—That clause 3, as read, stand part of the bill.

Mr SPEAKER: With the agreement of the House, I propose that for all future divisions the bells will ring for one minute.

AYES, 40:

LNP, 39—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Elmes, Emerson, Hart, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

PHON, 1—Dickson.

NOES, 44:

ALP, 40—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

Pairs: O'Rourke, Smith; Kelly, Frecklington.

Resolved in the negative.

Clause 3, as read, negatived.

Clause 4—

Mrs D'ATH (1.15 am): I move the following amendments—

4 Clause 4 (Amendment of s 11 (Conditions of release on bail))

Page 5, lines 11 to 34—

omit, insert—

(9B) Without limiting a court's power to impose a condition on bail under another provision of this section, a court may impose on the bail a condition that the defendant wear a tracking device while the defendant is released on bail.

(9C) If bail for a person is subject to a condition mentioned in subsection (9B), the court may impose any other condition the court considers necessary to facilitate the operation of the tracking device.

Examples of conditions a court may consider necessary to facilitate the operation of a tracking device required to be worn by a defendant—

- a condition that requires the defendant to attend at a stated place to be fitted with the tracking device
- a condition that requires the defendant to take stated and other reasonable steps to ensure the tracking device and any equipment necessary for the operation of the tracking device are, or remain, in good working order
- a condition that requires the defendant to permit a police officer to enter stated premises to install equipment necessary for the operation of the tracking device
- a condition that requires the defendant to permit a police officer to take stated and other reasonable steps to ensure the tracking device and any equipment necessary for the operation of the tracking device are, or remain, in good working order
- a condition that requires the defendant to comply with a direction given by a police officer that is reasonably necessary for the operation of the tracking device

5 Clause 4 (Amendment of s 11 (Conditions of release on bail))

Page 6, line 6, after 'service'—

insert—

, or the chief executive of the department in which the *Corrective Services Act 2006* is administered,

I table the explanatory notes to my amendments.

Tabled paper: Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill, explanatory notes to Hon. Yvette D'Ath's amendments [489].

Amendments 4 and 5 can be read together. Clause 4 seeks to amend existing section 11, 'Conditions of release on bail', of the Bail Act to provide additional special conditions of bail including express provisions of GPS monitoring. Amendment 4 omits the content of subclause (1) and inserts newly drafted subsections that better provide a legal framework for GPS monitoring as a condition of bail made by the court. The provisions are not specifically anchored to alleged domestic violence perpetrators, as under the private member's bill, but instead are capable of application to any defendant under the Bail Act. This will avoid having to come back and make further changes in legislation to expand it beyond domestic violence into the future.

I refer to proposed subsection (4B) inserted under the private member's bill, which requires a bail authority, when considering bail for a relevant domestic violence offence, to consider a special condition that restricts the defendant from attending nominated places associated with the complainant, for example their usual residence or workplace. On its face the proposal has merits; however, it was raised during consultation that an unintended consequence of the proposal is that the imposition of or even discussion about this type of condition could in fact provide the defendant with information that would assist them in locating a victim who may otherwise not wish to be found. For this reason, proposed subsection (4B) is omitted under government amendment 4. However, I note that this will not limit the existing ability of the bail authority to already impose such a condition at their discretion when appropriate in all the circumstances.

Amendment 5 retains subclause (2) of clause 4, which inserts a definition for 'tracking device' under existing section 11(10) of the Bail Act, but inserts a reference to the chief executive of the department that administers the Corrective Services Act 2006. This is to ensure its scope includes the potential for monitoring to be done by police or corrective services officers, ensuring flexibility when developing the operational framework for GPS monitoring as a condition of bail.

Mr WALKER: The opposition will oppose amendment 4 moved by the Attorney-General. The debate of this bill has been in the context of domestic violence matters. Questioning from the committee when we appeared there was about the scope and cost of that, yet it is ironic that the government has now put forward a proposal that increases that scope even further. That should be a matter for separate

debate. We would want to oppose the amendment and retain the existing limitation of GPS trackers, at this point, to domestic violence matters. That is what the debate has been about and there has been no further discussion or consultation about the widening that the Attorney-General proposes. The opposition will not oppose amendment 5. That is a reasonable and sensible amendment and we would accept that amendment.

Mr NICHOLLS: Clause 4 of the private member's bill inserting new subsection (4B) in section 11 requires that a person authorised by the act to grant bail must consider the imposition of a special condition in relation to approaching within a stated distance of a stated place. They must consider making an order so that someone charged does not approach someone's home, their place of work or some other place they are known to frequent. That does not mean that the court must disclose the location or the address of where that person may or may not be. It is fanciful to suggest that that is an unintended consequence of it.

That consideration can be made in the way that courts have done so for generations not to disclose confidential information if it can cause harm to one party or the other. It does not require the disclosure of an address. It does not require the disclosure of anything more than a consideration by the authority considering the bail application of whether such an order should be made. The explanation of an unintended consequence is a complete furphy in those circumstances.

In relation to the other change that is being sought, the change being sought by the government to the imposition of a tracking device simply says 'a court may impose' whereas the proposal in the private member's bill actually charges the bail authority with a positive obligation to consider the application of a tracking device. It says—

... a person who is charged with a relevant domestic violence offence must also consider the imposition of a special condition ... that requires the person to wear a tracking device ...

It places a positive obligation on the determining authority to actively consider that rather than just leaving it up to the whim of the court in those circumstances. It is quite a significant difference in the way that the magistrate or the police or a person authorised with charging the bail is actually to determine and consider the application of it. For those reasons, those sections that we have put forward in clause 4 of our bill to amend section 11 by inserting those new clauses are essential to the effective operation of the legislation in place. We are happy, as the shadow Attorney-General has said, to accept the amendment in relation to the appointment of the chief executive officer of the department to be a monitoring authority for the purpose of it, but the other two clauses that the Attorney seeks to delete and replace are essential to the operation of the legislation and are essential to the consideration by the court of the obligation to impose distance restrictions or restrictions about approaching the property and also the imposition of the tracker.

Division: Question put—That amendment No. 4 be agreed to.

AYES, 44:

ALP, 40—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 40:

LNP, 39—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Elmes, Emerson, Hart, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

PHON, 1—Dickson.

Pairs: O'Rourke, Smith; Kelly, Frecklington.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment No. 5 agreed to.

Clause 4, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 5—

Mr SPEAKER: I note that the Attorney-General's amendment No. 6 proposes to omit clause 5. Therefore, the Attorney-General should oppose the clause.

Mrs D'ATH (1.25 am): Amendment No. 6 omits clause 5 in its entirety. The notification to victims about relevant bail information is already provided for under Queensland's laws and is expanded upon under the government's Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016, in particular under charter of victims' rights.

Mr WALKER: We oppose this amendment and support the clause as it stands. We do not accept the Attorney-General's assertion that the existing law, even as amended by the bill that we just passed, is sufficient to match the requirements that are quite clearly in this bill about provision of notification to domestic violence victims. This is a key part of the bill. Failure to inform is one of the reasons that some of the folk sitting in the gallery are there tonight. We think this is an essential, crucial part of the bill and we could not in any way condone its being removed from the bill.

Mr NICHOLLS: I again rise to support the shadow Attorney-General. This is a gutting of this bill by this government. This is the removal of a critical section that is a key component of the five objectives of the act, and here they are: the right of the complainant to receive notice of application for bail. Who could sensibly oppose that? Why would you oppose that? What about the right of a person at risk of domestic violence to receive particular information about a release? Who could sensibly oppose that? This is a very straightforward part of the legislation that imposes an obligation on the Crown to give notice of the application to the complainant—that is, the prosecutor has to tell the complainant that there is something going on in terms of a bail application or if someone is applying for parole. How can anyone seek to oppose that part of the legislation specifically designed to give comfort to people in these circumstances, specifically requested by people who have witnessed their loved ones in those tragic circumstances, specifically witnessed by the people up in the gallery tonight who are watching this debate who simply said, 'Had we known'—Teresa Bradford's mother—'we would've taken action'? Had she known, Teresa Bradford would have secured her premises more, and here is the piece of legislation that answers that simple cry. Those opposite should hang their heads in shame.

Mrs D'ATH: That is misleading—not just of parliament but to those in the gallery. To say how can the government oppose this—

Mr SPEAKER: Attorney-General, unfortunately, I am advised that you do not get a second opportunity to respond.

Division: Question put—That clause 5, as read, stand part of the bill.

AYES, 40:

LNP, 39—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Elmes, Emerson, Hart, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

PHON, 1—Dickson.

NOES, 44:

ALP, 40—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

Pairs: O'Rourke, Smith; Kelly, Frecklington.

Resolved in the negative.

Clause 5, as read, negatived.

Clause 6—

Mrs D'ATH (1.33 am): I move the following amendment—

7 Clause 6 (Amendment of s 16 (Refusal of bail))

Page 8, lines 15 to 17—

omit, insert—

(1) Section 16(2)—

insert—

(f) if the defendant is charged with a domestic violence offence or an offence against the *Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012*, section 177(2)—the risk of further domestic violence or associated domestic violence, under the *Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012*, being committed by the defendant.

Note—

See section 15(1)(e) for the power of a court to receive and take into account evidence relating to the risk of further domestic violence or associated domestic violence.

(2) Section 16—

insert—

(2A) However, in assessing whether there is an unacceptable risk with respect to any event specified in subsection (1)(a) a court must not have regard to the effect on the risk of imposing a condition under section 11(9B).

(3) Section 16(3)—

insert—

(g) with a relevant offence;

(4) Section 16—

insert—

(7) In this section—

domestic violence offence see the Criminal Code, section 1.

relevant offence means—

(a) an offence against the Criminal Code, section 315A; or

(b) an offence punishable by a maximum penalty of at least 7 years imprisonment if the offence is also a domestic violence offence; or

(c) an offence against the Criminal Code, section 75, 328A, 355, 359E or 468 if the offence is also a domestic violence offence; or

(d) an offence against the *Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012*, section 177(2) if—

(i) the offence involved the use, threatened use or attempted use of unlawful violence to person or property; or

(ii) the defendant, within 5 years before the commission of the offence, was convicted of another offence involving the use, threatened use or attempted use of unlawful violence to person or property; or

(iii) the defendant, within 2 years before the commission of the offence, was convicted of another offence against the *Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012*, section 177(2).

This clause is a major portion of the private member's bill. The government's amendment in effect replaces clause 6, which amends existing section 16, which relates to the refusal of bail, to expand upon the show-cause provisions. In regard to domestic violence perpetrators, this amendment does two key things. Firstly, it reverses the presumption in favour of bail for a targeted but wide cohort of domestic violence perpetrators, thereby putting the defendant in a show-cause position as to why their continued detention is unjustified. Secondly, the amendment puts an assessment as to the risk of further domestic violence or associated domestic violence by the defendant at the forefront when assessing whether they present an unacceptable risk if released on bail.

In summary, this amendment provides that the defendant is in a show-cause position when the defendant is charged with the new Criminal Code offence of strangulation in a domestic context, which is section 315A, or the defendant is charged with an offence punishable by a maximum penalty of seven or more years imprisonment that is also a domestic violence offence—and I note that a domestic violence offence is already defined under section 1 of the Criminal Code—or the defendant is charged with one of the prescribed list of offences punishable by less than seven years imprisonment but it is offending of a type often associated with domestic violence behaviour. Again, the offence must also be a domestic violence offence. The list of Criminal Code offences punishable by less than seven years imprisonment are section 75, 'Threatening violence'; section 328A, 'Dangerous operation of a vehicle', which is currently not covered by the private member's bill; section 359E, 'Punishment of unlawful stalking'; section 355, 'Deprivation of liberty'; and section 468, 'Injuring animals', because we know that that is a precursor to further domestic violence.

This amendment also provides that the defendant is in a show-cause position when the defendant is charged with an offence of contravening a domestic violence order and one of the following scenarios applies: where the contravention itself involved the use, threatened use or attempted use of violence to a person's property, irrespective of whether the contravention on this occasion involved violence or not—

Ms Jones interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister for Education, you are warned under standing order 253A for your interjection. I am trying to hear, and I know other members of the crossbench are trying to hear, the Attorney-General. I note that members of the opposition are speaking as well. If you want to talk, go outside.

Mrs D'ATH: Thank you, Mr Speaker—irrespective of whether the contravention on this occasion involved violence and the defendant has previously been convicted of an offence of violence whether against the victim or another within the last five years; irrespective as to whether the contravention on this occasion involved violence and the defendant has previously been convicted of any offence of contravention of a domestic violence order, whether the same order or a different order; and irrespective of whether the order related to the same victim within the last two years.

The amendment also expressly provides that, in considering an application for bail regarding any domestic violence offence or any example of the offence of contravening a domestic violence order, the court or police officer must consider the risk of further domestic violence or associated domestic violence being committed by the defendant in their assessment of whether the defendant represents an unacceptable risk if released to bail. Again, the reliance is placed upon existing definitions under the criminal law and domestic violence related legislation.

The changes to section 16 of the Bail Act under this amendment better deliver on the underlying policy objective of the private member's bill. These amendments are designed to improve community safety for victims of domestic violence and hold perpetrators to account. The amendment also better aligns Queensland with the majority of other jurisdictions that have already reversed the presumption in favour of bail for prescribed domestic violence perpetrators.

In addition to the amendments related to domestic violence perpetrators, this amendment will ensure that the availability of electronic monitoring as a condition of bail cannot—cannot—influence the decision of the court to release a person on bail in circumstances where they would otherwise have been remanded in custody. That means that the option to impose a condition requiring a person to wear a tracking device will not shift a defendant from an unacceptable risk category to a manageable acceptable risk category, resulting in their release on bail. This potential consequence is not contemplated by the private member's bill. I want to reinforce that this means that a court cannot say that, instead of—

Mr Perrett interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Gympie, do you want to go outside? It is getting late. I am trying to hear what the Attorney-General has to say. You may know what you are going to do. I know that other crossbench members are interested.

Mrs D'ATH: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: That applies to other members who are interested.

Mrs D'ATH: This means that when a magistrate or judge is considering whether to grant bail they do not choose to release the defendant on bail with a tracking device as an alternative to remand. The court must consider whether this person is an unacceptable risk first. If the court finds that that person is an unacceptable risk, they cannot use the GPS tracker as an alternative to remand. It is only when they find that that person is not an unacceptable risk that the GPS tracking can be an option as part of bail conditions. That is a very important element that is not currently covered by the private member's bill.

Mr WALKER: The opposition will oppose this amendment. The Attorney-General used an interesting phrase: that the redefined set of offences to which she wants this reverse onus to apply is a targeted but widened group of offences. I think that, together with some of the other things the Attorney-General has said, goes to the very point of what the problem is with this amendment—that is, I do not think anybody understands it.

We have had a very simple definition of domestic violence offence and that has gone through the committee system and been consulted on. The Attorney-General now brings in, at a very late hour, a complex series of changes to the offences to which this will apply which have not been tested against any form of consultation whatsoever and again goes to the very heart of our bill, the reverse onus of proof being a key part of the legislation which we have brought to this chamber. Here we have, on the fly, at the last minute, a significant change which has not been tested in any forum whatsoever and yet we are being asked to vote on it at nearly two o'clock in the morning. We will oppose this amendment.

The other matters raised by the Attorney-General—the questions of likelihood for the offence to occur again in respect of a tracking device and so on—I believe are adequately covered by the existing discretions and provisions that a magistrate has to look at when bail is being granted. The point primarily is that these significant changes have only just been tabled today and have not had any form of consultation whatsoever yet go to the very heart of the bill.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Chatsworth, you are warned under standing order 253A. If you persist I will take the appropriate action.

Mr NICHOLLS: What we have here in the private member's bill is a clear definition of when the presumption for bail is reversed because it simply says, 'insert the clause that reads "with a relevant domestic violence offence"'. We have a well-established body of law with respect to this. It is not a new concept here in Queensland. In fact, the reversal of the presumption of bail is known in a number of instances—murder to name one—and a number of other instances that are set out in the Bail Act.

What we have here with the Attorney-General's amendment is a whole new set of circumstances being devised that are being put into this legislation. We heard the Attorney-General say there is a show-cause position as to why bail should not be granted, whereas in our legislation the presumption is that you do not get bail, full stop, and then you have to start from scratch and build the case as to why you ought to. Again, it is a very different concept to what the Attorney-General is talking about.

What we are seeing is a weakening of the presumption that the person who is charged will not be granted bail unless they can satisfy the magistrate or the other relevant authority that they ought to be given it. Here again we see change for change sake, change against established and well-understood principles, because there are already existing principles set out under the Bail Act, with no or little justification at the last minute.

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

AYES, 44:

ALP, 40—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 40:

LNP, 39—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Elmes, Emerson, Hart, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

PHON, 1—Dickson.

Pairs: O'Rourke, Smith; Kelly, Frecklington.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 6, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 7—

Mr SPEAKER: I note that the Attorney-General's amendment No. 8 proposes to omit clause 7. Therefore, the Attorney-General should oppose the clause.

Mrs D'ATH (1.48 am): Amendment 8 omits clause 7. The need to amend the Bail Act to provide for the stay of a defendant's release to bail pending a higher court review of the decision to grant bail is not supported by the government. From a policy perspective, the proposal is a serious limitation on individual liberty. Also, it is not considered appropriate to extend the stay proposal to children as it is fundamentally inconsistent with the principle of youth justice that a child should be detained only as a last resort and for the least time justified in the circumstances.

The provisions as drafted also render them unlikely to achieve the intended policy objective in any event. For example, clause 7 as drafted does not provide for an immediate trigger for the automatic stay of release of the defendant but rather requires an application for a review to be made under existing Bail Act provisions. This involves civil application processes and is not immediate. The practical reality is that the defendant would be released into the community awaiting the application for a review to be made. Thereafter, the court may issue a warrant to return the defendant to custody for the prescribed period under the stay proposal.

We also believe with the changes that are being made with the notations with the reverse onus, and the ability already under the act for the court to adjourn the matter to consider or get further information to make an informed decision, that those provisions are more adequately considered and

appropriate in the circumstances. This is a provision that has been picked up from New South Wales. It is not specific to domestic violence in New South Wales. In fact, New South Wales used this provision once in the last calendar year. It is, I believe, giving false hope that somehow this is a mechanism which automatically, when bail is granted, we are going to see people stayed for three days at a time being held in watch houses while the Supreme Court deals with all these applications. If that is not the intent and it is to be used very infrequently then I question the merit of putting it in here when we have all of these other provisions that already exist in the act that achieve the policy objective more appropriately.

Mr WALKER: The opposition will argue for the retention of this provision. It is an essential part of the bill. The Attorney-General's proposal that it not go forward represents yet another weakening of this bill which, as it goes through, is getting weaker and weaker. It is not a surprise to those on this side of the chamber that it is getting weaker and weaker.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. One moment, members. We need to hear what the shadow Attorney-General has to say.

Mr WALKER: This provision is not a novel one. It is taken directly from section 40 of the New South Wales Bail Act. We are not bringing in something that is crazy or new or different. It is already part of the law in another state of the Commonwealth. Yet this provision, which was part of the strength of the bill, is being taken out.

This clause is an essential part of the bill. It means that if the prosecutors are concerned that a magistrate has granted bail in an inappropriate circumstance, they can immediately apply for an appeal. That will mean that the person charged remains in custody for a period of three days, but that is necessary to assemble the appeal and go to the Supreme Court. My own expectation is that it would be used sparingly, but the very fact that it is there will keep people on their toes in respect of bail applications and will stop the sort of tragic situation we have had in the past. As the night proceeds and the government cuts and slices through this bill, it is progressively turning its back on just such a situation. We support the retention of the provision and will be voting accordingly.

Division: Question put—That clause 7, as read, stand part of the bill.

AYES, 44:

LNP, 39—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Elmes, Emerson, Hart, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Dickson.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 40:

ALP, 40—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

Pairs: O'Rourke, Smith; Kelly, Frecklington.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 7, as read, agreed to.

Clause 8—

Mr SPEAKER: I note that the Attorney-General's amendment No. 9 proposes to omit clause 8. Therefore, the Attorney-General should oppose the clause.

Mrs D'ATH (1.55 am): Amendment No. 9 was to omit clause 8 on the basis that if amendment No. 8 had been successful this would have been a consequential amendment. As amendment No. 8 was not successful, I will not be progressing with this amendment.

Clause 8, as read, agreed to.

Clause 9—

Mr SPEAKER: I note the Attorney-General's amendment No. 10 proposes to omit clause 9. Therefore, the Attorney-General should oppose the clause.

Mrs D'ATH (1.55 am): As with the previous amendment, this is a consequential amendment to the insertion of clause 7 of the bill. As amendment No. 8 has failed, I do not intend to progress amendment No. 10.

Clause 9, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Mrs D'ATH (1.56 am): I move the following amendment—

11 Before part 3

Page 10, before line 14—

insert—

9A Insertion of new s 46

After section 45—

insert—

46 Transitional provision for Bail (Domestic Violence) Amendment Act 2017

(1) Sections 11 and 16, as amended by the amending Act, apply in relation to the release of a person on bail on or after the commencement.

(2) For subsection (1), it is irrelevant whether the alleged offence in relation to which the person is released on bail happened, or the proceeding for the offence was started, before or after the commencement.

(3) In this section—

amending Act means the *Bail (Domestic Violence) Amendment Act 2017*.

Amendment No. 11 inserts new clause 9A into the private member's bill to provide the transitional arrangements for the amendments made to existing section 11, 'Conditions of release on bail', relating to GPS tracking as a condition of bail, and section 16, 'Refusal of bail', for example, relating to the reversal of the presumption in favour of bail. New section 46 of the Bail Act is inserted to put beyond doubt that the amendments apply on or after commencement, irrespective of whether the defendant is alleged to have committed the offence or was charged with the offence prior to commencement.

Mr WALKER: I will speak to amendment No. 11 and the member for Mudgeeraba will speak to the other amendments. Amendment No. 11 is not opposed by the opposition. It is a sensible transitional provision and we agree with the Attorney-General's position.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr SPEAKER: I note that the Attorney-General's amendment No. 12 relates to proposed amendments to other clauses. Therefore, consideration of amendment No. 12 is postponed until other clauses and amendments have been considered.

Clause 10—

Mr SPEAKER: I note that the Attorney-General's amendment No. 13 proposes to omit clauses 10 to 13. Therefore, the Attorney-General should oppose the clauses.

Mrs D'ATH (1.57 am): Amendment No. 13 omits clauses 10 to 13 in their entirety, which propose to extend the scope of the existing eligible persons register under the Corrective Services Act and to insert time frames about when certain information about the prisoner must be provided to the eligible person. The proposal is not supported.

On 30 November 2016, Mr Sofronoff QC delivered his report to government regarding the Queensland parole system review. His examination included consideration of the existing eligible persons register. He concluded that the victims register appears to be sufficiently broad to provide victims, their families, previous victims of violence and other persons who may be in danger with relevant information about offenders serving times of imprisonment for violent or sexual offences. The report indicates that Mr Sofronoff QC expressly considered a submission that appears to be in the same or very similar terms to that proposed under the private member's bill in this regard. Mr Sofronoff QC did not recommend the expansion of the eligible persons register to capture prisoners who are in custody for offending that is not for a sexual or violent offence.

However, recommendation 82 of the parole report was made in response to the submission. The government endorsed recommendation 82 as part of its response to the parole report. Indeed, the government amendment moved during consideration in detail this evening to the VOCA bill delivers on that commitment—namely, that the meaning of the phrase 'a history of violence' as it relates to the eligible person's register should be clarified to ensure it includes 'history of domestic violence'.

Ms BATES: I note the government's objection to section 320 of the Corrective Services Act based on advice from the department that it is too hard and moves away from the intent of the register. I say to the government that that is rubbish. Why did the department of corrective services not put in a submission and raise these concerns?

We have heard from the government about the views of stakeholders. This was a direct submission from the Women's Legal Service. Recommendation 84 of the parole review says exactly what we are proposing here in this bill. We as legislators set the laws that we want departments to work with. We on this side of the House say that victims and named persons on DVOs should be told when someone is coming up for parole or being considered and it should be law. It should not be left for policy and administrative arrangements.

Lives are at risk if we do not do this. Take the case of Shelsea Schilling. Her killer was released on parole and was living two streets from the family. Talk to her mother, Bonnie, who is here in the gallery and she will tell members that she would have done everything in her power to remove Shelsea if she had been told before his release. Are we saying to Bonnie and others like her, 'Sorry, it is all too hard, according to a few faceless bureaucrats, so we will not do it.'? I implore all members to support the changes that we have put before the House.

Alerting victims is too important to let bureaucrats dictate to us. Teresa Bradford's mother also wants everyone in this House to know these laws need to change so that other children like her grandchildren never have to grow up without a mother or have their grandmother, who has been sobbing in the gallery, tell them at some point how their mother died. She says she feels like screaming at the Labor MPs who are saying that we need to be more cautious. How many more women need to die before these changes are made?

Clause 10, as read, agreed to.

Clause 11—

Division: Question put—That clause 11, as read, stand part of the bill.

AYES, 44:

LNP, 39—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Elmes, Emerson, Hart, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Dickson.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 40:

ALP, 40—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

Pairs: Kelly, Frecklington; O'Rourke, Smith.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 11, as read, agreed to.

Clause 12, as read, agreed to.

Clause 13, as read, agreed to.

Mr SPEAKER: The House will now consider postponed amendment No. 12.

Mrs D'ATH (2.05 am): This amendment omits the heading 'Part 3 (Amendment of Corrective Services Act 2006)'. Considering the votes in relation to the previous clauses, I will not be progressing amendment No. 12.

Mr SPEAKER: The House will now consider postponed clause 1 and amendments 1 and 2.

Clause 1—

Mrs D'ATH (2.07 am): I just wanted to briefly speak to amendment No. 1. As amendments 12 and 13 have failed, I do not intend to progress amendment No. 1, but I will progress amendment No. 2.

Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Mrs D'ATH (2.07 am): I move the following amendment—

2 After clause 1

Page 4, after line 5—

insert—

1A Commencement

Sections 4 and 6(2) commence on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

This amendment goes hand in hand with amendment Nos 4 and 7 which have been upheld this evening. Amendment No. 2 inserts a new clause 1A into the private member's bill so that the provisions relating to GPS monitoring as a condition of bail will commence on a date to be fixed by proclamation. All other amendments to be moved by the government will commence on assent. A proclamation date is vital to ensure the operation of GPS monitoring is a condition of bail. Significant work must be undertaken to facilitate and ensure the successful management and administration of this type of condition. The provision of a strong legislative framework and ensuring that the proper operational framework is also in place is fundamental to the success of this bail condition and to the protection of victims and the wider community.

Mr WALKER: The opposition supports the amendment. It is a sensible amendment to make, although we do expect and trust that the delay in proclamation will not be long. I take the liberty of asking the Attorney-General whether a time of six months or thereabouts is what she would be thinking as an appropriate proclamation time.

Mrs D'ATH: As this is going to be contingent on consultation with the Queensland Police Service and Corrective Services, it would not be appropriate for me to give a time frame at this stage. It is part of the recommendations of the *Not now, not ever* report to trial the GPS tracking, so we will certainly be working towards meeting our obligations and delivering on all of those recommendations.

Amendment agreed to.

Mrs D'ATH: There is amendment No. 14 but, as amendment Nos 12 and 13 have failed I will not be moving that amendment.

Third Reading (Cognate Debate)

Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (2.11 am): I move—

That the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Question put—That the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Mr NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.11 am): I move—

That the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

In doing so, I acknowledge Dale Shales, Bonnie Mobbs and Sonia Anderson in the gallery here again tonight. Thank you for your perseverance. We have achieved something for you here tonight.

Question put—That the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title (Cognate Debate)

Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (2.11 am): I move—

That the long title of the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill be agreed to.

Question put—That the long title of the Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Mr NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.12 am): I move—

That the long title of the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill be agreed to.

Question put—That the long title of the Bail (Domestic Violence) and Another Act Amendment Bill be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (2.12 am): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Southport Electorate; Gold Coast Community Fund

Mr MOLHOEK (Southport—LNP) (2.13 am): I rise tonight to speak about the very busy week I had last week in my electorate of Southport. The rescheduling of this sitting week provided me with a bit of extra time so I was able to get out in the electorate and enjoy meeting many more of my constituents. Last week I held one of my quarterly new elector lunches at the Southport RSL. Just like other members, I have many people moving in and out of my electorate, and we had a number of new residents who were very excited to be joining us at the Southport RSL for lunch. Over lunch we discussed all sorts of topics, and it was particularly pleasing to hear a range of views around the table. I particularly want to thank Paul Burton and the team at the Southport RSL for their tremendous hospitality and the great work they do in the community. I absolutely enjoyed that occasion.

Last week it was also a great pleasure to attend the annual Gold Coast Community Fund breakfast. I note that the member for Gaven, Sid Cramp, and the member for Broadwater, Verity Barton, were also at the breakfast with me. The Gold Coast Community Fund does great work in assisting individuals and families who are experiencing financial hardship, and it also supports many local charities on the Gold Coast. It is pleasing to see that, in its almost 20th year, the fund has raised in excess of $2 million through various art unions and other fundraising activities. The relief it provides may include assistance for people who are suffering from the effects of homelessness, sickness or a disability where there is, more often than not, a very desperate financial need. I particularly commend Rutland Smith, the chairman of the fund, and Simon Bennett and many of the other board members for their efforts in making the Gold Coast a more passionate place.

I particularly honour Steve Cavalier. He has not only served the community fund since it was first founded in 2000; he is the major franchisee at Harvey Norman and has donated some $500,000 worth of appliances and goods as prizes over the years to support the activities of the community fund. I am pleased to say that I was there with Steve right back in the beginning when the fund was first formed. I was sitting in his office one day and he raised the prospect of doing something for the community. It has been a great journey to be on with him over these many, many years.

Sunnybank Special School; AEIOU Parent Conference

Mr RUSSO (Sunnybank—ALP) (2.16 am): I rise in the House this morning to reflect on two matters that have occurred that concern the parents and students in my electorate of Sunnybank. The first is the announcement yesterday by the Minister for Education, the Hon. Kate Jones, for funding to three schools in my electorate. I intend to mention at least one of those schools, the Sunnybank Special School. That school will have $5 million invested to redevelop classrooms to ease the demands it faces from the extra students who want to enrol in that great school. I know that the principal, Darren Greenway, will be a very happy man indeed.

The AEIOU parent conference was held at Griffith University on 4 March. Members may be asking themselves what the announcement of funding for the Sunnybank Special School has to do with the AEIOU conference, and I will explain. Parents all have the same hope for their children. The hope is that our children have the opportunity to reach their full potential. The funds that the Palaszczuk Labor government committed to the Sunnybank Special School are a commitment to the parents in my electorate that we as a government are committed to their dreams and hopes and that we as a government want children to be able to reach their full potential.

At the AEIOU conference on 4 March it was clear that parents of children with disabilities often face many challenges in finding services to help their children achieve their full potential. The Palaszczuk Labor government is committed to ensuring that children with disabilities have appropriate

services. This financial year the Palaszczuk Labor government is providing more than $5.8 million to Autism Queensland and AEIOU for early intervention services for children. The intention is to roll out this service across our great state. In conclusion, the commitments of the Labor Palaszczuk government to the children of the Sunnybank electorate are clearly shown by the financial commitments to both the Sunnybank Special School and AEIOU.

Wilsonton State High School

Mr WATTS (Toowoomba North—LNP) (2.19 am): Today I would like to pay tribute to the members of the Wilsonton State High School P&C and in particular David van Tricht. The P&C and the teachers and students of Wilsonton have been campaigning for a long time to get a school hall. I have been their strong voice in this place for a long time. One of my disappointments after we lost the election in 2015 was that I knew this school hall would not be built because at the last election Labor said it would not build it. It said it would not give the school the hall they needed to become a complete campus, so I became their strong voice and their advocate in this place. I worked very hard to make sure that the minister knew that this was a very strong Labor voting area and that if she did not build this school hall there would be no chance of Labor ever taking back the seat of Toowoomba North.

That pressure worked in spades last August, when the minister announced that she would provide the funding for the school hall. This was a great announcement. I was very pleased on that occasion to have had the success we did, with the help and assistance of the teachers, parents and P&C of Wilsonton high school. However, that was not enough because the announcement that was made in August 2016 was that the money would be available in the financial year coming up—that is, the 2017-18 financial year. I started a campaign to make sure this hall was not only started then but also finished before the beginning of the academic year in 2018 so that the school hall could in fact be used as a classroom and a teaching space and be an integral part of the campus, rather than having it opened later.

It has taken questions on notice, it has taken phone calls, it has taken a petition, it has taken lots of things to get the attention of the minister, but today the minister has yielded to the demands of the people of Wilsonton and she has brought forward the timing so that it will be completed and available for use as an academic space in 2018. This just goes to show what can be provided in opposition. This is what can be achieved if opposition members work hard and have their community behind them. We have got something delivered that even the government's own member would not commit to going into the last election. This is something that Labor was unable to fund and unable to deliver, yet it has yielded to my pressure and the pressure of the people of Wilsonton and has said that it will build the school hall and have it ready by 2018.

Queensland Women's Week

Ms PEASE (Lytton—ALP) (2.23 am): 'It's time for your voice to be heard, for risks to be taken and for your dreams to be fulfilled. It's time to acknowledge, recognise and embrace everything available. It's time to appreciate the fact that you are who you are and all you can be. It's time to dare to be wise and make a difference, whether that be big or small. Every action has a consequence whether it be good or bad. It's our time, not only to lead by example but also to learn, be challenged, to follow and to be followed.'

These are the words of 17-year-old Abbi Anderson, College Captain from Brisbane Bayside State College—an impressive young woman, leader and performer. What a wonderful way to kick off a very busy Queensland Women's Week. I was honoured to meet Abbi, the other college leaders—Noah, Tiffany and Alex—and all the leadership team at Brisbane Bayside State College's investiture ceremony.

I was delighted that Tiffany attended the Women's Week event that I co-hosted with the Waterloo Bay Leisure Centre. This event was a celebration of impressive women who have contributed significantly to the bayside. Aunty Merle opened the event with a welcome to country, and the Hon. Mark Furner, the Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, Aunty Becky and Catriona Kucks were our guest speakers. Aunty Merle and Aunty Becky are both Quandamooka women and founding members of Winnam, our local Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cooperative. Catriona is a project manager at BABI and runs, together with Grandi, the very successful Get Set for Work program.

This impressive group of women shared their stories with the over 100 baysiders. It was a wonderful opportunity to acknowledge and celebrate these women who work tirelessly creating opportunities for some of the most vulnerable in our community. I was so proud to be asked to present

Mrs Bev Weeks with life membership to acknowledge her more than 30 years of service. Everyone agreed that this was a suitable acknowledgment for Bev's work. I thank all of the volunteers at the club for their hard work.

The Eastside Community Church hosted a Be Bold for Change event, with stalls and information sessions from small businesses, in a truly collaborative and supportive environment, providing childminding and entertainment—a typical example of women working together. Sixty and Better hosted a wonderful event. It was a great opportunity to showcase the artwork of the Wynnum Manly Arts Council and the Salt Water Murri Gallery. Women from across the electorate enjoyed the local artwork and wonderful storytelling and music. I thank Coleen for organising the event.

The Royal Queensland Yacht Squadron celebrated bold bayside women. Thanks to Suzy and her fellow volunteers for that. The Women of Wynnum exhibition is a written word and photographic exhibition showcasing Wynnum women who have contributed to our community. Importantly, I would like to acknowledge strong and bold women in the bayside. May we know them, may we raise them and may we be them.

Bundaberg, Waste Minimisation and Recycling; Boomerang Bags

Mr BENNETT (Burnett—LNP) (2.26 am): Schools in the Bundaberg and Burnett region are taking part in a new education initiative that will promote to students the importance of recycling. I am proud to partner in this joint project with Bundaberg Regional Council, Impact Community Services and A2Z Waste Recycling. It encourages schools to participate in a waste minimisation and recycling competition.

The initiative encourages proactive sustainable recycling in the community, which can only be beneficial for our region and the environment. Registered school groups have been offered a tour of landfills and the material recovery facility operated by Impact Community Services and can opt to participate in a waste audit to work with one of the local waste and recycling officers to reduce waste and increase recycling and re-use within the school.

As part of the competition, schools can undertake a range of projects and submit a short summary to judges about improvements in waste reduction and recycling promotion. Schools can participate in any number of ways such as a waste audit. We want to see a system for paper and cardboard reduction and reuse initiated.

On completion of the competition, schools are being encouraged to submit a short summary covering how the waste reduction and recycling promotion was completed. The competition is coming to a close and submissions are due at the end of next week. We are really looking forward to seeing what the students have come up with and how they have made efforts in their school communities. There will be cash prizes of up to $1,000 to be divided between the winning school entries.

This initiative comes on the back of our container deposit scheme and is all about protecting our local environment to enhance its sustainability for future generations to enjoy. It is a great opportunity to get our message across to students and open their eyes about recycling innovations and the associated benefits, and it will hopefully revolutionise how the community sees and deals with waste.

It is also fitting tonight that I pay tribute to a fantastic group in my community. Boomerang Bags Bundaberg has recently launched in our community to rid the region of plastic pollution. This is thanks to Bargara local Carmen McEneany. Boomerang Bags is a community driven, nationwide movement to tackle plastic pollution at a grassroots level.

It seems the initiative is really taking off in the Bundaberg community. Dedicated schools, community groups, businesses and volunteers, including mums and dads, in the Bundaberg region have banded together to make re-usable boomerang bags, using recycled materials, as a means to replace plastic bags. One needle and thread at a time, this dedicated group of ecowarriors are slowly but surely changing our community's way of thinking and encouraging us all to a more sustainable way of living.

Boomerang Bags Bundaberg's goal is to produce 500 bags by 1 July as a start. They will then be dispersed to local shops. They are certainly on track to meet their target. The response has been incredible from local businesses, such as Learmonth's Foodworks and Nana's Pantry. Learmonth's Foodworks and Nana's Pantry have agreed to stock the recyclable bags to discourage their customers from using plastic bags.

I congratulate these local businesses for jumping on board this important initiative. Putting an end to single-use plastic bags in our local supermarkets is something we should look forward to. We want to make sure that this continues into the future.

Forest Lake, Community Safety Forum

Hon. LM ENOCH (Algester—ALP) (Minister for Innovation, Science and the Digital Economy and Minister for Small Business) (2.29 am): Looking out for your neighbour and taking care of each other remains a fundamental part of what makes my electorate of Algester such a great place to live and raise my sons and, of course, a great place to have the honour of representing here in this House. The Forest Lake community in the north-west of the Algester electorate is a very active community that is passionate about their beautiful part of the world and all the social connections and great lifestyle they have built over the decades. There are numerous social and community groups that all add to the sense of community connectedness.

Towards the end of last year some of our community members raised concerns about a perceived spike in crime in the local area, sharing information and their views via social media. In response and after some consultation I invited the federal member for Oxley, Milton Dick, and Brisbane City Council's councillor for the Forest Lake ward, Charles Strunk, along with several units from the QPS to an event to help facilitate a community safety forum.

Over 100 residents attended the event on a Monday night earlier this month. Police statistics were shared and participants had the chance to ask questions, voice concerns and contribute to strategies to help keep our community safe. I offer my sincere thanks to Inspector Joe Jaramazovic, who I discovered went to the same school as I did in Woodridge; Detective Inspector Geoff Sheldon and Sergeant Darnielle Fioriti from the Centenary patrol and crime groups; Senior Sergeant Craig Mackenzie, officer in charge from the Inala Police Station; and Senior Constable Noel Pederson, officer in charge from the Forest Lake Police Beat, who gave up their evening to share their knowledge and advice.

I also thank a number of community groups that generously offered their support on the night and that make a huge impact on our lives every day—Crime Stoppers, Neighbourhood Watch groups from around the local area, Forest Lake Crime and Community Watch, Volunteers in Policing and the Queensland Fire and Emergency Services. I also acknowledge the generosity of the Salvation Army, which kindly hosted the event.

The forum was a great demonstration of what can happen when community unites. It was a robust, respectful and action focused conversation, with nearly a dozen residents agreeing to represent the community on a community safety working group, which will meet for the first time early next month. My electorate of Algester and the community of Forest Lake is a great place to live and work and it is a place where looking out for your neighbour and taking care of each other is very much the norm.

Racing Industry, Minimum Bet Limit

Mr KRAUSE (Beaudesert—LNP) (2.32 am): The mishandling and bungling of the racing industry continues unabated under this Labor government. We have seen it on display again this week in relation to the decision by the minister to finally implement a minimum bet limit in Queensland—a minimum bet limit policy that brings us into line with New South Wales and Victoria. It is a decision they were dragged into.

We have been consistent on this. It is simply embarrassing for racing in Queensland that we had the CEO of Racing Queensland and the Minister for Racing pointing the finger at each other about who was responsible for making a decision about the minimum bet limit. Then the minister said that they were going to implement it, Racing Queensland said they were not going to implement it and two months later they have done a big U-turn and decided that they are finally going to implement it. It truly symbolises the way the government has treated racing in Queensland right from the beginning in 2015, when it sacked the entire board of RQ because of a few issues in the greyhound code. This destroyed confidence among owners, trainers and punters.

Since then the meandering along has continued. It continued under the member for Rockhampton and it is continuing under the member for Brisbane Central. The only time those opposite had a firm direction was when they were cutting prize money, especially for country racing. What about the infrastructure plan that they were going to be delivering? It is now March 2017, two years after Labor came to office, and no significant infrastructure funds have been made available for the racing sector. Now that they have backflipped on the minimum bet limit we would like to see some other changes

made too, such as restoring the on-field incentive scheme and country racing prize money. There has been money set aside by the government to help country racing clubs bring in other sources of income, but the only thing it has been used for so far is to prop up country racing prize money. Let us make it permanent. Country race clubs want to see that prize money back in country racing on a permanent basis.

We have also seen some problems in the integrity body that was set up by the government—the QRIC. Recently there have been a number of high-profile departures from QRIC. The harness steward, David Farquharson, has been dismissed. Today it has been reported in the *Gold Coast Bulletin* that another high-ranking steward, Norm Torpey, has been suspended or moved into another role as a result of an investigation and Jamie Dart, a very senior integrity officer, is under review. There is a cloud over the operations at QRIC. It is clear that it is not operating the way the government intended it to operate: as an integrity body to get things on the right path here in Queensland, in particular in the greyhound sector. It beggars belief that a steward who was overseeing greyhound racing when things went wrong was then appointed to a very senior role in QRIC. That person is still employed in that position. The meandering and mishandling continues.

Yates, Mr Tom, Retirement

Ms HOWARD (Ipswich—ALP) (2.35 am): I rise to speak in honour of Tom Yates. Tom recently announced his retirement as CEO of the Ipswich Hospital Foundation after 17 years of outstanding service to the organisation. Tom and his wife Susan and daughter Isabelle moved to South-East Queensland in August 1998—almost 20 years ago—after spending more than two decades working in international relief and development programs encompassing the globe from South East Asia, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Sudan, Egypt, the Balkans and Indonesia and East Timor. This rich life results in some great dinner party conversations and I personally have learned a lot of the challenges many people are facing globally through listening to their stories.

Tom has said that, after having lived in those communities, arriving in Ipswich was a welcome change. I think I can speak on behalf of numerous Ipswich people when I state that we have been very fortunate to have the Yates family living, working and playing in our community. Since taking on the role of CEO of the Ipswich Hospital Foundation, Tom has guided the organisation through many triumphs, changes and growth. A Catholic priest in the sixties and seventies in Berkeley, California, Tom has a unique ability to provide leadership with vision, strength and energy as well as with great humility. Under his leadership the Ipswich Hospital Foundation implemented the Ipswich Park2Park fun run, now an institution integral to the identity of the Ipswich community. Tom is also responsible for the construction of the Ipswich Hospital's renal unit—literally a life saver for many Ipswich people.

With eight board members and nine staff, the Ipswich Hospital Foundation is dedicated to supporting the community's health services and promoting healthy lifestyles to Ipswich people. We all know that rates of chronic diseases are increasing exponentially and many of them are preventable through lifestyle choices. The Ipswich Hospital Foundation has been committed to raising awareness of this because it wants to reverse the trend of increasing rates of obesity, heart disease, stroke and type 2 diabetes to name a few of the preventable chronic diseases placing an enormous burden on our health system.

The Ipswich Hospital Foundation has collected countless donations, innovations and staff development grants for the West Moreton Health and Hospital Service. All of this has happened under Tom's inspiring leadership. Under Tom's guidance, we saw the publication of *Healthy Living Ipswich* which goes to every household—around 65,000—in the Ipswich area. This publication is well received and provides practical and relevant articles and stories about health. Tom developed the health screening and goal setting program SNAP—Screening, Nutrition and Activity Program—which was extremely popular, as was his Sun Protection for Health free sunscreen programs.

Tom Yates is a role model to all men, adored by his family and extremely well liked and respected by all who know him. I thank him sincerely for his contribution and wish him well in his retirement.

Lockyer Electorate

Mr RICKUSS (Lockyer—LNP) (2.38 am): I am glad to see the Minister for Main Roads is in the chamber. The Warrego Highway needs some planning around it, in particular in the area of Hatton Vale, near Fairway Drive, Niemeyer Road, Summerholm Road and Shaws Road. It is a high-fatality area and the government needs to prioritise planning and put in place the necessary funding. The

second range crossing project at Postmans Ridge seems to be progressing rather well. After I brought a delegation to Brisbane the minister was kind enough to add $1.6 million out of the contingency fund to that project.

The second issue I would like to highlight tonight is the fact that Jim McDonald has been preselected as the LNP candidate for Lockyer. I am sure that he will be a great candidate. As Jim Madden supports him strongly I am sure he will go really well. I would also like to table a Facebook post by Jim Savage, the Bli Bli Lockyer candidate, referring to an interview he did with Channel 7.

Tabled paper: Extract, undated, from Jim Savage—Lockyer Candidate—Pauline Hanson's One Nation's Facebook page, regarding an interview on Ch. 7 [490].

The post states—

I was interviewed by Ch. 7 news today. All went well however later on they interviewed a guy on the street wearing a One Nation T-shirt who said a whole lot of very offensive things about Muslims. I totally refute this offensive tirade and this gentleman has no involvement with One Nation or my campaign. This kind of talk is not acceptable to One Nation and its supporters.

The man wearing the T-shirt was Rodney Stanley Welk who supported Pauline Hanson at the last election and handed out how-to-vote cards for her. There is no use Jim trying to wind these ratbags up and then walking away from them. They are ratbags. I know Rodney. He is a third-generation Lockyer Valley boy and I can tell members that he is a ratbag. There have been urban myths put about by Jim's illustrious leader Pauline, things such as, 'line up some Muslims and show us a good one'. At a rough count there are about 20 doctors in the Lockyer Valley who follow the Muslim religion and they would service somewhere in the vicinity of 3,000 to 5,000 people a week. At the 2016 Lockyer Valley Business Awards, the People's Choice Award went to Dr Mohammed Sultan and his practice. The Professional Health and Fitness Award went to Dr Mohammed Sultan and his Lockyer Valley family practice. These are the sorts of ridiculous generalised statements that are being put out by Pauline Hanson and the One Nation ratbags and that is why we must keep them out.

Gladstone Electorate, Aged-Care Facilities

Mr BUTCHER (Gladstone—ALP) (2.41 am): I rise tonight to speak of a living arrangement that none of us in this chamber has yet experienced, and that is leaving our family home to become a permanent resident in an aged-care facility. However, many of us have spent time visiting someone who lives in such an aged-care facility and I have recently visited two such places in the Gladstone electorate, Edenvale and New Auckland Place, which are both aged-care facilities that meet the level of care and safety that residents need. I took a cake to share with residents and was lucky enough to be at New Auckland Place last Friday during their happy hour so the coffee was swapped by many residents for a glass of wine or a beer, and I do admit that I opted to swap the coffee for an ice-cold beer with the residents.

It goes without saying that we should value all ages in our communities, from the very young to the very old. Having said that, I think that those of us who are able to visit residents in aged-care facilities should do so when we can. Many of them have outlived spouses and some have no family or visits from anyone and the visits from us are much appreciated. Obviously the level of care needed is not the same for every resident and I was able to spend quality time with many who were eager to share with me their personal stories from through the years. Many residents spoke of the fear of not being able to enter aged care close to family and friends and of the sheer relief when a bed became available in their home town.

At a time when people can no longer care for themselves, it is vitally important that sufficient aged-care placements are available within the community in which many of these people were born, educated, worked, married and raised their families. It follows that after they have paved the way for us surely it is not too much for them to hope and expect that they will be able to spend their twilight years in the same community should they wish. Both facilities are home to some of Gladstone's most well known pioneering names. One such pioneering name is Mr Reg Littlemore, grandfather to Gladstone mayor, Matt Burnett. Mr Littlemore is 104 later this year. He can still speak and hear as well as any of us.

I must also make reference to the dedication and skills of all staff at Edenvale and New Auckland Place. The respectful fun and banter between staff and residents, with no compromise to expert care and attention, was awesome to see. I left both places determining that, as one of a generation whose path was carved by those residing at those facilities, I will return and gather more of their personal stories as an educational curve for me and the Gladstone electorate.

Recently many people have raised concerns with me about retirement, aged-care and lifestyle options in my electorate. To this end I will be hosting a free information session in Gladstone on 18 April—my father's birthday—to provide updates where those attending will have the opportunity to hear directly from developers about what plans they have for aged care in the Gladstone area.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 2.44 am (Thursday).

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, Janetzki, Jones, Katter, King, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Lauga, Leahy, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Miles, Millar, Miller, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Perrett, Pitt, Powell, Power, Pyne, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Seeney, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Trad, Walker, Watts, Weir, Wellington, Whiting, Williams