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

Tuesday, 23 May 2017

Subject Page

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT **1207**
Absence of Member **1207**
SPEAKER'S RULING **1207**
Answers to Questions on Notice **1207**
Tabled paper: Bundle of correspondence in relation to certain answers to questions on notice 1207
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT **1209**
Anniversary of Legislative Assembly **1209**
PETITIONS **1209**
TABLED PAPERS **1209**
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS **1210**
Manchester, Incident **1210**
Pauline Hanson's One Nation **1211**
Mining Industry, Jobs **1211**
Sun Metals, Solar Farm **1212**
Queensland Rail **1212**
Infrastructure **1212**
Queensland Rail **1213**
Queensland Economy **1213**
Health Services **1214**
Gold Coast Commonwealth Games **1214**
Manufacturing **1215**
Skilling Queenslanders for Work **1215**
Advance Queensland **1216**
Roads **1217**
Ecotourism **1217**
Domestic and Family Violence **1218**

PW WELLINGTON
SPEAKER

NJ LAURIE
CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENT

LJ OSMOND
CHIEF HANSARD REPORTER

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 23 May 2017

ABSENCE OF MINISTER **1218**
NOTICE OF MOTION **1218**
Cedar Woods Development **1218**
PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS **1219**
Carmichael Mine **1219**
Cross River Rail **1219**
Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance **1220**
Leader of the Opposition **1220**
Carmichael Mine **1221**
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE **1222**
Carmichael Mine **1222**
Carmichael Mine **1223**
Works for Queensland **1224**
Carmichael Mine **1224**
Federal Funding **1225**
Adani, Royalties **1226**
Cross River Rail **1227**
Carmichael Mine **1227**
Unemployment **1228**
Carmichael Mine **1229**
Preventative Health Measures **1230**
Tabled paper: Document, dated 21 May 2017, displaying social media post by Mr Tim Mander MP regarding fighting obesity. 1230
Tow Truck Industry **1230**
Tabled paper: Invoices, dated 24 July 2012, issued by Accident and Breakdown Towing Pty Ltd. 1230
Education, Ministerial Council Meeting **1231**
Adani, Royalties **1231**
Building our Regions **1232**
MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST **1232**
Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance **1232**
Budget **1234**
Cross River Rail **1235**
Townsville, Business Advisory Council **1236**
Palaszczuk Labor Government, Jobs **1237**
Palaszczuk Labor Government, Achievements; Maryborough Hospital **1238**
Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month **1239**
Renewable Energy **1240**
Sugar Industry **1241**
Cross River Rail **1242**
CORRECTIVE SERVICES (NO BODY, NO PAROLE) AMENDMENT BILL **1243**
Introduction **1243**
Tabled paper: Corrective Services (No Body, No Parole) Amendment Bill 2017. 1243
Tabled paper: Corrective Services (No Body, No Parole) Amendment Bill 2017, explanatory notes. 1243
First Reading **1246**
Referral to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee **1246**
HEALTHY FUTURES COMMISSION QUEENSLAND BILL **1246**
Message from Governor **1246**
Tabled paper: Message, dated 23 May 2017, from His Excellency the Governor recommending the Healthy Futures Commission Queensland Bill 2017. 1247
Introduction **1247**
Tabled paper: Healthy Futures Commission Queensland Bill 2017. 1247
Tabled paper: Healthy Futures Commission Queensland Bill 2017, explanatory notes. 1247
First Reading **1248**
Referral to the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee **1248**
DISTINGUISHED VISITOR **1248**
UNIVERSITY LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL **1249**
Introduction **1249**
Tabled paper: University Legislation Amendment Bill 2017. 1249
Tabled paper: University Legislation Amendment Bill 2017, explanatory notes. 1249
First Reading **1250**
Referral to the Education, Tourism, Innovation and Small Business Committee **1250**
TRANSPORT AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL **1250**
Introduction **1250**
Tabled paper: Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2017. 1251
Tabled paper: Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2017, explanatory notes. 1251
First Reading **1252**
Referral to the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee **1253**
DEPUTY SPEAKER'S STATEMENT **1253**
School Group Tours **1253**

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 23 May 2017

LAND ACCESS OMBUDSMAN BILL 1253
Introduction 1253
Tabled paper: Land Access Ombudsman Bill 2017 1253
Tabled paper: Land Access Ombudsman Bill 2017, explanatory notes. 1253
First Reading 1255
Referral to the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee 1255
CORRECTIVE SERVICES (PAROLE BOARD) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL 1256
Second Reading 1256
Tabled paper: Pamphlet titled 'Queensland—It's in your hands' outlining One Nation policy. 1256
Consideration in Detail 1258
Clauses 1 to 4, as read, agreed to. 1258
Clause 5— 1258
Division: Question put—That leave be granted. 1258
Resolved in the affirmative 1258
Tabled paper: Corrective Services (Parole Board) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2017, explanatory notes to Mr Tim Mander's amendments. 1259
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to. 1263
Resolved in the negative. 1263
Non-government amendment (Mr Mander) negatived. 1263
Clause 5, as read, agreed to. 1263
Clauses 6 to 10, as read, agreed to. 1264
Clause 11— 1264
Tabled paper: Corrective Services (Parole Board) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2017, explanatory notes to Hon. Mark Ryan's amendments. 1264
Clause 11, as amended, agreed to. 1264
Clause 12— 1264
Clause 12, as amended, agreed to. 1265
Clause 13, as read, agreed to. 1265
Clause 14— 1265
Clause 14, as amended, agreed to. 1265
Clauses 15 to 24, as read, agreed to. 1265
Schedule 1, as read, agreed to. 1265
Third Reading 1266
Long Title 1266
PUBLIC HEALTH (INFECTION CONTROL) AMENDMENT BILL 1266
Second Reading 1266
Tabled paper: Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee: Report No. 37, 55th Parliament—Public Health (Infection Control) Amendment Bill 2017, government response. 1266
COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY 1288
Portfolio Committees, Reporting Dates 1288
MOTION 1288
Cedar Woods Development 1288
Tabled paper: Newsletter, undated, from Ms Kate Jones, then candidate for Ashgrove, titled 'My Commitment to The Gap'. 1288
Tabled paper: Letter, dated 20 April 2017, from the Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning, Hon. Jackie Trad MP, to councillor Julian Simmonds, Chairman for City Planning, Brisbane Council, regarding proposed amendments to the Upper Kedron Neighbourhood Plan. 1288
Tabled paper: Letter, dated 18 May 2017, from the Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning, Hon. Jackie Trad MP, to councillor Julian Simmonds, Chairman for City Planning, Brisbane Council, regarding proposed amendments to the Upper Kedron Neighbourhood Plan. 1289
Tabled paper: Letter, dated 27 February 2014, from Ms Rachel Stewart-Koster, solicitor, Brisbane City Legal Practice, Brisbane City Council, to Mr Ian Macallister, Director, Institutional Investments Pty Ltd, enclosing a copy of the Infrastructure Agreement for Institutional Investments for land at Upper Kedron. 1293
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to. 1294
Resolved in the negative. 1294
PUBLIC HEALTH (INFECTION CONTROL) AMENDMENT BILL 1294
Second Reading 1294
Consideration in Detail 1298
Clauses 1 to 9, as read, agreed to. 1298
Clause 10— 1298
Tabled paper: Public health (Infection Control) Amendment Bill 2017, explanatory notes to Mr John-Paul Langbroek's amendments. 1298
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to. 1299
Resolved in the negative. 1299
Non-government amendment (Mr Langbroek) negatived. 1299
Clause 10, as read, agreed to. 1299
Clauses 11 to 16, as read, agreed to. 1299

Third Reading **1299**
Long Title **1300**
COURT AND CIVIL LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL **1300**
Second Reading **1300**
Consideration in Detail **1312**
Clauses 1 to 10, as read, agreed to. 1312
Insertion of new clause— 1312
Tabled paper: Court and Civil Legislation Amendment Bill 2017, explanatory notes to Hon. Yvette D'Ath's amendments. 1312
Amendment agreed to. 1312
Clauses 11 to 149, as read, agreed to. 1312
Clause 150— 1313
Division: Question put—That clause 150, as read, stand part of the bill. 1313
Resolved in the affirmative. 1313
Clause 150, as read, agreed to. 1313
Clauses 151 to 219, as read, agreed to. 1313
Clause 220— 1313
Division: Question put—That clause 220, as read, stand part of the bill. 1313
Resolved in the affirmative. 1313
Clause 220, as read, agreed to. 1313
Clauses 221 to 258, as read, agreed to. 1313
Schedule 1, as read, agreed to. 1313
Third Reading **1314**
Long Title **1314**
ADJOURNMENT **1314**
Mount Ommaney, Small Business Awards **1314**
Kallangur Memorial Bowls Club **1314**
Mount Gravatt East State School, Drum and Fife Marching Band **1315**
Redlands Electorate, Domestic and Family Violence **1316**
Cleveland State High School **1316**
Rural Fire Service **1317**
Regional and Rural Queensland **1318**
Marchetti, Mr F; Australian South Sea Islanders **1318**
Gold Coast, Crime **1319**
Strathpine Railway Station, Upgrade **1319**
ATTENDANCE **1320**

TUESDAY, 23 MAY 2017

The Legislative Assembly met at 9.30 am.

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

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

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Absence of Member

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on 15 May 2017 I received a letter from the member for Maroochydore advising of her absence from the House during the sitting weeks beginning 9 May and 23 May 2017. The member's notification complies with standing order 263A.

SPEAKER'S RULING

Answers to Questions on Notice

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, my ruling in relation to a matter raised by the member for Hinchinbrook regarding three separate questions on notice on 22 March 2017 has led to additional complaints about answers to questions on notice. I stress that, 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 undertook to use my best endeavours to ensure ministers answered questions put to them. Accordingly, I find suggestions that ministers of an earlier government did not answer questions irrelevant.

A reference in an answer to a website, annual report or budget estimates document that does not, at the time of the question and/or answer, contain the information is not an answer to the question and is irrelevant to the question. Furthermore, the annual estimates process undertaken each year does not exhaust the government's accountability for financial matters. Answers cannot be avoided on the basis that the matters might be dealt with in the estimates process.

Where a question is asked that is broad in terms of its scope or it seeks information over a number of years, or seeks minutely detailed material, I am comfortable with the responsible minister making an attempt to answer the question, but the minister should attempt to answer the question in a genuine manner—that is, they should use their best and reasonable endeavours.

In summary, I have therefore ruled that questions on notice 11 of 2017, 18 of 2017 and 196 of 2017, addressed to the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services, remain unanswered and questions on notice 148 of 2017 and 157 of 2017, addressed to the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minster for Corrective Services, remain unanswered. I table the correspondence in relation to these matters.

Tabled paper: Bundle of correspondence in relation to certain answers to questions on notice [737].

I seek leave to incorporate the ruling circulated in my name.

Leave granted.

SPEAKER'S RULING—ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

MR SPEAKER: Honourable members,

My ruling in relation to a matter raised by the Member for Hinchinbrook regarding three separate questions on notice on 22 March 2017 has led to additional complaints about answers to questions on notice.

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 undertook to use my best endeavours to ensure ministers answered questions put to them.

Accordingly, I find suggestions that Ministers of an earlier government did not answer questions irrelevant.

A reference in an answer to a website, annual report or budget estimates document that does not, at the time of the question and/or answer, contain the information is not an answer to the question and is irrelevant to the question. (In this respect I note my ruling of 19 April 2016 at pages 978 to 979, ruling a question on notice not answered when a purported answer simply referred to a press release which did not contain material relevant to the question.)

Furthermore, the annual estimates process undertaken each year does not exhaust the government's accountability for financial matters. Answers cannot be avoided on the basis that the matters might be dealt with in the estimates process.

Where a question is asked that is broad in terms of its scope or it seeks information over a number of years, or seeks minutely detailed material, I am comfortable with the responsible Minister making an attempt to answer the question. But the Minister should attempt to answer the question in a genuine manner. That is, they should use their best and reasonable endeavours.

I will now turn to the specific complaints and questions on notice.

Question on notice 403 of 2017—

On 28 April 2017, the Member for Burleigh complained that the Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy's answer to question on notice 403 of 2017 that sought information about export protection equipment and network protection equipment relating to solar PV panels only referenced network protection equipment.

When Members ask questions that relate to more than one matter, they may be disappointed when the answer does not relate to all matters. I find that the Minister's answer was a relevant and reasonable answer to the question and if the Member wants more information the Member should ask further specific questions.

Questions on notice 148 of 2017 and 157 of 2017—

On 28 March 2017, the Member for Everton complained that the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services answers to questions on notice 148 of 2017 and 157 of 2017 had not been relevantly answered on the basis that it would be an unjustifiable use of resources. The first question related to the number of weapons licence holders that have had their licence either cancelled or suspended for committing a crime. The second question related to postage costs associated with roadside drug testing.

I corresponded with the Minister about this matter and the Minister noted that the answers were provided prior to my ruling of 22 March and, therefore, the Minister stated he did not re-scope the question to give an answer.

In the correspondence to me, the Minister provided information that would have satisfied the questions if it had originally been provided in the answers. I request the Minister replace his answers to questions on notice 148/17 and 157/17 with answers that include the information in his correspondence to me.

Questions on notice 11 of 2017 and 18 of 2017—

On 24 March 2017, the Member for Surfers Paradise made what I would term a general complaint about answers to questions on notice by the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services. The Member exampled questions on notice 11 of 2017 and 18 of 2017.

Question on notice 11 of 2017 asked 'Will the Minister advise, as at 31 December 2016, the projected full financial year (2016-17) operating result for each of the 16 HHSs (reported by the dollar value of the surplus/deficit and for each individual HHS)?'

The Minister's response was: 'Details in relation to the financial position of Hospital and Health Services are publicly available in State Budget Papers and relevant annual reports.'

The question related to the mid-year projected full financial year operating results for each of the 16 Hospital and Health Services. I am advised that the information was not contained in either the current budget papers or the previous annual report. The answer was not, therefore, relevant to the question and the question remains unanswered.

Question 18 of 2017 asked the Minister to advise the total amount spent by the department on external recruitment costs including job placement advertising, labour hire and expenses for contractors in 2016. The Minister's answer was that the information relevant to the question was available in the annual reports of the Department of Health and Hospital and Health Services. I am advised that the information sought is not contained in the previous annual reports. The answer was not, therefore, relevant to the question and the question remains unanswered.

Questions on notice 2064 of 2016 and 196 of 2017—

On 31 March 2017, the Member for Kawana complained about the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Service's answers to questions on notice 2064 of 2016 and 196 of 2017. Both questions on notice related to the number of Sunshine Coast current and former employees of Queensland Health who have alleged debts as a result of issues with the health payroll system. Question on notice 2064 of 2016 asked a number of sub questions going to quantum of debt, but question on notice 196 of 2017 only went to the number of debtors in the Sunshine Coast.

It is noted that the Minister for Health in the answer to question on notice 2064 of 2016 indicated it was neither practical nor reasonable to divert resources to identify and list all the information required. As I have previously said, where a question is asked that is broad in terms of its scope or it seeks information over a number of years or, in this case, asks a number of sub questions, I am comfortable with the responsible Minister making an attempt to answer the question.

However, I find in this case the Minister has not attempted to answer any part of the question. For example, the Minister did not identify the number of Sunshine Coast current and former employees of Queensland Health who have alleged debts. The Minister also did not indicate that any of the information was unavailable.

When the Member re-focused the question in question on notice 196 of 2017, the Minister made no attempt to address the single issue but merely referred to the answer to the earlier more detailed question.

I do not believe that the Minister has made a reasonable attempt to give a relevant answer to either question and the question on notice 196 of 2017 remains unanswered.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Anniversary of Legislative Assembly

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on 22 May 1860 the inaugural meeting of Queensland's first parliament occurred. Accordingly, yesterday, 22 May 2017, our parliament celebrated its 157th year, making Queensland one of the oldest continuous democracies in the world.

Our parliament is not the only one having a birthday this week. Today we celebrate the significant birthday of our Clerk. Happy birthday, Mr Clerk.

PETITIONS

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

Sunshine Coast, Beachfront Caravan Parks

Mr Dickson, from 3,241 petitioners, requesting the House to immediately apply the Caravan Park Policy to prevent closure of the Mooloolaba Esplanade Beach Holiday Park and confirm its intention to abide by the Caravan Park Policy to prevent the closure of other beachfront caravan parks which are presently at risk of closure: Coolum Beach Holiday Park and Mooloolaba Beach Holiday Park on Parkyn Parade [734].

M1 Motorway, Exit 49, Pimpama

Mr Crandon, from 507 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure the government undertakes, as a matter of utmost urgency, improvements to the operation of the dangerous interchange that is the northbound off-ramp Exit 49 of the M1 at Pimpama [736].

Pimpama, Yawalpah Road, Upgrade

Mr Crandon, from 257 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure the City of Gold Coast undertakes the essential and necessary roadworks to turn Yawalpah Road into two lanes, for 250 metres, leading to the roundabout at Exit 49 [735].

Petitions received.

TABLED PAPERS

PAPERS TABLED DURING THE RECESS

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

12 May 2017—

718 Education, Tourism, Innovation and Small Business Committee: Report No. 32, 55th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled from 30 November 2016 to 14 February 2017

15 May 2017—

719 Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee: Report No. 37, 55th Parliament—Public Health (Infection Control) Amendment Bill 2017

720 Public Works and Utilities Committee: Report No. 37, 55th Parliament—Transport and Other Legislation (Personalised Transport Reform) Amendment Bill 2017

721 Education and Care Services National Law (Victoria) Amendment Act 2017 [refer s 5 Education and Care Services National Law (Queensland) Act 2011]

722 Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 54, 55th Parliament—Crime and Corruption and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2017

723 Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 55, 55th Parliament—Court and Civil Legislation Amendment Bill 2017

18 May 2017—

724 Agriculture and Environment Committee: Report No. 34, 55th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled from 30 November 2016 to 14 February 2017

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

The following statutory instruments were tabled by the Clerk—

Environmental Offsets Act 2014, Nature Conservation Act 1992—

725 Nature Conservation (Wildlife) and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2017, No. 67

726 Nature Conservation (Wildlife) and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2017, No. 67, explanatory notes

Animal Management (Cats and Dogs) Act 2008—

727 Animal Management (Cats and Dogs) (Approved Entities) Amendment Regulation 2017, No. 68

728 Animal Management (Cats and Dogs) (Approved Entities) Amendment Regulation 2017, No. 68, explanatory notes

Nature Conservation Act 1992—

729 Nature Conservation (Protected Areas) (Bromley) Amendment Regulation 2017, No. 69

730 Nature Conservation (Protected Areas) (Bromley) Amendment Regulation 2017, No. 69, explanatory notes

Adult Proof of Age Card Act 2008, Gold Coast Waterways Authority Act 2012, Tow Truck Act 1973, Transport Infrastructure Act 1994, Transport Operations (Marine Pollution) Act 1995, Transport Operations (Marine Safety) Act 1994, Transport Operations (Marine Safety—Domestic Commercial Vessel National Law Application) Act 2016, Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act 1994, Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995—

731 Transport Legislation (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2017, No. 70

Adult Proof of Age Card Act 2008, Gold Coast Waterways Authority Act 2012, Tow Truck Act 1973, Transport Infrastructure Act 1994, Transport Operations (Marine Pollution) Act 1995, Transport Operations (Marine Safety) Act 1994, Transport Operations (Marine Safety—Domestic Commercial Vessel National Law Application) Act 2016, Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act 1994, Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995—

732 Transport Legislation (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2017, No. 70, explanatory notes

REPORT BY THE CLERK

The following report was tabled by the Clerk—

Report pursuant to Standing Order 165 (Clerical errors or formal changes to any Bill) detailing amendments to certain Bills, made by the Clerk, prior to assent by His Excellency the Governor, viz—

Water Legislation (Dam Safety) Amendment Bill 2016

Amendments made to Bill

Short title and consequential references to short title—

Omit—

'Water Legislation (Dam Safety) Amendment Act 2016'

Insert—

'Water Legislation (Dam Safety) Amendment Act 2017'.

Local Government Electoral (Transparency and Accountability in Local Government) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016

Amendments made to Bill

Short title and consequential references to short title—

Omit—

'Local Government Electoral (Transparency and Accountability in Local Government) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2016'

Insert—

'Local Government Electoral (Transparency and Accountability in Local Government) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2017'.

Child Protection (Offender Reporting) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016

Amendments made to Bill

Short title and consequential references to short title—

Omit—

'Child Protection (Offender Reporting) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2016'

Insert—

'Child Protection (Offender Reporting) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2017'.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Manchester, Incident

Hon. A PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (9.37 am): We are hearing news from the United Kingdom that police are responding to reports of a blast at an Ariana Grande concert in Manchester. While the latest news I have to hand is that this is a serious incident with multiple deaths and injuries confirmed, we anxiously await more details from the United Kingdom. On behalf of all Queenslanders, I send our condolences, thoughts and prayers to those affected by this tragedy.

I can also add that the Police Commissioner has assured the government that at this stage there is no known threat to Queensland and the level of threat remains unchanged. I am further advised that the commissioner will receive a briefing from the Australian Federal Police later today.

Pauline Hanson's One Nation

Hon. A PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (9.38 am): Over the last two days serious allegations have been raised about attempts by senior figures within the One Nation party to submit false expense claims to the Electoral Commission of Queensland. These allegations have been referred by a number of individuals to various law enforcement and oversight bodies.

From day one, my government has prided itself on transparency. The first piece of legislation we introduced was to reverse the LNP's changes to donation laws and voter identification requirements. We have introduced Australia's most transparent real-time donation laws, compelling all political parties and donors to submit what they have paid or received, and from whom, within seven days.

If the independent investigations of these allegations reveal gaps in our electoral laws that political parties could use to defraud taxpayers, then I will fill those gaps. Just as I pledged to retrospectively reverse the LNP's electoral disclosure limit changes, political parties need to know that any changes I make will also be retrospective.

Mining Industry, Jobs

Hon. A PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (9.39 am): I am happy to report that the green shoots of recovery in the Queensland resources sector continue to yield regional jobs and growth. In terms of jobs, data from the Australian Bureau of Statistics shows that jobs in the coal and exploration sectors grew by more than 3,000 in the six months to last November. Over this period, coalmining employment in particular increased by approximately 10 per cent to 20,000 jobs. This jobs creation momentum is set to gather pace, with more construction and operational jobs set to be created.

I welcome the recent announcement of the QCoal and JFE Steel joint venture Byerwen project with 350 construction and 500 operational jobs. Last year during a trade mission to Japan, I met with JFE representatives, personally toured their steel works and spoke to them about their investment in Queensland. As a result of those meetings, my government introduced legislation that was passed by the parliament to get this project moving. The impasse preventing the project from moving forward and employing Queenslanders was not dealt with by our predecessors. My government is determined to get the best results for Queenslanders. In addition, Batchfire Resources' Callide mine and Stanmore's Isaac Plains mine are re-entering production, with Glencore's Collinsville mine likely to follow soon after. BHP recently announced a $204 million upgrade to its Peak Downs and Caval Ridge mines. Investment in exploration has been climbing, with coal and metals exploration expenditure up by $33 million to $108 million over the six months to last November, contributing to an increase of about 1,500 jobs.

There are also positive signs of renewal in the Queensland metals industry. We are expecting that this situation will stabilise as the Rocklands copper project, which is expected to create up to 200 jobs, ramps up. In addition to Rocklands, a number of other projects are also being progressed. Altona's Cloncurry copper project, which will deliver 300 construction and 280 operational jobs, and MMG's Dugald River zinc project, which will deliver 400 jobs, are on track.

Queensland also has large reserves of good-quality bauxite that, over the next 15 years, have the potential to feed growth in demand from China as its own domestic supply runs out. That represents an exceptional opportunity for Queensland's bauxite producers in the Far North, led by Rio Tinto's $1.9 billion Amrun expansion on Cape York and several smaller bauxite projects—delivering another 600 construction jobs—that are in the pipeline.

Queensland continues to lead the nation in the expansion of gas supply, as demonstrated by QGC's $1.7 billion Charlie project, delivering 1,600 jobs, and its recently announced Ruby project, which will deliver 350 jobs. Combined, those projects offer more than 6,000 jobs. My government continues to work to get the best results for Queenslanders. That was our commitment and that has been our performance.

Mr Cripps interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Hinchinbrook, I will make sure I give you a warning this time. You are warned under standing order 253A.

Sun Metals, Solar Farm

Hon. A PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (9.42 am): Queensland's renewable energy future has never looked brighter. The extraordinary growth in solar power stations, particularly in the north of our state, brings with it a source of cheap, clean energy and a source of new skilled jobs for the workforce of tomorrow. Last week with the Minister for Energy, the minister assisting me on North Queensland and the member for Thuringowa, I had the privilege of visiting the Sun Metals zinc refinery just south of Townsville. The plant has played a key role in Townsville's economy for more than 20 years and today employs 291 people. Those jobs at Sun Metals are now even more secure, thanks to the power of the sun.

Sun Metals will build a $200 million, 125-megawatt solar farm on land adjoining the refinery. When complete, the farm's 1.3 million solar panels will supply up to one-third of Sun Metals's energy requirements. Upon completion, it will become Queensland's largest single-site user of renewable energy. Through Powerlink—which we still own—the Sun Metals solar farm will be connected to the grid. That is what you can do when you own the infrastructure.

The project has been funded entirely by Sun Metals, which is the surest possible testament to the viability of renewable energy and a slap in the face to those who want to build only new coal-fired power stations. The construction of the new solar power station will employ another 210 people, which is a great boost to the economic strength of the Townsville region. I know that all the Townsville members are very excited about that. Sun Metals CEO, Mr Yun Choi, pointed out to us the tailings dams where ferrite that would previously have been discarded is being reprocessed and exported to Korea. That is another example of greater efficiency that leaves an even smaller impact on the surrounding environment.

Sun Metals is another example of the clean energy boom that is occurring in Queensland under this government. Since January 2016, Queensland has seen an unprecedented level of renewable energy investment activity in North Queensland, with over 780 megawatts of large-scale projects either commencing construction or securing financial support. Those projects will deliver $1.6 billion of infrastructure spending to the north, creating more than 1,400 construction jobs. It is a great result for employment, a great result for regional Queensland, a great result for the economy, a great result for the environment and a good result for Queensland.

Queensland Rail

Hon. A PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (9.44 am): On 14 February I informed the House that the Strachan report provided that the report-back on the stress test of the timetable would be within one month. I wish to clarify that the information was not contained in the report, as I said, but in briefings that I had personally received.

Infrastructure

Hon. JA TRAD (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning) (9.44 am): Over the past two budgets the Palaszczuk government has invested billions of dollars to build essential infrastructure and create jobs for Queenslanders. That includes the $2 billion State Infrastructure Fund that was established in the last budget, and we have already allocated more than $1.6 billion to critical infrastructure across Queensland. The State Infrastructure Fund is part of a $40 billion capital program that allows the government to target programs where they are needed the most and to immediately fund job-creating projects across Queensland. Much of that need is in regional Queensland and this financial year 46 per cent of the capital spend has been targeted at the regions. As a result, the $25 million Cairns Special School, which supported 100 local jobs during construction, accepted its first students this year and the $200 million section 4 of the Townsville ring-road was completed in December, six months ahead of schedule.

Another great example of how our infrastructure investment is creating jobs is the $200 million Works for Queensland program. Works for Queensland is supporting more than 5,700 jobs and more than 700 projects across regional Queensland, in partnership with local government. Similarly, the government's $300 million Priority Economic Works and Productivity Program is delivering major projects such as stage 1 of the Ipswich Motorway upgrade, the Pacific Motorway-Gateway Motorway merge upgrade and the Riverway Drive duplication in Townsville. More than $50 million has been spent to date.

In addition, the $180 million Significant Regional Infrastructure Projects Program is delivering 25 projects in regional and remote Queensland and supporting at least 280 jobs. The program funds regional projects such as the Bill Fulton Bridge in Cairns, new fire stations in centres such as Proserpine, Herberton and Mackay and the Townsville Hospital children's ward upgrade. Wherever you look, this government is delivering infrastructure and creating jobs in local communities.

Queensland Rail

Hon. JA TRAD (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning) (9.46 am): Last weekend marked 100 days since I was sworn in as the Minister for Transport. In that time, I have been focused on fixing the trains and implementing the recommendations of the Strachan inquiry. In that time, Queensland Rail has accelerated the recruitment of drivers and guards, opening external applications to drivers with previous Queensland Rail experience. Of the 200 additional drivers required, Queensland Rail has selected 106 drivers, with 62 currently in training. We have extended our target of 200 additional guards, with Queensland Rail selecting 263 guards, 55 of whom are currently in training.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: One moment, Deputy Premier. Member for Glass House, you are warned under standing order 253A. Member for Burleigh, if you persist, you will follow that lead.

Ms TRAD: We are also fast-tracking training. QR has formed a partnership with GHD and the Centre for Excellence in Rail Training that will support the implementation of best practice training programs. Queensland Rail has also invested in training additional driver and guard route mentors, recruiting additional tutors and increasing training school capacity for both drivers and guards. Customers will also notice a significant improvement in customer service. Queensland Rail is enhancing the way it engages with its customers, including by holding commuter catch-up sessions with Queensland Rail staff, including the CEO and myself, travelling on the network to listen to feedback. Our stations are also in the spotlight with an additional $6 million allocated to refreshing stations and improving the customer experience.

I am determined to continue to fix the trains. We have a plan to put Queensland Rail back on track and we are delivering on that plan.

Queensland Economy

Hon. CW PITT (Mulgrave—ALP) (Treasurer and Minister for Trade and Investment) (9.48 am): In a few weeks I will deliver the third state budget for the Palaszczuk government. Since our first 2015-16 budget, this government has been implementing an economic plan to revitalise our state's billion dollar economy and create jobs now and for the future. Our disciplined and methodical approach has significantly improved the state's financial position. The government's strong fiscal management has seen us deliver surpluses on our first two state budgets. Significantly, both were in surplus before the spike in world coal prices, which increased each forecast surplus.

I have spoken previously about the fiscal impacts of Tropical Cyclone Debbie. We estimate a financial cost of $1.5 billion. The state must initially bear that cost in our budget before any reimbursement occurs through federal-state disaster relief arrangements. Despite this significant cost, it is still my aim to have the 2017-18 budget in surplus.

Our next budget will continue to progress the commitments we made to the people of Queensland. In particular, it will continue our focus on job creation and supporting regional economies and communities. The latest ABS figures show a trend unemployment rate in April steady at 6.4 per cent from March. They show close to 60,000 net new jobs created since the election under our economic plan. Our unemployment rate is lower now than the 6.6 per cent trend rate we inherited at the 2015 election. Compare that to the former government that inherited a trend rate of 5.5 per cent at the 2012 election. Despite a promise to head to a rate of four per cent, the trend rate hit 6.7 per cent for four months in late 2014.

Despite lowering the state's unemployment rate since we took office, we know there is much more to do. We know the challenges that many Queenslanders are facing with finding jobs, particularly in regional Queensland. That is why in the last budget we introduced our Back to Work program giving regional employers incentives of $10,000 and $15,000 for hiring unemployed or long-term unemployed jobseekers. At the December 2016 Mid Year Fiscal and Economic Review I was able to deliver a new $20,000 Back to Work Youth Boost to enable regional employers to engage jobseekers aged 15 to 24. Our previous budgets have improved front-line services while delivering job-creating infrastructure across the state.

Unlike the federal budget, our budgets have had real money allocated to real projects. We are investing in the future through our Advance Queensland agenda—developing new industries while supporting innovation in our traditional strengths such as agriculture, resources, tourism, manufacturing and others. At the same time we are delivering on our commitment to reduce general government debt. We have done that without selling our income-generating government owned corporations. We have achieved it without increasing taxes on Queenslanders and without cutting front-line services or jobs. No state budget I deliver will have as its centrepiece 14,000 job cuts.

As a result of our economic plan, including two state budgets, our state's economy and finances are in better shape, business confidence is back and our economy is growing strongly. This was confirmed by the recent announcement by ratings agency Moody's to affirm our Aa1 rating equivalent to AA+ and to change Queensland's outlook to stable from the negative outlook it applied after the former government's first budget in 2012.

While we acknowledge this positive rating outcome, we know there is more work to do. Our 2017-18 budget next month will continue to deliver on our commitments to restore front-line services, support the state's economic transition and continue to demonstrate responsible management of our state's finances.

Health Services

Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (9.52 am): Last year the Palaszczuk government launched *My health, Queensland's future: advancing health 2026*. At its heart is the Palaszczuk government's aim to make Queenslanders amongst the healthiest people in the world by 2026. Since coming to government we have increased funding by 12 per cent to our state's health system to ensure our hospitals can cope with increasing demand. This money has gone into restoring front-line health services cut by the previous LNP government.

Over the last two years we have employed an additional 4,000 nurses and 1,300 doctors to deliver the health services Queenslanders expect. We have just celebrated the first anniversary of our groundbreaking nurse-to-patient ratio legislation which will improve patient care. We are employing 400 nurse navigators over four years to help patients with complex health conditions navigate their way through the health system and ensure they are connected to the right services.

This investment in our front-line services is paying dividends. When we came to government there were more than 104,000 Queenslanders who had waited longer than clinically recommended for an appointment with a specialist. With the introduction of our specialist outpatient strategy, that number is now down to just over 50,000—a reduction of 52 per cent.

I am also pleased the latest data from the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare shows that Queensland has the shortest median waiting time for elective surgery in the country. The median waiting time for elective surgery in Queensland is 29 days compared to a national waiting time of 37 days. Without the dedicated commitment of our front-line staff and the investment needed to back this up, these achievements would not have been possible.

We have introduced the most progressive medicinal cannabis laws in the country. We have successfully overseen the safe opening of the Sunshine Coast University Hospital—the first new, not replacement, tertiary hospital built in Australia in the last 20 years. Later today I will be introducing into the parliament a bill to establish the Healthy Futures Commission to help tackle Queensland's high obesity and chronic disease rates by supporting children, young people and families to adopt a healthy lifestyle.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, you will have an opportunity to debate it when it comes into the House at the appropriate time. You will not debate it now.

Mr DICK: While members opposite interject and criticise the proposal, I am very delighted to report to the parliament that this initiative has been welcomed by Diabetes Queensland, the Heart Foundation and the Urban Indigenous Health Institute. This initiative, together with all of our investment in health, is evidence of the Palaszczuk government's commitment to delivering on our goal of making Queenslanders amongst the healthiest people in the world by 2026.

Gold Coast Commonwealth Games

Hon. KJ JONES (Ashgrove—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism, Major Events and the Commonwealth Games) (9.54 am): I am pleased to announce that we have received more than 1.2 million ticket requests for the Gold Coast Commonwealth Games in April 2018. When ticket

requests closed at midnight last night, all sports had received strong interest. Sports such as netball, swimming, Rugby 7s, track cycling, athletics, diving as well as the opening ceremony and my favourite, gymnastics, are among the most popular so far.

This is great news for what we know will be the best games ever. We can expect big crowds supporting our athletes in April next year. I am sure you will be there, Mr Speaker. Computer automated ticket allocations to oversubscribed events will now take place before remaining tickets go on sale in July.

There is so much happening in our preparations leading up to the Commonwealth Games. Queensland's own Cathy Freeman has joined our games family as an official ambassador. The Queen's Baton Relay is making its way around the Commonwealth and this week is in St Helena. Interviews are underway with thousands of potential volunteers. All new games competition venues are complete. These venues are already delivering for Queensland, with the brand-new Sports and Leisure Centre at Carrara hosting the Sudirman Cup this week. With our strong backing and support, the games are going from strength to strength.

It was a Labor government that bid for the games because we knew it would create jobs, infrastructure and a long-lasting legacy when it comes to tourism and jobs on the Gold Coast and beyond. Due to our investment we are on track to deliver the best Commonwealth Games ever.

Manufacturing

Hon. AJ LYNHAM (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (9.56 am): This government wants to see jobs and business opportunities growing in our $20 billion manufacturing industry. The latest initiative to help that happen is our 'Design in manufacturing' seminar series that kicks off tomorrow. Up to 25 South-East Queensland manufacturers will be at a seminar at Mount Gravatt East tomorrow morning learning how and why design can benefit their businesses. In early June 25 Toowoomba businesses will have the same opportunity. A further five seminars will be held over the next two years. That means that dozens of Queensland manufacturers will be armed with the expert design knowledge they need to be world leaders.

More than 70 per cent of the cost of a manufactured product is influenced by design—the choice of materials, the processes used and how things are assembled. That means that the greater use of design will help our manufacturers lower costs, bring their product to market faster, be more competitive and, in turn, grow and employ more Queenslanders. This is just part of a suite of measures to help our manufacturing industry to innovate, grow and become internationally competitive.

We are doing this with the *Queensland advanced manufacturing 10-year roadmap and action plan—powering the Queensland economy*, our plan to transform this vital Queensland industry. We are doing this with our Made in Queensland program, which is distributing $20 million to manufacturers who have put their hands up to take their business to the next level. More than 160 Queensland companies now know what they can do to innovate and grow. That means that they can now apply for a grant of up to $2.5 million to increase their productivity and be more competitive. Already more than 20 have applied and are being assessed for grants.

Why are we doing this? This is a government that believes Queenslanders can be world leaders in advanced manufacturing. We are implementing programs to help our state reach that goal. That is why our past two budgets have funded the establishment of our Industry and Manufacturing Advisory Group and our 10-year advanced manufacturing road map. I am confident that my colleague the Treasurer will be providing further funds to grow advanced manufacturing in this state. This government is determined to encourage the growth of advanced, knowledge based industries and create the high-skill jobs of the future for Queensland.

Skilling Queenslanders for Work

Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (9.59 am): I rise to update the House on the great success of the Palaszczuk government's reintroduced Skilling Queenslanders for Work initiative.

Opposition members interjected.

Mrs D'ATH: I hear the laughs on the other side. They do not want to talk about jobs and they certainly did not support this very important initiative. They scrapped this initiative. I am very proud to say that, as of the end of April, over 11,500 Queenslanders have now exited the Skilling Queenslanders

for Work program. Of those 11,500 Queenslanders, 7,439 of them now have jobs, 1,943 have taken on further training and I am very pleased to say that 308 young people have returned to school. The success of this program is unquestionable, changing the lives of thousands of Queenslanders in just over 18 months. This government has a proven commitment to skills, training and jobs.

On 13 April 2017, I announced the activation of the $10 million Skilling Queenslanders for Work community recovery package to assist with the clean-up and rebuilding across Queensland as a result of widespread damage and severe flooding following ex-Tropical Cyclone Debbie. This $10 million is in addition to the $240 million over four years of the current program and is available immediately. I am pleased to announce today the approval of five Work Skills Traineeships projects worth $3.68 million that will create 161 jobs in disaster affected communities. These projects will offer immediate job opportunities for up to six months in Rockhampton, Gladstone, Laidley, Beaudesert and Slacks Creek—all areas that have experienced damage from widespread flooding.

In Rockhampton, a community organisation has been awarded $1,514,700 to employ 80 jobseekers to undertake reparation works in parks and gardens. Another organisation has been awarded $292,200 to employ 15 jobseekers to undertake renovation works on the RSL hall at Laidley which has been prone to flooding. The Palaszczuk government has committed up to $10 million under the SQW community recovery package, so there will be more jobs to come.

Last week I was delighted to attend a Skilling Queenslanders for Work graduation at Multicultural Development Australia. Out of the 28 graduates, 15 were unable to make it because they had already secured jobs. This is a fantastic outcome. The MDA also hosted 'Right Match', an event providing an opportunity for employers to conduct short five-minute interviews with graduating students—basically speed dating for employers and graduates—to take the opportunity to learn new skills and get the opportunity to be interviewed for jobs.

I would like to take this opportunity again to thank the hundreds of community organisations, registered training organisations, councils and businesses delivering these Skilling Queenslanders for Work projects and the employers who see the potential of graduates. The Palaszczuk government is committed to jobs for Queenslanders. That is why we have invested in Skilling Queenslanders for Work to support our most vulnerable and disadvantaged people in our communities to gain the skills they need to assist them into employment.

Advance Queensland

Hon. LM ENOCH (Algester—ALP) (Minister for Innovation, Science and the Digital Economy and Minister for Small Business) (10.03 am): In the 2015-16 budget we launched the Advance Queensland initiative to harness innovation, foster collaboration, support start-ups, drive productivity improvements and, most importantly, create jobs in our state. Expanding on our election commitment to deliver a $50 million innovation program, we established a $180 million suite of initiatives to diversify the economy and usher our state into the knowledge economy.

Examining world best practice and tapping into the knowledge of local talent, we co-designed a broad suite of programs to ignite the entrepreneurial spirit in our state to turn great ideas and research into commercial reality. Over the first 12 months of the program we set a cracking pace in delivering programs to solve challenges, take ideas to market, attract investment, build economic opportunities and create jobs. We did this because we knew that, if we did not act immediately, it would be our children and the generations to come who would be left lagging behind the rest of the world.

Then, in last year's budget, the Palaszczuk government accelerated the Advance Queensland program, turning it into a $405 million whole-of-government initiative. This new investment propelled the transformation we began with the launch of Advance Queensland and put in place the foundation to create a bright and prosperous future for young and old.

It must be noted at this point that all of this has been achieved in less than two years despite the savage cuts to support research and innovation in Queensland which we saw under the previous Newman-Nicholls government—cuts headlined by ripping $50 million from the Innovation and Science Division in Tim Nicholls's very first budget as treasurer, including slashing more than $20 million of Smart State grants funding.

It is Labor who understands the need to diversify our economy. It is Labor who is supporting our start-ups and small businesses. It is Labor who is fostering collaboration between researchers and industry and it is Labor who is keeping our state at the forefront of a changing global economy. Most importantly, it is Labor who is delivering.

Roads

Hon. MC BAILEY (Yeerongpilly—ALP) (Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply) (10.05 am): The Palaszczuk government is delivering road infrastructure across our state, creating jobs and connecting all Queenslanders. Our record $20 billion four-year QTRIP program is supporting 15,900 jobs in our state. Over the last two budgets we have seen nearly $7 billion in investment by the Palaszczuk government on road and transport infrastructure. That is more than 3,000 kilometres worth of road newly sealed and 250 kilometres of road constructed and rehabilitated.

We are getting the M1 upgrades funded at the merge and on the Gold Coast after three years of inaction by the LNP. We are getting the $400 million Ipswich Motorway upgrade going—again, ignored by the LNP for three years—getting jobs going. There is the $42 million Gregory Development Road north of Charters Towers and the $74 million upgrade of exit 54 on the M1, started and finished by the Palaszczuk government. There is the Toowoomba to Oakey Warrego Highway upgrade—$150 million for stage 2. The Palaszczuk government started and finished the Townsville ring-road. We are getting going on Riverway Drive within weeks—a great credit to the member for Thuringowa. We are also getting the $384 million Bruce Highway section C Cooroy to Curra funded and constructed.

There is the Gateway Arterial north—$1 billion worth of road. There is the Toowoomba Second Range Crossing and the $512 million Logan Enhancement Project, which involves the Gateway extension and the Logan Motorway—half a billion dollars in investment with not a single taxpayer dollar, but we are getting that project going. Only last week I was at the sod-turning ceremony for the $929 million upgrade of the Bruce Highway at the Caloundra Road and Sunshine Motorway interchanges. We are looking after Western Queensland with a $40 million package. Again, Western Queensland was ignored by the previous government.

It is the Palaszczuk government that is creating jobs and delivering for Queensland after $600 million being slashed from roads funding by the previous Newman-Nicholls government. No amount of chino wearing or beer drinking or motorbike riding will get away from the fact that the member for Clayfield ratted on regional roads. He also cut the TIDS program by 37 per cent to the detriment of local governments right throughout this state. The Palaszczuk government has restored roads funding for local governments through the TIDS program—$30 million per year, locked in for three years, working with local government, working for local jobs, working for local roads, and we will keep doing it.

The Palaszczuk government record is clear: we build and they cut. We know that they will do it again if they get the chance. This government will be announcing further road projects in our upcoming budget, creating and supporting Queensland jobs.

Ecotourism

Hon. SJ MILES (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef) (10.08 am): Queensland is home to many of the world's best national parks. From the majestic Great Barrier Reef to the Wet Tropics and Cape York, the outback and the prehistoric Gondwana, tourists travel from around the world to experience our national parks and hope to catch a glimpse of our wonderful native wildlife.

Our tourism industry and the jobs it supports rely on our world-class parks for their livelihood, but we have to do more than protect these natural assets. We need to invest in them. When visitors come here, they expect—in fact, they demand—a world-class ecotourism experience. For three years the LNP talked a big game when it came to ecotourism but they delivered nothing. In just two years we have turned that around. Of all the ecotourism projects being delivered by this government in or near our national parks, the one I am most excited about is what is happening at Green Mountains campground. This project, in partnership with the O'Reilly's, who for generations have hosted visitors to Lamington National Park, will see one of Queensland's best camp sites transformed into an ecotourism drawcard. Guests will have a range of accommodation options, from traditional camping to powered sites and standing tents. There will even be hanging sky tents for a true treetops experience. They will be able to cook their meals in a communal cooking facility and share camp fire stories around a communal fire pit. This is a fantastic example of the government working with accredited ecotourism providers to expand the range of options available for visitors. That is just one of the ecotourism projects we have underway.

We have also developed Walkabout Creek in the tourism minister's own electorate, and every weekend that place is chock-full of families. We have invested $10 million in Mon Repos. I know that the member for Burnett is very appreciative that Labor delivered those funds when his party would not.

We are rebuilding the Dubuji Boardwalk in the Daintree. We are working with 'Skroo' and Jude Turner to deliver a multiday walk in the Scenic Rim. Stay tuned: there is so much more to come, because we know how important tourism is to the Queensland economy. We know it is our natural assets, our national parks, that draw tourists here from around the world, and we know that it is not good enough to just talk about ecotourism because that will not create jobs. You have to deliver new, exciting, world-class experiences, and that is what we are doing.

Domestic and Family Violence

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) (10.11 am): I am incredibly proud of the progress we have made in improving services for women and children who are experiencing domestic and family violence. The Palaszczuk government has opened the first new shelters in over 20 years, with two more to come. This parliament has passed several laws to increase protection for women and to hold perpetrators to account, and we are funding more and more programs on the ground across Queensland to support women and change perpetrator behaviour. However, it is about more than implementing the *Not now, not ever* recommendations, of which 55 are now complete and action has been taken on all of the remaining. It is also, importantly, about cultural change.

We are reaching the end of Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month, and it has been heartening to see so many organisations take up the *Not now, not ever* challenge. If we include attendance at the Cowboys NRL and the Suns AFL DV round footy matches, the DV prevention month events have included over 33,000 Queenslanders.

One of the most important events held this month was the 'Umi One, Mepla Way', the first-ever domestic and family violence prevention conference on Thursday Island. As both ministerial champion for the Torres Strait and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, I was so proud to join key partners and community champions from most of the Torres Strait Islands at the conference last week. My department proudly sponsored this conference, and it was moving to sit with elders, emerging community leaders and people who work in services that help victims of violence every day.

Aunties, uncles, police and local councillors all yarned about ending violence against women, achieving gender equality and tackling the attitudes and behaviours that underpin a cycle of violence. An incredible contribution came from NRL great and TI local Michael Barni, who told his story of growing up in a house of violence and of his own use of violence. He is now a powerful advocate for the power of behavioural change programs and works with Indigenous youth to connect to culture and reject violence.

During this month we also announced extra funding for DV services including $130,000 for the Redlands Centre for Women in Cleveland to employ a counsellor. This came to my attention after the member for Capalaba, Don Brown, organised meetings and made representations on their behalf. It would be hard to find a stronger, more effective voice in the Redlands than Don Brown.

Speaking of the Redlands, I also recently attended an annual domestic family violence fundraising dinner by Mayor Karen Williams and the Redlands City Council. A big congratulations to the mayor and the council. Whether it is remote Indigenous communities or councils in the south-east corner, all across Queensland people have embraced the month and I wish to place on the record my sincere gratitude and appreciation.

ABSENCE OF MINISTER

Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (10.14 am): I wish to advise the House that the Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries and Minister for Rural Economic Development is absent from the House this week due to family reasons. I further advise that, in addition to his existing portfolio, Minister Lynham has been appointed Acting Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries and Minister for Rural Economic Development for the duration of this absence.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Cedar Woods Development

Mr WALKER (Mansfield—LNP) (10.15 am): I give notice that I will move—

That this House condemns the Palaszczuk government for its rank hypocrisy and planning uncertainty regarding the Cedar Woods development.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Carmichael Mine

Mr EMERSON (Indooroopilly—LNP) (10.16 am): This government is hopelessly divided. Civil war has broken out in the ranks of the Labor Party over the Adani project. We know that cabinet is split and they cannot make a decision. The factions are fighting. Sadly, this factional fighting is not about what is best for Queenslanders desperate for a job. This fight is about what is best for those factional power brokers desperate to hold on to their seats and keep the internal grip on power in the Labor Party.

This bitter internal fight has been playing out behind the scenes for many months, but tensions exploded in the last few days in a dramatic way. On Friday, after hugely damaging leaks emerged, this rudderless Premier refused to confirm or deny reports of a secret deal. The Treasurer was then sent out to try to clean up the very public mess, denying any such deal had been done. It was all part of a cover-up. The most telling quotes of the last few days have come from the left faction ministers who have publicly pushed the Premier into a corner. The member for Yeerongpilly was quick to remind the Premier of Labor's pre-election promise saying, 'Our position has been very clear since the days of opposition. We said we would not subsidise that project. That is still our position. We've been consistent year in, year out.' The Deputy Premier went even further, 'We've got a pre-election commitment in relation to any subsidisation to Adani and we made that commitment very clearly.' That is from the Labor left. This secret deal would be a broken promise.

The member for Mackay, who represents a region that would benefit greatly from the $16.5 billion Adani Carmichael mine, has said, 'Adani shouldn't be trying to blackmail Queensland,' and 'I think they are playing games, holding Queensland to ransom.' What did the member for Rockhampton say? Bill Byrne said that royalty arrangements were being considered by the government: 'Queensland Labor has always taken a sensible and prudent approach to resource development.' This was an act of sabotage from the left to force the Premier from the right into an embarrassing backflip. Clearly the government was working on a secret deal behind the scenes. The left, worried about how this deal would play out in seats like South Brisbane, decided to start a public brawl over the Adani project. We all know how it is going to end, with a public backdown from the Premier who has been overruled by her own cabinet.

The leaks have once again illustrated what is at the core of this government. This government does not care about the jobs of people in regional Queensland. They care about holding on to their own jobs. Queenslanders deserve better than a do-nothing government that has descended into civil war.

(Time expired)

Cross River Rail

Hon. JA TRAD (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning) (10.19 am): In the last few days we have seen the Turnbull government back Sydney over Queensland when it comes to vital infrastructure. Analysis done by the Victorian government details that 46 per cent of the federal infrastructure budget is pouring into New South Wales. What that means is that there is less money for other jurisdictions, particularly Queensland. There is no new funding for Cross River Rail, the Bruce Highway or any other major project that would drive jobs and the economy of our state. Sadly, the so-called independent authority Infrastructure Australia has just become a political tool to be used by the Turnbull government to avoid investing a fair share into our state.

I place on record our engagement with IA since submitting the comprehensive 2,000-page business case in June last year. IA's first set of questions about the business case came in on 7 July last year and we responded 11 days later. Then IA asked for further modelling, which was provided in November last year, and guess what? That actually showed an even higher cost-benefit ratio for the project. Then we had some follow-up questions about this revised modelling that was based on new policies such as the Fairer Fares scheme and new decisions such as rolling out the European Train Control System throughout our network. These questions were also addressed. During this period there were frequent meetings between my officers and Infrastructure Australia.

To be sure they had everything they needed, my director-general wrote to IA on 7 April this year with the final response to the outstanding questions. If any other information was required this letter asked IA to contact my agency, and the response from IA was absolute silence. There was not one

word for six weeks until last Thursday when the Prime Minister claimed that there were still issues outstanding. Then what happened? With behaviour like that it is no wonder the states are losing confidence in Infrastructure Australia and its CEO, Phil Davies.

Cross River Rail will transform South-East Queensland. It would be a shame if the Commonwealth government's and Infrastructure Australia's inactions were to cost Queensland thousands of jobs that will be delivered through the construction and operation of Cross River Rail. IA has previously ranked Cross River Rail as a critical infrastructure project and a high-priority initiative, notwithstanding their political games. Along with the Brisbane Metro, Cross River Rail will mean more jobs, better public transport and less congestion for South-East Queenslanders.

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance

Mrs FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (10.22 am): If people ever want to see the cost of this government's inaction it is the price Queensland jobseekers will pay by having to remain on the dole queue for even longer all because of this government's inaction, all because this government—

Ms Jones interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Minister for Education, you will have an opportunity to speak if you speak with the Leader of the House. I counsel you.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON:—all because this do-nothing government could not get its act together and make a decision to support Adani's Carmichael mine. After two years of negotiating with Adani, the Premier and the Treasurer were cut off at the pass by a leaked CBRC document last week. I am sure the Premier only needs to look to her right to discover the culprit behind that leaked document.

The LNP knows Queenslanders need jobs. It is the left-wingers from South Brisbane, Mount Coot-tha and Yeerongpilly who need to get out into regional Queensland—not just fly in and out—and talk to locals who will give them some home truths about regional Queensland. They need to listen to the mums and dads; they need to listen to the contractors and the small business owners. We need to be encouraging people to live in rural and regional Queensland. We want to encourage people to stay in the regions and, most importantly, we want to give them some hope.

Regional Queenslanders know what it is like to be searching for a job; what it is like to worry week in, week out about paying their bills; what it is like to look at their savings and wonder how long they can pay their rent before they have to sleep in their car. They will tell the government what it is like to have to decide what bills to pay.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. If the cross-chatter continues I will consider inviting the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to start again.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Excellent!

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: That is not an invitation to do it. It will not happen. I now call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and we will listen to her.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Most importantly, what regional Queenslanders want is some hope. This government cannot and simply will not make a decision. This is a do-nothing government. This government has completely lost its way. It has lost sight of the people who are desperately relying on this government to give Adani the go-ahead. It has lost sight of the fact that it needs to govern for all of Queensland, not for itself and not for Labor. It should not be governing to keep green preferences in the city seats. This government is thinking of just itself by denying the go-ahead for the jobs that come with Adani. Queenslanders are the real losers of this government's inaction.

Leader of the Opposition

Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (10.25 am): In the last few months Queenslanders have been subjected to the vainglorious yet ham-fisted spectacle of the Leader of the Opposition trying to rebrand himself. We have had the dirt bikes; we have had the stubbies and thongs; we have had him going hard in the front bar of the pub sipping on the shandies. The Leader of the Opposition is looking to the past to try to explain to Queenslanders who he really is.

All of this really is a sideshow to the one real issue which he refuses to deal with and that is his relationship with One Nation. The tawdry affair with One Nation is there for all to see. The latest revelations expose One Nation as a political party not of principle but of profit. They are not just content to use the election to line their own pockets but are a party happy to rip off their own members, supporters and candidates in the process.

Elections are meant to be a contest of ideas and philosophy, not boiler room schemes to rip off voters on the way through. Yet James Ashby and Pauline Hanson are running One Nation as a money-making exercise, clipping the ticket of every vote on the way through because for them every vote is another dollar that they can find to put in their coffers. We are still waiting for answers on who owns the plane used by Pauline Hanson in the last election campaign. She claims it was a gift from a generous benefactor—we should all be so lucky—which is at complete odds with what James Ashby said, which was that he bought the plane. This comes from a man who said a few months ago he could not pay his own legal bills.

The Queensland public need answers and they need answers from the Leader of the Opposition, who has kicked the door wide open to a coalition government with One Nation. He needs to find courage, finally show some leadership and say he is not an accessory to One Nation's scheme to rip off Queensland voters. For once in his life he needs to stand up to One Nation and rule out a deal with One Nation. That is critical to the future of his leadership.

He has distanced himself from everything in the past. It appears he was not the treasurer; he did not do any of that in the last government. That was Campbell Newman. Do honourable members remember that? It was not his fault; it was not his doing. What happened when his staffer was caught out talking to Ashby about a deal? He did not know anything about it. He put it off. It was someone else's problem.

The Leader of the Opposition is like an ostrich with his head in the sand. It is not good enough for Queensland. He needs to show some courage and rule out a deal with One Nation once and for all.

Carmichael Mine

Mr NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (10.28 am): At a time of unacceptably high unemployment across regional Queensland this bungling, do-nothing Labor government has come up with its most costly bungle of all. The toxic brew of self-interest and division concocted by the Deputy Premier and her kitchen cabinet of the loony left designed to kill off the $16.5 billion Adani Carmichael mine puts green inner city preferences and phoney ideology before thousands of Queensland jobs and billions of dollars in investment. Yesterday was a test of this Premier's leadership and she failed. Adani cancelled its crucial final investment decision because this Labor government's conceited, scurrilously compromised left faction revolted and walked all over the Premier. A compromise government which is beholden to the green guerrillas of inner Brisbane and an undermined and wounded Premier spell continued joblessness for all those regional Queenslanders many hundreds of kilometres away who are counting on the Adani mine. Almost 15,000 young Queenslanders have lost their jobs since the election of this inexperienced do-nothing Palaszczuk government, yet the member for South Brisbane is more concerned with protecting her own $320,000 a year job than giving regional Queenslanders a fair go.

This is a deal that the Premier and Treasurer have already had more than two years to get right. Now it has been indefinitely delayed and the Premier unceremoniously outed as a puppet of the left. Her regional caucus members have all been silenced and the once vocal union movement is powerless against the omnipresence of Labor's green shadow cabinet. The block of greens—the member for South Brisbane, the member for Mount Coot-tha and the member for Yeerongpilly—have blockaded jobs for Queenslanders. They have stopped a first mover in the Galilee Basin, which is a region that could support more than $50 billion in investment, more than 16,000 construction jobs and more than 15,000 ongoing jobs. The block of greens say to regional Queensland that the jobs of a few Labor MPs in Brisbane seats are far more important than thousands of jobs in Queensland. The price of this do-nothing inexperienced Labor government is thousands of lost job opportunities, billions of dollars of lost investment—

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Logan, you are warned under standing order 253A. I could hear you loud and clear from your position in the back.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr SPEAKER: Question time will finish at 11.31.

Carmichael Mine

Mr NICHOLLS (10.31 am): My first question is to the Premier. I refer to today's report that the cabinet was unable to agree on a royalty rate for the Carmichael mine and I ask: is this divided cabinet and the fact that thousands of jobs for Queenslanders hang in the balance not a complete failure of the Premier's leadership?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. As I have said very clearly in the House today, we are firmly focused on building resource jobs and renewable jobs in this state. We will do everything that we can to ensure that jobs are created, especially in those areas of our state experiencing high unemployment. That is why $100 million for the Back to Work program has been put in place to drive employment across the state and create 4,000 jobs. We heard the Attorney and Minister for Training talk about Skilling Queenslanders for Work and creating thousands of jobs, which was a program they shut down when they were in government. I was asked a question today by the Leader of the Opposition, the former treasurer, who axed 14,000 jobs in this state. Do not come in here and lecture me about jobs, because I will put my record against their record when it comes to creating jobs.

We know that communities facing high unemployment are hurting, and that is a direct result of the actions of the former LNP government. I remember the three years I spent in opposition travelling from community to community listening to the tales of people who had lost their jobs under those opposite. Who was the architect of that? The man sitting there. What I would like to see from those opposite is some leadership and ruling out a deal with One Nation.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Premier, I would ask you to make sure that your answer is relevant to the question.

Ms PALASZCZUK: It is very relevant, Mr Speaker. We are talking about leadership, and I firmly say to the people of Queensland that there will be no deals with One Nation. I challenge the Leader of the Opposition to stand up today and say exactly the same thing, especially after we have seen revelations today about trying to—

Mr SPEAKER: One moment, Premier. I urge you to make your answer relevant to the question that has been asked.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I rise to a point of order. The Leader of the Opposition asked a question about leadership, and the Premier is making some points in relation to leadership by comparing and contrasting leadership positions and styles. I would contend that the answer of the Premier is entirely relevant.

Mr SPEAKER: I call the Premier.

Ms PALASZCZUK: We have seen revelations two days in a row on the front page of the *Courier-Mail* about One Nation trying to trick—

Mr SEENEY: I rise to a point of order. I raise the question of relevance in relation to the Premier's answer. The question was about the Carmichael mine and Adani. The Premier has not—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, you will all have a chance to rise on a point of order on relevance if you choose. I will hear the member for Callide first.

Mr SEENEY: The Premier has not been able to bring herself to say the word 'Adani' in her answer, and therefore the answer that she is giving about One Nation must surely be irrelevant.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I rise to a point of order. The Leader of the Opposition's question was framed in relation to a reference to the Carmichael mine project, but the question related to leadership and that is why the Premier's answer is entirely relevant in responding to the essence of the question, the core of the question and the actual question—not the framework.

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, do you have anything further you wish to add in answer to the question that has been asked?

Ms PALASZCZUK: Absolutely. Today is the day that the Leader of the Opposition can rule out a deal with One Nation once and for all. Leadership is about standing firm, putting it all on the table and taking a principled stance in the public arena. That is exactly what I will do.

Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the Leader of the Opposition for his next question, I am informed that we have students from St Joseph's Primary School in the electorate of Sandgate observing our proceedings. Welcome.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Carmichael Mine

Mr NICHOLLS: My second question is to the Premier. In light of her cabinet failing to make a decision on royalty rates for Adani's Carmichael mine, does the Premier agree that her claims of putting jobs first are nothing more than rhetoric and the reality is that Labor's green preference deals will always come before jobs for Queenslanders?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for that question about preference deals. Let me make it very clear that there will be no preference deals with One Nation.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: If you ask the question, you get the answer. If you want to talk about jobs, let's talk about jobs. There have been 59,000 jobs created in this state under my government. Compared to the rabble opposite, I am absolutely proud of this cabinet and this government. Let us be honest: the public do not even know that he is the Leader of the Opposition. They still think Lawrence Springborg is the leader.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr Bleijie: They know Jackie Trad is the Premier.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I know that the member for Kawana will never again be the state's attorney-general after his debacle. He was the worst attorney-general this state has ever seen.

Ms Trad: In Australia—in the nation.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take that interjection. You could not think of anyone worse than him. Even the federal Attorney-General, George Brandis, says those opposite are very mediocre. He is from their own side! Now they want to get rid of Barry O'Sullivan. They have to get rid of a few senators—

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I am having difficulty hearing the Premier. Premier, do you have anything further to add?

Ms PALASZCZUK: Absolutely. Those opposite want to talk about jobs, so let us talk about jobs. There is a $40 billion infrastructure fund to grow jobs across our state. Market-led proposals are being driven by our Treasurer. The Logan Motorway has $512 million, supporting 1,300 jobs. Minister Bailey is working with the Commonwealth to get extra money for the M1. Those opposite failed in that regard. Our tourism minister—the best tourism minister in Australia—is driving tourism in this state. Some 1.2 million tickets for the Commonwealth Games have been sold.

Ms Trad: That is lots of jobs.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is right.

Mr SEENEY: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. This morning the Premier has been asked two questions about the Carmichael mine and Adani. In both her answers the Premier has not been able to bring herself to say the word 'Adani' or to mention the Carmichael mine. I draw your attention—

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, I am having difficulty hearing the member for Callide.

Mr SEENEY: As I said, the Premier has not been able to bring herself to say the word 'Adani' or to mention the Carmichael mine. I draw your attention to the rules of this House about the relevance of answers to questions.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: Mr Speaker, on the point of order, the students here from St Joseph's school in Bracken Ridge all know the difference between a preamble to a question and a question. Both questions asked this morning by the Leader of the Opposition have involved a preamble which has set a context, but in the first instance the specific question was about leadership—as you ruled upon, Mr Speaker—and in the second instance the question was in relation to jobs and preference deals. The Premier has been answering the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition. Mr Speaker, I suggest that you rule that way and maybe remind the Leader of Opposition Business to not keep interrupting the Premier.

Mr WATTS: Mr Speaker, on the point of order, I think the students from St Joseph's college also know the difference between relevant and irrelevant.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr Mander: Just mention the word.

Mr SPEAKER: No, I will mention the word, member for Everton. My recollection is that the question related to Adani and touched on the issue of preferences. I find that the Premier's answer is relevant because of the scope of the question that was asked. Premier, do you have anything further to add?

Ms PALASZCZUK: Of course, Mr Speaker. I always have more to say. Let us be very clear: 59,000 jobs have been created under my government. We have thousands more to go. Next month the Treasurer will bring down the budget. It is going to be gold. There will be a jobs bonanza. I cannot wait.

Works for Queensland

Mr PEARCE: My question without notice is to the Premier. Will the Premier please update the House on the government's Works for Queensland program and how it has been received by local councils?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Mirani very much for that very important question. As a regional member, he knows how important jobs are in his local community. I am often in his electorate meeting with both him and the member for Mackay, Julieanne Gilbert. I know that they are 100 per cent focused on jobs.

Our Back to Work and Skilling Queenslanders for Work programs are working. We also have Works for Queensland, which is a $200 million program to deliver jobs and really help out local councils in rural and regional Queensland. Some 65 councils have benefited from the program. I thank the Treasurer and the Deputy Premier for working very hard with the local councils right across rural and regional Queensland to ensure we get those projects up and running quickly. What is the most important outcome of that? It is getting people into work. I can report that under the program 582 projects have commenced and $8.84 million has been spent as of 30 April 2017.

I think it is very important that I update the House and the public about what the mayors are saying about this important program. Mayor John Ferguson writes that Works for Queensland grants have 'provided significant stimulus to our region'. Banana Mayor Nev Ferrier writes that 'the $1.73 million received by Banana shire will certainly help drive jobs and investment in the region'. Bundaberg Mayor Jack Dempsey—we all remember Jack; he is a nice guy—writes that 'your government's $200 million Works for Queensland infrastructure program to help spark job creation in the regions will have a real impact across the state'. That is from one of their own.

Diamantina Mayor Geoff Morton thanks the government for its generous allocation of more than $1 million and he appreciates that although 'we are a long way away, we are definitely not out of sight'. Flinders shire CEO Graham King says that 'council greatly appreciates your government's initiative in establishing Works for Queensland and the very efficient way this program has been implemented'. The list goes on. I have also received letters from Livingstone Mayor Bill Ludwig, Charters Towers council, McKinlay council and Hinchinbrook council.

This program clearly shows that we are a government that works with councils to deliver jobs and deliver projects right across our state. We will continue to do that for many years to come.

Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I am informed that we have students from the Caningeraba State School in the electorate of Burleigh in the gallery observing our proceedings. Welcome.

Carmichael Mine

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: My question is to the Deputy Premier. Queenslanders just want a straight answer to this question: does the Deputy Premier support Adani's Carmichael mine?

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

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Leader of the House, what is your point of order? No? I have assumed that the question is linked to the Deputy Premier's portfolio.

Ms TRAD: I assume the question was asked because I am a member of the Palaszczuk Labor government that supports jobs in regional Queensland in the resources industry, in tourism, in construction, in small business, in agriculture. I am part of a government that is passionate about jobs and passionate about delivering jobs right throughout Queensland. I am very proud of the fact that this government focuses right across the state, as the Premier just detailed, in the Works for Queensland program—a program that is supporting 5,700 regional jobs right across Queensland.

When we came to government, we made some very clear commitments around the Carmichael mine proposal. We supported it, but we said that the LNP's plan to dump three million cubic metres of dredge spoil on the reef was not supported. We also said that the LNP's plan to dump dredge spoil on the Caley Valley wetlands was not supported. We also said that the secret deal that the member for Callide was doing with the Adani mine proponents to the exclusion of the then treasurer, the member for Clayfield, was not to happen.

In contrast, the Premier has been very strong and very clear about this. Let us be clear: when the LNP was in government it wanted to hand over at least $500 million as a grant—Queenslanders' money—to Adani for the rail line. In contrast, we said that we would not do that.

Mr SEENEY: I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, the question to the Deputy Premier was very short and succinct. It was a question to which all of Queensland wants to know the answer. Does she or does she not support the Adani Carmichael mine? Could I suggest that, rather than trying to rewrite history, you instruct her to answer that very simple question.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I rise to a point of order. The Deputy Premier is clearly answering the question that has been put before her. We had earlier points of order.

Mr Seeney interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Callide, you have made your point of order. The Leader of the House is now raising his point of order. I will listen to it in silence.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: Mr Speaker, earlier, the Leader of Opposition Business raised points of order trying to suggest that the Premier was not answering a question because she was not making reference to the Carmichael project. We have a situation where the Deputy Premier is clearly making reference to the Carmichael project and its history—how it has come about—and its future. I suggest that the Deputy Premier is clearly answering the question. The Leader of Opposition Business is trying to interrupt her ability to answer the question and put facts on the record.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, members. I find that the Deputy Premier's answer is relevant. I understand that she has already stated that she has supported it. Deputy Premier, do you have anything further that you wish to add?

Ms TRAD: As I have also said in the media, I am part of a government that supports this project and wants to see the jobs for Queenslanders. We made commitments that we will not do secret deals and we will not hand over taxpayers' funds to build the infrastructure that Adani wants—unlike the member for Callide, who did secret deals and did whatever it took and, at the time, cut out the treasurer, the member for Clayfield. In contrast, the Premier has been strong and clear. This will go through a cabinet process and there will be a framework going forward.

Federal Funding

Mr POWER: My question without notice is to the Premier. I note that last week in Brisbane the Premier met with Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull. Will the Premier update the House on whether the Prime Minister promised that the federal government would give Queenslanders a fair share?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Logan for that very important question. I think it is an important question for all of Queensland because, unfortunately, when it comes to Queenslanders standing up, standing firm to get their fair share, we are seeing little traction from the federal government. I was grateful that we had over an hour to discuss a range of issues. The Prime Minister was courteous and we had a lengthy discussion canvassing a whole range of issues.

One issue that was front and centre is our No. 1 infrastructure project, Cross River Rail. This is an important project. Not only is it our No. 1 infrastructure project; it is the No. 1 infrastructure project for Australia. The federal government handed down its budget just a few weeks ago. Did we see any money allocated for Cross River Rail in that budget? No. The excuse that was given was that we had not provided a business case. One thing that was conceded by the Prime Minister was that, yes, they had received a business case.

Once again, all we are seeing is roadblock after roadblock after roadblock being put in front of us to deliver this vital project for Queensland. The Cross River Rail Delivery Authority is up and running. The board has been appointed. I know that South-East Queensland commuters want this project, because it reduces congestion on our roads. It cuts down travel time. This is a job-generating project. Clearly, the state government needs a contribution from the federal government so that it can get this project moving. This project is incredibly important for the people of the south-east network of our state, because it will not only cut down travel times but also create tens of thousands of jobs over the life of the project. We need to get it underway and we need to get it underway this year.

We will work very closely with the federal government to do everything that we can. When Malcolm Turnbull became Prime Minister, he came to the party and worked with us and the council to deliver the second stage of the light rail, which is incredibly important not only for public transport on the Gold Coast but also for connectivity for the Commonwealth Games next year. We will continue to fight for Queensland. We will continue to stand up for Queensland. I would like to see those opposite also stand up for Queensland.

An opposition member interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take that interjection. There is a 2,000-page business case with the Commonwealth. There is no business case for the Perth metro and there is no business case for the connection to Badgerys Creek.

(Time expired)

Adani, Royalties

Mr EMERSON: My question is to the Premier. Townsville Mayor Jenny Hill has told the media today that Under Treasurer Jim Murphy went to India with the Premier with the clear understanding that he was there to discuss royalties. How long has Jim Murphy been negotiating with Adani? What royalty concessions has Labor's Under Treasurer formally offered on behalf of taxpayers?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for the question. From the outset, I say that the regional mayors have been working very closely with my government in terms of delivering Works for Queensland. I took a delegation of regional Queensland mayors, including Mayor Jenny Hill, to India to also discuss matters relating to Adani. This project is incredibly important for regional Queensland. In regional Queensland there is not a street you can walk down where people do not understand how important this project is for jobs in that area. My government has done everything that is required in terms of the approvals to be given to the Adani Carmichael mine.

We have also had conversations with the federal government in relation to amendments to the Native Title Act. Let me make it very clear: my cabinet is very determined that we will open up the resource basins of not just the Galilee, but also the North West Minerals Province and the Bowen Basin, something that those opposite neglected for many, many years. Why will we do that? Because we understand that regional unemployment is higher than it should be. Why is it higher? Because those opposite did nothing for three years. They failed to deliver for Queensland. They failed to generate jobs. The architect of the destruction of jobs in this state is Tim Nicholls who is now the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr EMERSON: I rise to a point of order. The question clearly referred to the Under Treasurer Jim Murphy and what royalty concessions has Labor's Under Treasurer formally offered on behalf of taxpayers. The Premier has not mentioned Jim Murphy or those offers.

Mr SPEAKER: I call the Premier to make her answer relevant.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Jim Murphy is the Under Treasurer. There you go. Is the member happy now I have mentioned his name?

Mr EMERSON: I rise to a point of order. If the Premier feels that she can make a mockery of question time by not answering the question—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

Mr EMERSON: This is a genuine question, a very clear question about the Under Treasurer Jim Murphy and what royalty concessions the Under Treasurer has formally offered Adani. I can understand why the Premier does not want to reveal that. She wants to make a mockery of question time, but I urge her to answer the question.

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, can you answer the question.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Yes, I am answering the question. Let us go back to the fact that the regional mayors came with me to India. Jim Murphy, the Under Treasurer, was there, and so was Dave Stewart. What I am saying very clearly is that cabinet is going to consider a proposal to open up three huge basins in Queensland to generate jobs. That is the framework and the policy proposals that cabinet and my government will be considering. What that will do is not just unlock the Galilee, but it will unlock the other precincts as well.

Cross River Rail

Mr KELLY: My question is to the Deputy Premier. Will the Deputy Premier update the House on the Cross River Rail, particularly the benefits it will bring to rail commuters on the south side, and is the Deputy Premier aware of any alternative approaches?

Ms TRAD: I thank the member for Greenslopes for the question. I know that the member for Greenslopes has actually been out talking to his constituents about exactly this project so I do want to acknowledge all of the good work he is doing on the ground in relation to this. Cross River Rail is simply our No. 1 infrastructure priority for South-East Queensland because it means jobs, it means less congestion, it means faster travel time and, ultimately, in terms of people's lives, it means more time at home with their families.

Cross River Rail is ready to go and, as the Premier has already said, we are deeply disappointed that the federal government did not make an allocation to this critical infrastructure priority for Queensland. Forty-six per cent of infrastructure dollars will go to New South Wales, but in terms of assisting with our No. 1 infrastructure priority there is nothing. We saw a number of projects without business cases allocated funding out of the federal budget, but Cross River Rail, with a 2,000 page, $7 million business case, independently reviewed, received nothing—absolutely nothing.

When it all comes down to it, what is the reason for the federal government not funding Cross River Rail? It is actually all about politics. Recently it was the federal LNP member for Bowman who let the cat out of the bag. The federal member for Bowman said on ABC Radio on 10 May in relation to Cross River Rail—

The LNP opposition will come up with their version and the election this year will decide what we do. Labor can fight it out with the LNP about what is the most cost-effective solution and we'll be at the table with a $10 billion fund to fund it, but it's got to stack up.

Steve Austin then asked—

So, the federal coalition wants to wait until after the state election to see what the figures, the final figures will be?

Andrew Laming responded—

If the figures come forward sooner, that would be great, Steve, but let's hear what the state LNP opposition comes up with.

There we have it! There is one reason why Malcolm Turnbull is not funding Cross River Rail and that is because Tim Nicholls needs a hand up. He needs a hand up because we know, as federal Attorney-General Brandis said, this is a very mediocre opposition. One cannot help but give credit where credit is due: Malcolm Turnbull is trying to do his bit. What that means is that Queenslanders are losing out on jobs. Queenslanders are being held to ransom because Tim Nicholls, the member for Clayfield, the Leader of the Opposition, cannot do his job. He has no cut-through, he has no commitment.

Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Hinchinbrook, I am informed that we have another group of students from St Mary's College Ipswich in the electorate of Ipswich. Welcome.

Carmichael Mine

Mr CRIPPS: My question without notice is to the Premier. I refer to media reports that Labor has been negotiating royalty arrangements for Adani's Carmichael mine for the past two years. What message is Labor's indecision on the Carmichael mine sending to other potential investors about the sovereign risk associated with doing business in Queensland under her government?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Hinchinbrook very much for that question. As I said in my previous answer—let me repeat it—we are 100 per cent focused on growing jobs in this state, both in the resources sector and in the renewables sector, in the tourism sector, in agriculture, in construction, in education with Advancing Education and in health. What my government is clearly looking at is a policy framework that is going to open up areas of high unemployment, especially in those basins I mentioned: the Bowen Basin, the Galilee Basin and the North West Minerals Province.

That is what we are focused on. What did those opposite do when they had three years in office? Absolutely nothing! They cut jobs. They cut services. Now we are looking at proposals tackling areas especially where there is high unemployment in this state.

Next month, let me make it very clear to all members of this House, will be a jobs budget. I do not believe there will be a single member in this House who will not be happy with this budget. We have sat down and looked at areas of high unemployment in the state, we have looked at where there are issues with youth unemployment and we will tackle those issues head on because that is what we were elected to do. We were elected to find a better way for Queensland and that is exactly what we are doing—finding a better way for Queenslanders no matter where they live. Our social justice reforms in the state have been second to none. In relation to issues that were too hard and too complex for governments to tackle in years gone by we have actually made decisions and we have implemented them.

When it comes to the resources sector, while other states are not even looking at their gas reserves, my government is opening up those gas reserves because we are an energy state. We have seen over $2 billion invested in renewables in our state and where are those jobs? In regional Queensland benefiting regional Queenslanders who are doing it tough.

Let me also make it clear that every day I am more than happy to get up in this House and remind the Leader of the Opposition of what he did to Queenslanders: 14,000 jobs cut at a minimum. There were other cuts that were made through other organisations cutting services and we have had to repair the damage inflicted by those opposite. Do not come in here and try to lecture me about jobs. There have been 59,000 jobs under my government. Those opposite left the state with one of the highest unemployment rates we have seen. We are bringing that down. Everyone on my team—every single member—is focused on growing jobs.

Unemployment

Mr CRAWFORD: My question without notice is to the Treasurer. I refer to the recent release of unemployment figures by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, and I ask: will the Treasurer advise the House of recent assessments expressed by private sector economists about Queensland's employment data?

Mr PITT: I thank the honourable member for Barron River for his question. At the outset, it is heartening to see jobs growth come back to Queensland after what we saw under the previous government, which was a period of negativity and cuts to jobs and services. Since this government has come to office, we have seen the creation of more than 59,200 net new jobs in this state. We should take a moment to think about that number, as it is a significant outcome and it represents exactly the agenda that our leader, Annastacia Palaszczuk, and our entire government are committed to. Over the past 12 months, Queensland has had the second largest increase in trend employment. We have had six months in a row of positive jobs growth. Therefore, when we talk about what this side of the House is doing to support local economies and growth in jobs, there is a very clear contrast with what the previous government did. Under our government, a net average of 2,190 jobs a month has been created in Queensland; under the Newman government, that figure was 830. Therefore, we are averaging more than twice the jobs created each month.

The member's question raised an important point, as he asked if there was any independent analysis of what is happening. At the last sitting, the LNP referenced independent economist Gene Tunny no fewer than 10 times, if I counted correctly. I too have referenced Mr Tunny in the past. Mr Tunny said that the latest ABS job figures have made it likely that job growth under the Palaszczuk government will be stronger in its term of government than during the Newman government. If it is not enough to hear from Mr Tunny, another Far North Queenslander, Pete Faulkner of Conus, said that last Thursday's job report was 'a strong report for the state'.

As the member for Barron River knows well, we have seen a turnaround in the unemployment rate in Far North Queensland. The 12-month moving average has come down to its lowest level since October 2011. That means it is lower than it was throughout the entire time the previous government was in office and is actually going in the right direction. In addition, the youth unemployment figure has come down from 28 per cent to around 21 per cent. The Youth Boost is working and the activities that this government is undertaking are working.

It is really important to note that those opposite inherited a 5.5 per cent unemployment rate across the state, which blew out to almost 6.7 per cent for four months in a row. That shows a significant difference in the way we approach government. It is important for Queenslanders to know that, when we talk about jobs, we talk about creating jobs; when they talk about jobs, they talk about cutting them.

Carmichael Mine

Mr BLEIJIE: My question without notice is to the Premier. In light of the extraordinary uncertainty of the Carmichael mine project because of this government's do-nothing approach to all major projects, can the Premier tell the House why she is putting the member for South Brisbane's job ahead of the jobs of thousands of regional Queenslanders?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Kawana for that question. As I have said, my government has worked very hard to progress the Adani Carmichael mine through all necessary approvals, including the environmental conditions. Let us go through a few of them, because he asked about the processes. The minister for DNRM approved the three mining leases for the Carmichael coalmine. The environmental authority for the Carmichael coalmine and rail project was granted. The environmental authority for the Abbot Point terminal was appointed. The licence to access surface water from the strategic reserve for state purposes was granted. Adani was granted an associated water licence for groundwater. I have three pages, that go through step by step—

Government members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Shall I go through them all? All right, I will keep going. DNRM granted Adani an extension—

Mr BLEIJIE: I rise to a point of order. I apologise, Mr Speaker, but the Premier just said that I asked about processes. I have reviewed my question. I talked about extraordinary uncertainty and the do-nothing approach of this Labor government, and I asked her to tell the House why she is putting the member for South Brisbane's job ahead of those of regional Queenslanders. I did not ask about processes.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The member for Kawana asked about processes. I am more than happy to go through the milestones.

Mr SPEAKER: I do not think the member for Kawana used the word 'processes'. I will check *Hansard* later today.

An honourable member interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you for the clarification. I will allow the answer because it is relevant to the questions asked.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am more than happy to talk about Adani and what my government has done to facilitate the process. These are the milestones in order of priority. On 3 April 2016, the minister for DNRM approved the three mining leases for the Carmichael coalmine: tick. On 2 February 2016, the environmental authority for the Carmichael coalmine and rail project was granted by DEHP. On 14 December 2015, DEHP granted the environmental authority for the TO Abbot Point.

On 29 March 2017, DNRM granted Adani a licence to access the surface water from the strategic reserve for state purposes as specified in the Burdekin Basin Resource Operations Plan. On 29 March 2017, DNRM granted Adani an associated water licence for groundwater. On 27 April 2017, DNRM granted Adani an extension to the Belyando construction water permit.

On 22 December 2015, the Coordinator-General approved a material change of use for rail package 1 in the Galilee Basin State Development Area. On 10 March 2016, the Coordinator-General approved a material change of use application for Adani rail package 2 in the GBSDA. On 2 August 2016—

Mr Bleijie: What happened in cabinet on 22 May 2017?

Ms PALASZCZUK: They do not want to hear it. There are pages here and they should let me keep going. On 2 August 2016, the Coordinator-General approved a material change of use application for rail infrastructure and nonresident workforce accommodation rail package 3 in the GBSDA. On 10 March 2016, the Coordinator-General approved a material change of use application for Adani rail package 4 in the GBSDA. On 1 December 2016, the Coordinator-General—

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: They asked the question and I am telling them everything my government has done to facilitate this project.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: They do not want to hear it. It all happened under my government.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. I know what you want to know, member for Kawana, but the Premier is answering the question.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am up to page 2. On 1 December 2016, the Coordinator-General approved a material change of use application for Adani rail package 5 in the APSDA. On 10 March 2015, the Coordinator-General approved a material—

(Time expired)

Preventative Health Measures

Mr MADDEN: My question is to the Minister for Health and the Minister for Ambulance Services. Will the minister inform the House of the preventive health measures restored by the Palaszczuk government to help Queenslanders become among the healthiest people in the world by 2026?

Mr DICK: I am delighted to say that the Palaszczuk government will be delivering on our election commitment to establish a public health commission. Later today I will introduce a bill to establish the Healthy Futures Commission Queensland, which will focus on reducing obesity and chronic health rates in Queensland, with a particular focus on children, young people and families. I was encouraged that the LNP members for Caloundra, Gaven and Mount Ommaney supported in principle the establishment of a public health commission when the matter was considered by the parliamentary health committee. However, it is a shame that the member or Everton thinks that he can improve the health of Queenslanders by a tweet. What did he tweet yesterday? He tweeted—

I can save Qld taxpayers $20m in fighting obesity. Eat fruit & Veges every day instead of a Big Mac & large coke. More Labor waste.

Tabled paper: Document, dated 21 May 2017, displaying social media post by Mr Tim Mander MP regarding fighting obesity [738].

I will tell the member for Everton that when the Beattie Labor government started its program in 2001 to reduce daily smoking rates we did not reduce daily smoking rates from 30 per of adults to 12 per cent today by tweeting about it. We did it by investing in public and preventative health.

Mr Mander interjected.

Mr DICK: Well may the member for Everton call out because I and every member of this House know his form when he was in government with the member for Clayfield and the member for Indooroopilly, who also called this a waste. How many jobs did they cut from public and preventative health in Queensland Health? Not seven jobs, not 77 jobs, but 177 jobs were gutted from public and preventative health.

Government members: Shame!

Mr DICK: I take the interjection from government members that it was a shame. That was not enough for the member for Clayfield. What else did he do? He cut other programs. He terminated almost $8 million in annual grants to help provide health prevention promotion and early intervention, including programs that supported vitally important preventative health work in areas of Indigenous child health, alcohol and drug prevention and community nutrition. That is what they do in government. It is a complete disgrace.

We have rebuilt public and preventative health. We have developed a sexual health strategy for Queensland. In the north of our state they eliminated the tropical public health service in Cairns. They defunded sexual health services when the rates of STIs were increasing in Indigenous communities and in the north of the state. We have replaced it.

The truth of the matter is that only Labor will invest in public and preventative health. Labor invests, builds and creates. The only thing the member for Clayfield has ever done is cut, sack and sell.

Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Glass House, I am informed that we have another group of students from St Joseph's Primary School in the electorate of Sandgate observing our proceedings. Welcome.

Tow Truck Industry

Mr POWELL: My question is directed to the Premier. I table two invoices issued by a towing company of which and at a time when the member for Pumicestone was a director that show a $6,000 charge for beach towing and storage. Isn't this action by the member for Pumicestone the kind of consumer gouging the Premier was furious about just two weeks ago?

Tabled paper: Invoices, dated 24 July 2012, issued by Accident and Breakdown Towing Pty Ltd [739].

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for the question. I am more than happy to follow up any issues. My government has appointed Michael Forde to undertake this investigation in relation to the tow truck industry. People can raise issues with him directly. I am more than happy to follow that particular matter up with my director-general. Whilst we are talking about tow trucks, I remind people that they can have their voices heard by contacting the inquiry hotline on 1800681636.

An opposition member interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: This is a very serious issue. We will be doing everything we can to ensure that we get the policy framework right in relation to that matter.

Education, Ministerial Council Meeting

Ms FARMER: My question is directed to the Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism, Major Events and the Commonwealth Games. Will the minister update the House on the outcomes of the education ministerial council meeting last week?

Ms JONES: I thank the member for Bulimba for her question. She, like me, joined the Labor Party because we believe in the fundamentals of education—

Mr Minnikin: Democratic socialism.

Ms JONES: No, we believe that education changes lives. That is what we believe. If you want to grow the economy you do not cut teachers and you invest in schools. Do members know what else we believe? We believe that parents have a choice when it comes to education. We believe that every parent has the right to choose which school is best for their child.

That is why when we have the students from St Joseph's, from the honourable member for Sandgate's electorate, in the gallery today we say very clearly that we stand as one with Catholic Education to stand for a good deal for every school, including the great Catholic schools in our state. We know that there are more than 300 Catholic schools in Queensland educating more than 150,000 students in our state. They play a vital role in educating the next generation of leaders in Queensland. We will be standing as one with them to ensure that we do not see a reduction in funding for Catholic schools in this state.

In actual fact, at the meeting held last week in Adelaide—we were all flown down to Simon Birmingham's home town—we were told absolutely nothing. Despite the leaks ahead of the meeting in the News Limited press about the prep test there was not one paper, not one agenda item on the prep test whatsoever. There was no detail about what we are going to have to deliver for his pay deal.

Today they are going to be introducing that bill into the parliament but no state, including the New South Wales minister for education, who I must say led the charge against this raw deal for Catholic schools and state schools across our nation, supports this. The states and territories stand as one, including the Liberals in New South Wales who are standing up for Catholic schools and who are actually standing up for state schools. All I get is deathly silence from those opposite. If there is one issue where we significantly differ from those opposite it is that the LNP in Queensland will roll over every single time when it comes to fighting for—

Mr Dick: Stand up to Canberra.

Ms JONES: Stand up to Canberra. In terms of Cross River Rail there is deathly silence. They stand in the way of thousands of jobs from Cross River Rail.

Ms Trad: The backpacker tax.

Ms JONES: With the backpacker tax where are they? There is deathly silence. When will the member for Clayfield and the LNP in Queensland stand up for Queenslanders? They will not do it for schools, they will not do it for tourism and they will not do it for Cross River Rail. We will stand firm with state schools and Catholic schools in this state.

Adani, Royalties

Mr PYNE: My question without notice is to the Premier. How does the Premier justify the use of taxpayer funds to support the foreign owned Adani corporation when it will put at risk thousands of jobs generated by the Great Barrier Reef?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Cairns for that very important question. Let me state from the outset that my government is investing in protecting the Great Barrier Reef. We know how important tourism jobs are. There are 60,000 jobs in the tourism industry alone.

Usually when I am up in Cairns I catch up with people who are linked to the tourism industry. A couple of weeks ago I was in Cairns for a meeting with Julie Bishop, our foreign affairs minister, who invited all of the ambassadors from Canberra to Cairns to look at opportunities in North Queensland. As an outcome from that meeting a number of ambassadors have already contacted me about investing in Queensland. They are wanting to come here and speak to us. That is a direct result of attending that forum and talking up the benefits of North Queensland.

In terms of the second part of the question let me make it very clear that at the last election I said that my government would not spend taxpayers' money building a railway line. I was very clear in that. I said that in our Great Barrier Reef document. I also said it at our election campaign launch. That is unlike those opposite who wanted to allocate $455 million of taxpayers' money to contribute to the building of that rail line.

What did we do with that $455 million? We built the Cairns State Special School with that money. What else did we do? We put $140 million into the Townsville stadium. We also put $28 million into the Vines Creek bridges upgrade. We put money into the Back to Work program and Skilling Queenslanders for Work. We have utilised that money for growing jobs.

I made it very clear that we would not put money into that rail line. I understand that there is a separate application for NAIF funding. The federal government has not got one single dollar of that $5 billion out the door. Queensland should rightly have a good share of that $5 billion. Where is that money? If that money were out the door we would be able to get on further with growing jobs in this state.

From those opposite, I want to hear the end of the whingeing. I want to see some positive contribution about making phone calls to Canberra and getting that NAIF money out the door to grow jobs. Also, we want Cross River Rail. It is about time they stood up and backed us in and backed Queensland in for a change.

Building our Regions

Ms DONALDSON: My question is to the Minister for State Development. Will the minister update the House on the status of the Palaszczuk government's job-generating Building our Regions program?

Mr SPEAKER: You have two minutes, Minister.

Dr LYNHAM: I thank the member for Bundaberg. The member for Bundaberg knows only too well the value of the Building our Regions program and what it is doing for the people of Bundaberg and how little the opposition's rorting the regions program did for the community of Bundaberg. In July I anticipate announcing the successful projects under round 3 of the Building our Regions infrastructure program. My department is currently assessing 124 applications under round 3. Projects range from airport upgrades to water projects and bikeways in Emerald. We have also recently announced 15 projects valued at $6.2 million for vital projects in remote and Indigenous communities.

In total, we have so far allocated $156 million to 108 critical projects, generating 1,323 jobs in regional Queensland. To date, 10 projects have been completed, 44 are underway and 39 are at design and tender stage. There is the Balonne Shire Council irrigation system for St George—a wonderful project. It is getting half a million dollars to use treated effluent water to grow crops at St George. We are providing $3.5 million to the Isaac Regional Council for a new landfill cell. The member for Bundaberg knows about the recent opening of the Bundaberg Region Multi-Use Sports and Community Centre. The $5 million contribution from Building our Regions gives the PCYC a home and a place for locals to get fit. It also serves as a central evacuation centre should there be a natural disaster in that region. That project generated 43 jobs.

We got out the door $37.9 million over the past two years. That is $15 million more than their rorting our regions program—$15 million more.

Mr SPEAKER: The minister's time has expired. Question time has concluded.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance

Mr NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (11.32 am): Over the last few days I have spent time, alongside our hardworking member for Gregory, Lachlan Millar—who recently widely travelled and was re-endorsed out there; congratulations to him—visiting some of the most productive

parts of our state in and around Emerald in Central Queensland and then west to Longreach. I have to say to the member for Stafford: mate, they ain't buying whatever you are selling! They are not buying it. You could not give it away out there, even if it came with some free surgery.

Regional and rural Queensland is in the LNP's DNA and we are determined to listen and implement policies that will build a better Queensland. On Friday the LNP's entire shadow cabinet held a community shadow cabinet meeting in Emerald offering an opportunity for locals to tell us all the action they would like to see occur in their community. We spoke with locals about the failures of the Palaszczuk Labor government of which there were many and the need to provide infrastructure and services for the Central Highlands and Coalfields region, a region that is so productive.

We know people in regional Queensland are hurting. We know that they want better business opportunities and jobs for our young people and we know that they are not getting that from a do-nothing Labor government that is presiding over a youth unemployment rate of above 40 per cent in outback Queensland—and we have seen the impacts of that total inaction in the past 24 hours! Labor's inability to make a decision after two long years in government and this Premier's inability to control her own cabinet have led to Adani putting off indefinitely a financial decision on the Carmichael mining project in Central Queensland. People in Emerald know the impact of not having that project go ahead. They know what it means for jobs. Whether it is the local tyre supplier, the local restaurants and businesses, the local workshops or the schools, they understand the value of this project going ahead. They want it to go ahead and they want to it to go ahead quickly.

Labor's bitter internal divisions over the Adani project have thrown the future of that mine and its thousands of jobs into serious jeopardy. Despite all of the protests today and all of their rhetoric, it all rings hollow. It took almost two hours from the beginning of today's sitting of parliament for the Premier to even mention the word 'Adani' in this place. She has run, she has hidden, she has ducked and she has weaved. She has avoided at every opportunity answering questions that the people of Queensland deserve to have answers to. She has avoided telling the people of Queensland what her plan is because there is not one. After two years of bungling, two years of ineptness, two years of doing nothing, Adani have been left at the altar wondering what it is they have spent all of that time and money on.

The LNP understands the importance of these critical projects. We heard a little earlier the member for Ashgrove crowing about standing up for Queensland. When will the member for Ashgrove stand up for Queensland jobs in the regional parts of our state? When will she stand up for Queensland jobs against the left wing of the cabinet that wants to see this project die and not get out of the starting blocks? When will she stand up and support the kids who will be educated at the Emerald Christian College or St Pat's or St Brigid's in Emerald? When will she stand up for the kids at the Emerald State High School who want to get an education, who want to live in their communities and who want their parents to have jobs as a result of the Adani mine?

It is easy for the member for Ashgrove to come in here and spend everyone else's money, take the funds from the federal government and make a political point of it but she fails to actually make the tough decisions that will see this project go ahead. The member for Ashgrove is pretty quick to claim credit for everything and pretty quick to run away when it comes to taking responsibility for anything.

We were also visited by the Prime Minister, who took time to visit Emerald for a community barbecue hosted by the local federal MP, Ken O'Dowd. He was warmly welcomed by the townspeople, local students and locals from across the district. He remarked on the enterprising nature of Central Queenslanders he had met who, like so many regional Australians, work hard every day to make their own success and who rarely seek government help to get there—the spirit that forged Queensland.

I want to acknowledge and thank the Central Highlands Mayor, Councillor Kerry Hayes, and his team for hosting a tour of some of the district's most progressive agricultural operations and who exemplified the Queensland spirit when he said, 'We are not looking for a handout. We are prepared to do the hard work ourselves. We just need someone to give us the assistance on occasions that regional and rural Queensland needs because of our distance, because of the vast areas that we cover.' He was only looking for a government that supports rather than opposes.

While, sadly, over 70 per cent of our state remains drought declared, I am pleased to report the pioneering spirit of our rural producers has not been broken. I saw many examples of agricultural businesses thriving through their investment in technology. We saw in Fairbairn Dam a clear example of how building a water storage facility and creating a reliable water supply can transform an agricultural area, bringing jobs and businesses and opportunities not just to the agricultural industry but to all of its related industries and, of course, to the mining sector.

The construction of the 1.3 million megalitre Fairbairn Dam in 1968 which was completed in 1972 was obviously a game changer for the Central Highlands and coalfields region. Filling and overflowing just two years later, Fairbairn has supported a massive expansion in cotton production and horticulture, including citrus, table grapes and melon crops, as well as irrigated winter crops like grain and chickpeas. There are even figs now being planted out there. Even at Fairbairn's current 45 per cent capacity, irrigators are currently drawing 100 per cent of their water entitlements from that dam.

On our trip last Thursday we saw a small percentage of the more than 50,000 hectares of agricultural land under irrigation. We visited the massive 2PH citrus and packaging operation owned by Craig Pressler. Those of us who were there saw millions of dollars of investment exporting up to 200 tonnes per week of citrus product to the world. We saw the Hinkler Park macadamia plantation—the world's largest macadamia producer managed by Ian Walter. We saw seedless watermelon grower and President of the Australian Melon Association, Mark Daunt. We also visited Alkira Vineyards where John Staier grows table grapes, figs—as I mentioned—and lemons for the domestic and export market. We saw hard evidence of how Emerald's vibrant farming sector filters into business opportunities right through service industries in town. It affects all of those businesses from fuel suppliers to machinery dealers to clothing shops and cafes. They all benefit from a healthy agriculture and mining sector. I might say they also benefited from a visit by the LNP cabinet which took heart and supported local industry.

Congratulations should go to Mayor Kerry Hayes for the strong role his local government is playing to drive economic growth across the Central Highlands. What I saw in Emerald reinforced why the LNP team will continue to push this do-nothing Labor government to get off its backside and work with the Turnbull coalition government to access the billions of dollars on the table to build the roads, bridges and dams Queensland needs. That money is there. It is waiting to be spent. It is only the failure of this Labor government to do the work that means it is not happening. This Labor government which cries poor, which always goes cap in hand like beggars to the table asking for the crumbs, cannot deliver.

It was the LNP government that made projects like the Toowoomba Second Range Crossing happen; that invested in the Toowoomba ring-road; and that put money into the Cooroy to Curra upgrade program. It was the LNP government which put the money on the table for exit 54 on the Gold Coast. It is this cheap, point-scoring jackal of a minister who feeds on the carcass of everyone else—who cannot go out and hunt it down himself but who has to sniffle around like some measly creature deleting emails and claiming he is poor—who rides on the coat-tails of those who can deliver.

We then travelled out to Longreach where, sadly, conditions are not as good, where people are doing it tough and there has not been good rain in four or five years. The hope is for winter rain again as there was last year and the proper summer rains to come so that reinvestment can go through. The Queensland spirit remains dauntless out there. The frontier spirit, where it is you who backs yourself and not the government that makes the decision, stands strong in Longreach.

(Time expired)

Budget

Mr PEGG (Stretton—ALP) (11.42 am): The third Palaszczuk government state budget is approaching, and I am very confident that it will be fairer than the federal budget, with a strong focus on health, education and jobs. I am also very confident that it will be much fairer and better for Queenslanders than anything the member for Clayfield produced during his time as treasurer of this state.

I have previously had the opportunity to highlight the tremendous economic successes of the Palaszczuk government. Today I am very happy to speak in support of the Advancing Trade and Investment: Queensland Trade and Investment Strategy 2017-2022 that was officially launched by the Treasurer and Minister for Trade and Investment on 18 April 2017. The strategy provides an ambitious and exciting agenda designed to drive economic growth and job creation through coordinating trade and investment outcomes across the state. By aligning Queensland's competitive strengths with the global trends influencing our world, the strategy identifies both existing and growing industries where Queensland has a clear advantage. The development of this strategy has been informed through careful analysis of Queensland's competitive advantages, an examination of Queensland's trade and investment service offerings and an extensive consultation process with a wide range of public and private sector stakeholders.

In addition to detailing the Queensland government's existing actions regarding trade and investment, the strategy outlines 22 new initiatives to mature the export and investment pipeline for Queensland. These initiatives are underpinned by $35 million in new funding over the next five years. Amongst other initiatives, they will include the following: a comprehensive case management service for exporters and investors; industry-led international trade missions; a Queensland government accreditation program; a new Trade & Investment Queensland office in North America; strengthening of our offices in Singapore and Jakarta; and a prospectus to highlight the abundant investment opportunities available to international investors in Queensland.

I am glad to see that the strategy and underpinning initiatives have been very well received by stakeholders including in my electorate. As the *Courier-Mail*'s editorial said on release of the strategy, 'It is a solid and positive focus that should be embraced and, if successful, expanded to ensure that all Queenslanders reap maximum benefit from the resources and skills we have in abundance.' How true that is. I congratulate the Treasurer on this outstanding strategy. By way of contrast, let me remind the House just how little the LNP and the member for Clayfield—

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr PEGG: The member for Nanango, I am sure, will be very interested to hear what the LNP did for trade and investment outcomes in this state.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr PEGG: She needs a lot of reminding, because in 2012 the freshly elected LNP government moved the trade portfolio to Queensland Treasury, making the then treasurer and current Leader of the Opposition the minister responsible for trade. Just like every other activity the member for Clayfield was responsible for, the trade portfolio was subject to a harsh austerity regime.

In the ruthless 2012-13 state budget—a budget where over 14,000 public servants were sacked, $1.4 billion was wiped from the state's capital program and a supposedly low-tax LNP increased taxes by $600 million—the member for Clayfield took the axe to the trade portfolio as well. Trade Queensland obtained funding of $27.6 million, almost 20 per cent less than the funding allocated by the Palaszczuk government this year. I note the member for Nanango is not disputing those figures. I have some more figures for the member for Nanango that she will not dispute. In 2013-14 this allocation was very slightly increased to $28.8 million—a pathetic amount that barely kept up with wage and inflation growth. Then—hopefully the member for Nanango remembers this too—in 2014-15 only $15.8 million was allocated to Trade Queensland while it was part of Treasury until it transitioned to becoming a statutory body.

To sum up, what did the member for Clayfield achieve? It seems that he did two things. One, he sacked a number of Trade Queensland employees as part of the 14,000 hardworking individuals that the LNP happily retrenched in 2012. He then immediately proceeded to fly to Japan, China and the US for two weeks in August 2012 which included costs of around $14,000 in accommodation, $24,000 on flights, $57,000 on costs for the 44 members of the trade delegation and $4,000 on gifts. For the information of the member for Nanango, the numbers I just quoted were unashamedly provided by the member for Clayfield himself in 2012—talk about arrogance! Yet again I implore those opposite, including the member for Nanango, to come clean and admit their mistakes. Any self-respecting member in this position must, as a matter of urgency, apologise to Queensland—

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Crawford): Member for Stretton, your time has expired. I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition rose before time had expired for the previous member. You had not given her the call and she started to speak. I would encourage you to remind the Deputy Leader of the Opposition how the protocols work in this House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I was watching the clock. The clock was counting down to zero. I will take the last couple of seconds as an interjection instead of starting a speech. Member for Stretton, your time did expire. I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Cross River Rail

Mrs FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11.48 am): Last week we saw this state's worst infrastructure minister dodging and weaving around the facts regarding Cross River Rail. The member for South Brisbane only needs to look in the mirror if she wants someone

to blame for the inaction on Cross River Rail. The minister simply has not done her homework with the Cross River Rail business case. She has hidden her secret taxes. She has bodgied up the patronage figures, but independent Infrastructure Australia still thinks there are holes in the business case you could drive a train through. Inadequate is what her business case was called. Inadequate is what Infrastructure Australia called this business case. We brought this to light through leaked parts of the business case that we had seen through the estimates process last year. A full 12 months later and this incompetent minister still has not been able to line her ducks up in a row to get this project right.

She has bungled the project from the start and then had the hide to go on ABC Radio to try to rewrite history over her plan to slug Queenslanders with higher taxes and charges to fund the pipedream through a half-baked business case. The Deputy Premier is in denial. This is what the Deputy Premier said on Steve Austin's program, 'I think what is happening here, Steve, is a lot of political spin and game playing.' 'What the officials are saying is very different from what the politicians are saying on this,' she continued. However, she was the one caught out playing politics with Cross River Rail with independent Infrastructure Australia releasing a statement saying—

IA has a number of outstanding concerns with the Cross River Rail business case and we have advised the Queensland government of these concerns.

What do we see the Deputy Premier do here in this House today? We see her not get her own way, so she stands in this House and starts to attack the independent Infrastructure Australia.

It is this Deputy Premier who has been caught out misleading Queenslanders over her sloppy attempt at a business case. If the minister thinks her pet project stacks up, then there is one simple thing she can do. She can put it out there; she can release it to put Queenslanders' minds at ease. She should table the business case in this parliament and let Queenslanders decide whether the project stacks up. Remember, it was the member for Inala who said in 2013 that Cross River Rail was 'shovel ready'. That has never been further from the truth. Two weeks ago we announced in this parliament that they have not even got their own state government approvals for this project. All the government has achieved in two years has been to set up a $50 million bureaucracy and send out glossy brochures. Cross River Rail has been worse off under this bungling Deputy Premier than it was under the member for Inala, and no-one would have thought that could ever happen.

We know this government has no plan for infrastructure. Queenslanders know that only the LNP has a track record to build the congestion-busting infrastructure we desperately need. We have seen a media report today that polling commissioned by Infrastructure Partnerships Australia, the Infrastructure Association and the Property Council found 62 per cent of Queenslanders believe investment in and development of infrastructure is poor or very poor. Dissatisfaction was the greatest in the state's north at 67 per cent with 62 per cent of people unhappy in the south-east corner. Is there any wonder that Queenslanders are dissatisfied with this Labor government's lack of investment in infrastructure? We have seen a $3 billion cut to our LNP infrastructure program. In Townsville Labor cut $180 million from the budget just this year. In Cairns it is $260 million. In Wide Bay it is $400 million. These cuts to infrastructure are why Queenslanders are hurting with fewer jobs.

The majority of Queenslanders rightfully believe Annastacia Palaszczuk is not doing enough. This is a do-nothing government. This is a government that has failed to plan. This is a government that has failed to develop and, most importantly, this is a government that has failed to invest in infrastructure.

Townsville, Business Advisory Council

Mr STEWART (Townsville—ALP) (11.53 am): On Wednesday last week it was our pleasure to host the Premier and the Business Advisory Council in Townsville on their first ever regional meeting. Council members are from a diverse range of large, small and medium sized businesses. As the Premier has said, whether it is the resource sector, skills and training, property development or construction, or one of our emerging sectors like IT, these business leaders will bring to the table a variety of perspectives and ideas that can inform government policy. That is exactly what happened.

The Minister Assisting the Premier on North Queensland, the member for Thuringowa, and I had the ability to highlight the region's capabilities and potential to a very captive audience. We were able to focus on five major areas of the region's economy including our tourism, edutourism and ecotourism, our world renowned tropical science, the role of James Cook University and that developing area. We talked about the key importance the defence sector has in our city as well as the importance of the agricultural industry and in particular the sugar industry and the cattle industry. Finally, we talked about the impact that one of the most richly mineralised regions in Australia has on our economy.

The Business Advisory Council heard about the port of Townsville being the largest commercial port in Northern Australia, exporting over 30 different commodities with a growing containerisation handling facility by the expansion of berth 4 through the $100 million investment by the Palaszczuk government. The port contributes $635 million to Townsville's GRP and is quickly becoming the pivotal factor in the intermodal freight and storage system in North Queensland. This was one of the assets that the Leader of the Opposition was going to sell when they were in government. This jewel in the crown of North Queensland's assets was going to be sold to the highest bidder so that the money could be spent in Brisbane on who knows what.

The council also heard of the future potential of the defence industry in the region. Lavarack Barracks is the largest military base in the country and Townsville is considered Australia's largest military city. It is supported by air and port facilities critical for its defence operations. Additionally, Townsville has direct access to the high-range training facility located 40 minutes drive from Lavarack Barracks. With the Australia-Singapore comprehensive strategic partnership worth $2 billion, this project will create hundreds of support and logistics jobs right across the north.

What the people of Townsville know is that we are on the cusp of recovery, and that was made abundantly clear to the Business Advisory Council. I can tell honourable members that the council were fully supportive of the Palaszczuk government's approach to reactivating North Queensland. They understood when we said that Townsville was the hub of North Australia. They could clearly see our strengths as a city. They saw firsthand the port which handles $11 billion of trade annually. They understood that the Townsville region has significant mineral deposits and is home to two major mineral processors. They experienced Australia's largest tropical city and saw that it is the main government, health and education centre in the north.

The Business Advisory Council listened to the vision articulated to them about Townsville's rich renewable energy resources including bagasse, wind and solar power. They understood that the Townsville region has large areas of fertile land and globally significant raw sugarcane production. For one night they were among tourists who spend over $1 billion annually in the region.

The council was very interested in the new Townsville stadium and the potential that that will generate within the city. It was great to see that Watpac were awarded the managing contractor position, and they have given us assurances that they will have a very strong local content focus.

Finally, the Business Advisory Council were in no doubt when they left Townsville that the Palaszczuk government is investing in Townsville, because we see the potential the city has as an economic powerhouse of North Australia. We might have been knocked down to the canvas by Queensland Nickel and the Newman government, but under the Palaszczuk government we are picking ourselves up and are ready to take on the fight.

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Jobs

Mr BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (11.57 am): Following on from the previous member's comments, the Palaszczuk Labor government are only interested in their own jobs. They are not interested in jobs for regional Queensland. They are interested in saving their own jobs in their own seats, particularly for their mates whom we have seen appointed over the last couple of years. The Labor Party are very good in Queensland at talking, but they do not act. They just talk about it. All the ministers came in here this morning and talked about jobs, jobs, jobs, but the facts and the statistics speak for themselves.

The Minister for Training and Skills rose and talked about the Skilling Queenslanders for Work program and the $240 million they reinvested. The question that the minister does not answer is: why are traineeships and apprenticeships still on the way down? They are investing all this money—

Mrs D'Ath: Ask me a question.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection. I should not have to ask a question because the minister made a ministerial statement this morning. They talk, talk, talk, but they do not give the statistics. The national statistics show that apprenticeships, traineeships and school based apprenticeships are on their way down under the watch of the Minister for Employment, the member for Redcliffe. She talks a lot, but their actions are not seeing results at the other end. They are not seeing all these people they are talking about getting all these jobs, traineeships and apprenticeships. Why do the statistics not reveal the rhetoric?

Over the years we have heard about jobs, jobs, jobs. We have seen jobs for mates, jobs for union thugs and jobs for former MPs. We have also seen jobs on the health boards of all our electorates for fly-in fly-out former Labor members when those health board positions were meant to be for community

representatives. This morning members in this place talked about the confusion and risk that are associated with the Adani project not going ahead. The Premier was in India a few months ago. She visited the port headquarters of Adani and talked about how great this project is. A few months ago the Premier stood up with the federal government at a big press conference and talked about how her government is making sure this happens, but today there has been complete silence.

Mr Seeney: Then Jackie happened.

Mr BLEIJIE: Then Jackie happened. I take the interjection. The member for Callide will recall that when the Premier was the Leader of the Opposition she took an interjection and said, 'In opposition we don't have strategy meetings.' If they do have strategy meetings in government I suspect the strategy this morning was, 'Don't mention Adani.'

An opposition member: 'Don't mention the war.'

Mr BLEIJIE: 'Don't mention the war.' But after a couple of hours in parliament the Deputy Premier came in here and mentioned Adani. The Premier has a light bulb moment and thinks, 'If the Deputy Premier mentioned Adani I'd better mention Adani as well, so I'll talk about Adani and how committed we are.' No ministerial statement mentioned the jobs at risk with Adani, but the benefit is that one of the LNP's top priorities in government in Queensland will be creating jobs across Queensland and better managing our finances.

We will do that through our plan to get Queensland working. Unlike the Minister for Employment over there who said, 'There is not much you can do about youth unemployment,' we have a real plan. There will be $5,000 incentives which will create 10,000 jobs with our Queensland Apprenticeship Boost. The Tools for Tradies initiative will provide $500 for hairdressers, carpenters and chefs after they finish their apprenticeships to help with tools. The Job Start Incentive will provide $4,000 to small businesses and people who do not want to go to school or go into training but just want to get off the couch, get off the dole and get a job. That will create 10,000 jobs. Our employment bonus will give a workers comp rebate to those who employ people under the Job Start Incentive. That will reduce the unemployment rate in Queensland.

Labor's plan does not even apply across all of Queensland. They target little pockets. If you want to reduce the unemployment rate in Queensland you have to have a Queensland plan, and the LNP is the only party in Queensland with an employment and unemployment package which will create lots of jobs. It applies right across Queensland. Whether you are in Toowoomba, Ipswich, North Queensland, Far North Queensland or the Sunshine Coast, it will apply. The only way we can get jobs and opportunities for young Queenslanders is to have an LNP Nicholls led government, and the only way we can do that is to build a better Queensland. We will do that. We will build a better Queensland and our major focus will be on creating jobs and the better financial management of state finances.

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Achievements; Maryborough Hospital

Mr SAUNDERS (Maryborough—ALP) (12.03 pm): Wow, they have an employment plan! As a result of the last employment plan they had we lost hundreds and hundreds of public servants across the Wide Bay region. They took a great city like Maryborough and brought it to its knees. The member for Kawana has the audacity to stand here and tell us that in 2½ years they have changed, but leopards do not change their spots. The lot of them dislike Queenslanders. All they can do is sack Queenslanders. The only thing the LNP did when they were in government was lengthen the unemployment line.

This Palaszczuk government is a traditional Labor government. This Labor government is about jobs, health and housing. The Newman-Nicholls government was a traditional LNP government and they have not changed. Look at what they are doing federally. When they come in here they talk the talk, but if they are elected they will walk the walk because all we will see grow under the LNP is more job cutbacks. They will sell assets and cut back jobs.

Ms Pease interjected.

Mr SAUNDERS: I will take that interjection from the member for Lytton, because she knows firsthand that what happened in her electorate was the same as what happened in mine when the LNP were last in government. When you compare their record to our record, their record is a blank piece of paper. That is all they achieved for Queensland. When you look at what the Palaszczuk Labor government has achieved in my electorate, $12.7 million has been invested for projects that will keep locals employed; $4.5 million for a brand new school hall at Maryborough High School; $1 million for a

music hall at Tinana State School—jobs, jobs, jobs and more local jobs; and roadworks in the Wide Bay and particularly in the Maryborough electorate. We are seeing more and more roadworks, which means more local jobs.

We on this side care about people. That is our mantra. We make sure that people have a job and food on the table. All those opposite worry about is letting their mates suck on the taxpayers' teat. We know those opposite want to put public money into private pockets, reduce services and sack people. The minister, the member for Redcliffe, is here. When we talk about Skilling Queenslanders for Work, what a great program that is. I was saddened to hear members opposite laugh when we were talking about Skilling Queenslanders for Work. It was disgraceful.

Ms Pease: Shocking!

Mr SAUNDERS: It was absolutely disgraceful. I will take that interjection from the member for Lytton. We are talking about people's livelihoods, we are talking about people who pay mortgages and we are talking about training our young people and getting them back into work. I know what a great success the program has been in my electorate, and those opposite have the hide to sit there and laugh and throw silly comments at the minister. I was disgusted. As the local member, I have seen how great this program is and how many people's lives it has changed in my electorate in the 27 months that this government has been in power. I would like to thank the minister because it is a marvellous project. When I go back to my electorate on Friday I am going to make sure that I tell everyone what those opposite did when we talked about Skilling Queenslanders for Work.

The Maryborough hospital turned 130 on Saturday and we had a great celebration. I would like to thank the Minister for Health because he has come good. After everything had been stripped out of the hospital after three years of an LNP government, the health minister has come good and is restoring all the services we lost. It was the only hospital on the east coast of Australia without pathology and this Labor government restored it. A public servant and his wife approached me and said that they sleep easier at night now because they know there will be no mass sackings under the Palaszczuk Labor government when the budget comes out.

Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month

Ms BATES (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (12.08 pm): I rise today to share my concern about the scourge of domestic and family violence. As everyone in this House would be aware, May is Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month. This is a month when we as a community say with one voice that we will not tolerate any form of violence. I note with a level of regret that once again the commitment of this Labor government has not been backed up by action. All of those opposite voted against the LNP's tough new laws and *Hansard* contains the proof. The Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence then tried to claim that she supported the laws, but what we now know is that those opposite refused to back a $300,000 funding shortfall to the state's Women's Legal Services. Labor's do-nothing 'D'Ath Evader' and her fumbling sidekick 'phoney Fentiman' used the Women's Legal Service Queensland—

Mr HINCHLIFFE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. There have been a number of rulings in this House about referring to members by their correct titles. I suggest that you provide some guidance to the member for Mudgeeraba and instruct her to refer to other members of the House by their appropriate titles.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Crawford): Member for Mudgeeraba, I did not hear the reference but will you ensure that you refer to members by their appropriate titles.

Ms BATES: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. The Attorney-General and the Minister for Women and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence used the Women's Legal Service Queensland to try to score cheap political points against the federal government and have now hung it out to dry. Unless this all-talk, do-nothing Labor government steps up, the only statewide DV legal helpline will have its funding slashed by half from 1 July. I am joining the Women's Legal Service Queensland in calling on the Premier to meet the critical $300,000 per annum funding shortfall and ensure thousands of Queensland women and children escaping domestic violence are not turned away from this vital service. Women's Legal Service CEO Angela Lynch said—

> If WLSQ doesn't receive an increase in funding right now, it will mean thousands more victims and their children will be turned away every year, starting in just six weeks.

The cuts will hit regional Queensland the most, because the statewide helpline is the main access point for regional Queenslanders. If Labor does not act it will be further condemned as being all talk, asleep at the wheel, doing nothing and taking no action when it comes to domestic violence.

I will provide some key facts on Women's Legal Service Queensland. Funding shortfalls put Queensland victims of domestic violence at risk. Legal advice is essential to safety, assisting with protection orders, child arrangements and separation rights for victims. Fifty per cent of calls already go unanswered due to capacity constraints. Effectively, 9,000 victims cannot get assistance on current demand and service capacity.

It was the LNP that delivered an extra $750,000 for the Women's Legal Service over three years. When it comes to action, it is the LNP that delivers for victims of domestic and family violence. We cannot trust Labor to do anything. As I travelled around Queensland during the past week, attending various domestic violence awareness events, it was apparent that we cannot rest on our laurels on this issue. It is not enough to ride on the coat-tails of federal funding to look like you are doing something, as the minister did recently when she announced federal funding to assist victims of domestic violence stay in their homes safety.

We only have to look at some of the local statistics to see just how far we have to go. Figures released by Bundaberg police show that there were more than 3,000 domestic violence incidents reported in 2016, resulting in more than 500 applications for DV orders. In the same period there were 700 contraventions of DV orders. Further north, it was reported that in the 2015-16 financial year police were called to 5,533 incidents of domestic violence just in the Mackay and Northern Beaches area. To date in 2016-17 that number sits at 4,486 for Mackay and Northern Beaches. I visited the local Domestic Violence Resource Service in Mackay and heard firsthand how it is grappling with family violence in the region post the mining boom. It is one area that is plagued by ice and its impact on family breakdown. The centre is doing great work to help victims and their families.

Sadly, at the beginning of the month I attended another Red Rose Foundation event following the death of Mauryeen Kenny and a moving ceremony by the Queensland Homicide Victims' Support Group for its Homicide Awareness Day. We heard the shocking facts from advocates at the candle-lighting ceremony hosted by DVConnect for the national day to remember—18 DV related deaths in 2016. Numbers are climbing this year, and we are not even through May.

As Domestic and Family Violence Awareness Month comes to an end, Queenslanders deserve more than a few glossy selfies from the minister and this do-nothing government. We want bipartisanship on this issue, but that is a two-way street of everyone doing something. As a survivor I can say: make no mistake, I will never give up and I will never stop working to stamp out domestic violence in our community and across this state. Together we can end domestic and family violence, once and for all. Only the LNP will build stronger families and provide safe and livable communities.

Renewable Energy

Mr WHITING (Murrumba—ALP) (12.13 pm): I rise to inform the House that the Palaszczuk Labor government is creating a whole new industry in Queensland: the renewable energy industry. This industry is surging ahead under the stewardship of the Palaszczuk government. When the budget is brought down next sitting week we will see even more jobs and investment flowing from our decisions. This will mean more jobs for Queenslanders.

The Queensland industry has made solar rooftops the second biggest power station in the state. In the past year we have doubled our renewable energy capacity. In the past year we have seen 16 projects commence or move into the pipeline. This is creating 2,000 jobs. These projects include the Collinsville Solar Farm—a $100 million, 42.5-megawatt energy and jobs generator, bringing 120 jobs to the Whitsunday region. There is the $380 million Mount Emerald Wind Farm, creating 150 direct jobs during construction. That project will generate enough output to power a city the size of Mackay. The Clare Solar Farm, near Ayr, will create 100 megawatts of power.

Let us look at the 42.5-megawatt Collinsville Solar Farm. This Ratch-Australia project demonstrates how the clean energy boom in Queensland is accelerating due to the Palaszczuk government. This Collinsville project will utilise existing local electrical infrastructure that was previously established for the old Collinsville coal-fired power station, closed during the term of the Newman-Nicholls government. We expect construction to start during May, with the project feeding into Queensland's electricity grid by mid-2018.

Powerlink and Edify Energy have finalised agreements for the Whitsunday and Hamilton solar farms near Collinsville to connect to Powerlink's network. That means Collinsville is again sending more power into Queensland's network, powering the homes of Queenslanders.

The Collinsville project is just one of $7.8 billion worth of renewable energy projects proposed across regional Queensland because of the Palaszczuk government's energy policies. This wonderful boom did not happen by accident; it is happening because we have created a pathway for this industry. An important part of this pathway is the renewable energy target, RET. The RET could drive $6.7 billion of new investment in this industry.

We have established an independent expert panel to investigate ways to achieve our 50 per cent renewable energy target by 2030. The draft RET panel report shows that we can have an increase of between 6,400 and 6,700 direct and indirect jobs per annum on average between 2020 and 2030 in Queensland. The pathway for this industry also includes the solar rooftop program. We want to see one million solar rooftops in Queensland by 2020. We are halfway there.

Let us contrast this to the LNP's record on Queensland's renewable energy industry. You would think the LNP would be supportive of new enterprises, of a new component in our state economy, but under the previous government this industry was sent backwards. Some 1,300 jobs in this industry vanished under the LNP's stewardship. The solar PV industry fell 41 per cent. Not one project was commissioned under the former treasurer, the member for Clayfield. Their dismissive attitude to this new growth Queensland industry can be summed up by the comments made by the now Leader of the Opposition—you know these comments—that the consumers of renewable energy are champagne drinkers and latte sippers. That is a great insult. The electorate of Murrumba has one of the highest uptakes of solar rooftops in Queensland.

What have we seen and heard from the LNP recently? We have heard nothing but great silence. I find that a great mystery and a great shame, because this industry is creating a new stream of employment right across regional Queensland. These are the full-time blue-collar jobs of the future. This industry also creates white-collar jobs in regional centres. It is an industry that Queensland kids can aspire to work within when they finish school.

It is a mystery why the LNP will not support an industry that brings jobs to regional Queensland. Then again, it is not a mystery when you realise that only the ALP has a credible plan to grow jobs in regional Queensland. We have a whole new industry here that has been ignored, derided and undermined by the state LNP. My message to those opposite is that you cannot claim to be natural stewards of the economy if you keep dismissing this industry.

(Time expired)

Sugar Industry

Mr LAST (Burdekin—LNP) (12.18 pm): The sugar dispute between Wilmar and QSL, which was resolved this week, will go down in history as the dispute that almost broke the back of the sugar industry in North Queensland. After 18 months of toing and froing, finger-pointing, wild acquisitions and political posturing, the 1,500 canefarmers from the Wilmar sugarcane-growing areas can finally breathe a sigh of relief after an on-supply agreement was signed this week. The fact remains that this issue took far too long to resolve and that Labor's performance regarding the resolution of this matter was appalling.

When I was elected I made a commitment to resolve this issue with the marketing of sugar, because my farmers were telling me loudly and clearly that they wanted choice in the marketing of their grower economic interest sugar. I was proud to stand shoulder to shoulder with my canefarmers on this issue and I will continue to do so.

On 19 February, Tim Nicholls and I stood in front of 450 canegrowers at the Burdekin Theatre and gave a commitment that the LNP would introduce into parliament legislation aimed at resolving the long-running dispute between Wilmar and QSL. In accordance with that commitment, the LNP came to parliament and introduced the Sugar Industry (Arbitration for Mill Owners and Sugar Marketing Entities) Amendment Bill 2017. This bill was aimed at amending the sugar marketing act and would have compelled Wilmar and QSL to participate in compulsory arbitration with a view to having an on-supply agreement in place before the commencement of this year's crushing.

The LNP had carefully developed this bill over several weeks in close consultation with canegrowers and industry bodies. We rightfully pointed out in this chamber that the amendments in the LNP's bill were common sense and necessary to deliver a mechanism for negotiations between millers and marketers that could break deadlocks that may arise in finalising on-supply agreements. The LNP and I left no stone unturned in our argument in support of the bill, making it undeniably clear to each and every member the importance and urgency of the bill.

Labor, with the support of the member for Cairns and the member for Cook, voted against the bill and they should all be ashamed of their actions. They should be ashamed for abandoning canegrowers and their families, ashamed for abandoning rural communities that rely on the sugar industry and ashamed for abandoning North Queensland. Yes, on 28 February Labor appointed former Supreme Court justice Richard Chesterman as mediator to the sugar dispute, but more than two months later the dispute was still not resolved, with as many as 1,500 growers' livelihoods remaining in limbo.

Thanks to Bill Byrne and Labor, time nearly ran out for our growers, who would have been left with no option but to go cap in hand to Wilmar to sign a cane supply agreement. While Labor's ineffective mediation was dragging on, growers had to sit by and watch sugar prices slide by more than 20 per cent, with prices now back to $480 a tonne from earlier highs of $600 a tonne and more. Bill Byrne and Labor failed our growers. He and Labor were only ever interested in playing politics and siding with multinationals. In the canegrowers' hour of need, when a viable option to resolve this dispute between Wilmar and QSL was presented to this parliament in the form of legislation, those opposite turned their backs and said, 'We don't care.'

Perhaps the most galling comment to come out of this whole dispute was from the agriculture minister when he said, 'This is a good result for this vital Queensland industry.' I would like the minister to come up to the Burdekin and tell canefarmers in my electorate how good a result it has been for them, when the contracts were signed only at the eleventh hour and they missed out on record high sugar prices. Growers feel betrayed by a government that has sided with a multinational company that puts profits ahead of people. They feel betrayed, frustrated and angry that, in their hour of need, this government deserted them. I will use the ineffable frustration and anger that I feel towards Labor and those who voted against the LNP's bill to further strengthen my resolve to continue my work on the behalf of growers and the Burdekin community.

Growers need legislation that will prevent a similar dispute arising again in the future. They need legislation that will deliver mechanisms for negotiations between millers and marketers, that could break deadlocks when finalising agreements. Such legislation will provide a safeguard for growers into the future—something that gives them assurance leading into the crushing each year and something that gives them and my community peace of mind. I and the LNP will continue our fight for growers. We will see to it that such a dispute is never able to rear its ugly head again.

Cross River Rail

Ms FARMER (Bulimba—ALP) (12.22 pm): The federal budget, which was handed down on 9 May this year, showed us very clearly that the Turnbull government is not interested in Queensland. In that budget, it did not fund a whole lot of things, but today I want to talk about the infrastructure the Turnbull government did not fund for Queensland, for South-East Queensland in particular, for my electorate and for the electorates of every member representing South-East Queensland in this House, including those represented by LNP members. Specifically, the infrastructure that the Turnbull government has dismissed so steadfastly for so long is Cross River Rail.

That is the Cross River Rail project that is Queensland's highest priority infrastructure project, that Infrastructure Australia nominated last year as the highest priority infrastructure project in Australia, that is a once-in-a-lifetime project that will revolutionise the way we move our growing population around the South-East Queensland corner. Cross River Rail is going to create significantly higher capacity for five key inner-city stations. It is going to make a real difference to travel time for South-East Queenslanders, including my constituents, my local mums and dads. Cross River Rail is going to mean cars off South-East Queensland roads, including roads in my local area. It is going to address traffic congestion in South-East Queensland, including in my local area, and it is going to put Brisbane on the world stage as a 21st century city. Most importantly, Cross River Rail is going to create tens of thousands of jobs over its life.

That is the project that I am talking about. The thing that really makes me angry is not just that Malcolm Turnbull is happy to give more money to the other states but not to us. In New South Wales, he gave $5.3 billion for a new airport, $2.9 billion to the Western Sydney Infrastructure Plan, billions for WestConnex and Sydney Metro and millions more for NorthConnex, Parramatta Light Rail, the New England Highway, the Princes Highway and more. I think the Deputy Premier said that, in total, 46 per cent of the infrastructure budget went to New South Wales. Also, there is billions for Victoria—going to projects like Geelong rail, North East rail and the Tullamarine Freeway.

That funding to the other states is not the only thing that makes me angry. It is truly appalling that, instead of coming out and saying that he does not like Queensland, which he clearly does not, Malcolm Turnbull is trying to play games with us and patronise us by saying that we do not have a

business case, when, in fact, in June last year Infrastructure Australia received a 2,000-page, independently reviewed, $7 million full business case from this government. Our current workings are showing a cost-benefit ratio for the project of 1.41, meaning that for every dollar we invest in Cross River Rail $1.41 is returned to our economy and our communities.

Of course, we know that Malcolm Turnbull is perfectly happy to give almost $800 million for the Metronet rail project in Western Australia without a business case on top of the millions that he gave them for NorthLink, the Kwinana Freeway, the Great Northern Highway and more. That is just Malcolm Turnbull. It is clear that he is waiting to give his state colleagues a hand up. Queenslanders can see through that.

Queenslanders can also see clearly that neither the member for Clayfield nor any other member of the opposition team has lifted a finger to help Queensland on such an important project. These people want to put themselves up as an alternative government but, when push comes to shove on the really important matters, we do not hear a word. I listened to the member for Nanango talk about a business case—I am not sure if she has seen it herself; not that that has ever stopped her from speaking with great authority on anything—but the audacity of any member of the opposition to talk about business cases when we have a case in point, 1 William Street, sitting on the other side of the road, for which we will be paying off $1.114 billion over the next 14 years!

I get that the members opposite do not have a plan for anything themselves, but a project of enormous merit, such as Cross River Rail, which will benefit millions of Queenslanders, that will generate tens of thousands of jobs—

Mr Hinchliffe interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Crawford): Member for Hinchinbrook, you are currently on a 253A warning. It is close to lunch. Please contain it.

Ms FARMER: We do not hear a word from them. We hear nothing about Cross River Rail—not a word about transforming the south-east corner, nothing about addressing traffic congestion, cutting down travel time, creating jobs, no phone calls to Malcolm, no meetings, no advocacy. It is no wonder no-one knows who the Leader of the Opposition is. He does so little he is not even on their radar.

On 13 June, the Palaszczuk government is going to be delivering its third budget and I am so looking forward to it. I know that the state budget will be fairer than the federal budget. I know that it will be about jobs. We have already created 59,200 jobs and there will be more. I know that the budget will be about standing up for Queensland. It will address the needs of our state and it will take us into the future. I am proud to be part of it.

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

CORRECTIVE SERVICES (NO BODY, NO PAROLE) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (12.28 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Corrective Services Act 2006 for particular purposes. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Corrective Services (No Body, No Parole) Amendment Bill 2017 [740].

Tabled paper: Corrective Services (No Body, No Parole) Amendment Bill 2017, explanatory notes [741].

I am pleased to introduce the Corrective Services (No Body, No Parole) Amendment Bill 2017. This bill reinforces the government's commitment to victims of crime. The loss of a loved one through the criminal act of another is distressing enough, but often this heartache and loss is further compounded when the body or remains of loved ones are unable to be recovered by investigating authorities.

Generally speaking, the term 'no-body no-parole' refers to the principle that a prisoner convicted of murder or manslaughter who refuses to adequately assist police in locating the victim should not be granted parole. As such, a primary focus of the principle is to encourage cooperation by these prisoners by denying them parole release until such time as the parole board is satisfied the prisoner has satisfactorily cooperated in locating the body or remains, or the last known location of the body or remains, of the victim.

I would like to acknowledge the efforts of Mrs Fiona Splitt in presenting two petitions advocating for this scheme to be implemented in Queensland. Mrs Splitt's husband, Mr Bruce Schuler, disappeared in 2012 while prospecting at Palmerville Station north-west of Cairns. Stephen Struber and Dianne Wilson-Struber were convicted in July 2015 of his murder. In sentencing the couple to mandatory life imprisonment, Justice Henry remarked on their failure to disclose the whereabouts of Mr Schuler's body. I share my sympathy with Mrs Splitt and her family, and to all other families who find themselves in the distressing position of enduring the unknown. I hope the reforms contained within this bill will provide some comfort to these families.

This proposal was also expressly addressed in the Queensland Parole System Review report which was tabled in parliament by the Premier and Minister for the Arts on 16 February 2017. Recommendation 87 of the report specifically suggested the implementation of a no-body no-parole scheme in Queensland. As indicated in the government's response to the report, which was also tabled in parliament on 16 February 2017, this government committed to introducing legislation in 2017 to give effect to the no-body no-parole policy which prevents a murderer from being granted parole where he or she has not revealed where the victim's body is located.

In committing to legislative reform in 2017, the government noted that there are a number of models which exist and could be adopted in Queensland. The best model to introduce in Queensland would be determined to give effect to the recommendation and the policy goals of the reforms. Despite this very clear public commitment, the member for Everton circulated amendments on 9 May 2017 to be moved during the consideration in detail stage of the debate of the Corrective Services (Parole Board) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2017 which purported to introduce a no-cooperation no-parole framework in Queensland. As I noted in my public statement on 12 May 2017, this government has serious concerns about the framing of the amendments flagged by the opposition and we are especially concerned about their rushed nature, denying the families of victims the chance to participate in this process. Ideally, such an important reform would be implemented after consultation with key stakeholders including victims' rights groups, in particular the Queensland Homicide Victims' Support Group, and legal bodies. The introduction of the government bill provides a robust and better considered no-body no-parole framework in Queensland.

During the development of the bill, the government has been informed by the approaches taken in other jurisdictions that have implemented a no-body no-parole framework. We have considered the positive aspects of each model, the series of development of schemes over time and, ultimately, the approach included in the bill was most significantly informed by the effective approach taken in Victoria. The bill applies to prisoners serving a prison sentence for certain serious offences in circumstances where the body or remains of the victim have not been located or, because of an act or omission of the prisoner or another person, part of the body or remains of the victim has not been located. The bill captures prisoners convicted of the Criminal Code offences of murder, manslaughter, accessory after the fact to murder, conspiring to murder, or who counselled, procured or conspired to commit these offences.

Unlike the approach taken under the opposition's proposed amendments, the relevant homicide offences in this bill are clearly articulated and lack ambiguity. I am concerned that in the opposition's proposed amendments the drafting of the very definition of murder poses significant risk. In particular, the way the term 'offence of murder' has been drafted forgets to include the actual Criminal Code offence of murder, an oversight that risks the offence of murder being incorporated into the definition which strikes at the heart of the scheme. Remembering, of course, that this bill, and the opposition amendments, are reforms to the Corrective Services Act and does not sit in the Criminal Code itself. It is reflective of the sloppy and lazy approach of those opposite that in a model apparently about no-body no-parole they forgot to include the offence of murder in their definition or, in fact, link the model to finding a body.

In contrast, under the government's bill the prisoner will not be granted parole unless the Parole Board is satisfied they have satisfactorily cooperated in the investigation of the offence to identify the location, or the last known location, of every part of the body or remains of the victim and the place where every part of the body or remains of the victim may be found. Importantly, this is designed to address those horrendous cases where some remains have been found but some parts of the body continue to be hidden or missing. Again, the approach taken in this bill implements the government's commitment to deliver a comprehensive and effective regime.

In contrast, the proposed opposition model requires the Parole Board to assess the general level of cooperation provided by the prisoner in the investigation of the offence. While I acknowledge this approach is consistent with South Australia, this is an extremely broad approach that misses this central

point. It is not anchored to locating the body or remains of the victim of the offence. The opposition proposal does not refer to the body or remains of the victim at all. This is out of step with the fundamental policy underpinning the no-body no-parole policy and why the South Australian model has become known as the no-cooperation no-parole model. The foundation of this policy is to incentivise prisoner cooperation in locating the victim and to hopefully offer some comfort and assistance to the victim's families in locating their loved ones.

In terms of assessing whether the prisoner has satisfactorily cooperated, the government bill provides that the Parole Board is required to take into account a range of matters, including a report of the Commissioner of Police which evaluates the prisoner's cooperation in the investigation of the offence to identify the victim's location; the capacity of the prisoner to give cooperation; the record of the court in relation to the offending, including any sentencing remarks or comments made by the sentencing judge during sentencing submissions; and any other relevant information it considers appropriate. The report of the Commissioner of Police will include information relating to the nature, extent and timeliness of the prisoner's cooperation; the truthfulness, completeness and reliability of information provided; and the significance and usefulness of the cooperation.

The South Australian, Victorian and Northern Territory models all provide that the Police Commissioner is to give a detailed report regarding the level of cooperation provided by the prisoner. The model circulated by the opposition, however, expects the Parole Board to inform itself of the details of the prisoner's cooperation without assistance. It does not include any mechanism by which the Parole Board can seek a report from the Police Commissioner as to whether the prisoner has cooperated and, if so, an evaluation of that cooperation. It appears a prisoner could submit their version of what cooperation they apparently gave without the mechanism for that information to be verified by the police. The Police Commissioner is in the best position to provide this advice and to give a thorough evaluation that assists the Parole Board in determining the calibre of the cooperation provided. The bill rightfully provides for his input in the Parole Board's decision-making process.

Where the body may have decomposed to the point where it is no longer recoverable or the body, as part of the offence, may have been completely disposed of or has since been interfered with by animals or environmental interference, the framework in the bill seeks to determine from the prisoner the last known location and place of the victim's remains. That is, the bill contemplates those cases where it is an impossibility for the body to, in fact, be recovered.

Importantly, the bill includes clear transitional provisions to ensure the full cohort of prisoners intended to be captured are, in fact, caught by the new policy. The no-body no-parole provisions will apply to the following: a parole application from a prisoner convicted and sentenced for the relevant offence after commencement of the bill; a parole application from a prisoner convicted before commencement but sentenced after commencement; a prisoner who was convicted and sentenced prior to commencement and the parole application is to be made after commencement or was made before commencement but is not yet determined at the time of commencement; and a parole application from a prisoner convicted, sentenced and released on parole but then returned to prison before or after commencement and the parole order is subsequently cancelled.

It is not proposed to capture those prisoners who have already been released on parole into the community at the time of commencement. However, if one of these prisoners has their parole order cancelled and they return to prison, the no-body no-parole provisions will apply to their subsequent application for release. The approach in the government bill regarding the transitional application is in stark contrast to the approach taken in the proposed opposition amendments. The opposition amendments do not provide any transitional provisions to ensure that existing prisoners who are yet to apply for parole are captured under the framework.

Failure to provide for this process retrospectively would mean that high-profile murderers currently serving their sentences awaiting a parole eligibility date and who know where the body or remains of their victims lie but have so far refused to satisfactorily cooperate will not fall within the scope of the LNP's no-body no-parole regime. Despite the opposition's explanatory notes referring to this being retrospective, their amendment introducing a no-cooperation no-parole model is not retrospective. This is a significant failure of the LNP's amendment. It means that, under the LNP's model, families currently suffering the anguish of still waiting to find the remains of their murdered loved ones would continue to suffer.

Mr Mander: Rubbish.

Mrs D'ATH: I take that interjection. These amendments have been thrown together without any consultation. Their explanatory notes state that. In fact, fundamentally, they fail at law.

An opposition member interjected.

Mrs D'ATH: I take the opposition interjection that the government has allegedly been brought kicking and screaming to this. In February we announced that we would introduce this bill. We have been working on this legislation—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Crawford): Order! We will have plenty of time to debate this in the second reading of the bill.

Mrs D'ATH: This government has been looking at the models of all jurisdictions to come up with the best proposed model. We are introducing the bill this week because, as we have had to do in the past 2½ years, the government has to fix up the absolute mess that the opposition keeps creating with its cheap stunts in bringing before this House private members' bills that are half baked and that have not been adequately put together. The government has to fix up those mistakes every single time. As a stakeholder said to me during consultation, they would rather wait and take some time to get this right. How can you have a proposed amendment—

Mr Mander interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Everton, you have had a good go. As I said before, we will have plenty of opportunity to debate this in the second reading of the bill. If you persist, I will warn you.

Mrs D'ATH: How can you propose an amendment that does not take the best model available, that does not link it to finding a body or remains, that does not put in place a proper mechanism for the Parole Board to satisfy itself that there has been cooperation, that does not define the most significant offence, being murder, and that fails to have any transitional provisions so that it will not apply to any prisoners currently serving time? That is a very quick summary of what those opposite have put together. The government's bill better delivers a no-body no-parole policy for Queensland, just as this government committed to doing. Unlike the opposition approach, the government wants to ensure that a bill of this importance and seriousness is referred to the relevant parliamentary committee for its detailed consideration and analysis, and to enable the full consultation process to occur.

Mr Ryan: That's what the stakeholders want.

Mrs D'ATH: I take the interjection from the Minister for Police: that is what the stakeholders want. It is also the view of key stakeholders that the government has consulted. The opposition should support the views of stakeholders and acknowledge the significant failing of their proposed amendments. They should give a commitment that they will no longer introduce their amendments. They should allow victims of families, homicide victims' groups and the legal profession to be part of the parliamentary process and have input into a no-body no-parole model that delivers for the people of Queensland, because that is what they want. Importantly, the process can now include the families of victims, that is, the very people whom this bill and the opposition's proposed amendments specifically target for support. Surely, they deserve a voice in this process. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (12.44 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.

Referral to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee

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

HEALTHY FUTURES COMMISSION QUEENSLAND BILL

Message from Governor

Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (12.44 pm): I present a message from His Excellency the Governor.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Crawford): The message from His Excellency recommends the Healthy Futures Commission Queensland Bill. The contents of the message will be incorporated in the *Record of Proceedings*. I table the message for the information of members.

MESSAGE

HEALTHY FUTURES COMMISSION QUEENSLAND BILL 2017

Constitution of Queensland 2001, section 68

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

A Bill for an Act to establish the Healthy Futures Commission Queensland and to amend this Act and the Public Service Act 2008 for particular purposes

(sgd)

GOVERNOR

Tabled paper: Message, dated 23 May 2017, from His Excellency the Governor recommending the Healthy Futures Commission Queensland Bill 2017 [742].

Introduction

Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (12.44 pm): I present a bill for an act to establish the Healthy Futures Commission Queensland and to amend this act and the Public Service Act 2008 for particular purposes. I table the bill and explanatory notes. I nominate the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Healthy Futures Commission Queensland Bill 2017 [743].

Tabled paper: Healthy Futures Commission Queensland Bill 2017, explanatory notes [744].

This bill will deliver the Palaszczuk government's election commitment to create a statewide health promotion commission by establishing the Healthy Futures Commission Queensland as an independent statutory body focusing on the health of children and families in our state. Obesity and, in particular, childhood obesity is a persistent challenge to the health and wellbeing of Queenslanders. In November 2016, Queensland's Chief Health Officer reported that one in four children and two in three adults in Queensland are overweight or obese. In real figures, that is about 259,000 children and 2.3 million adults.

There are very serious health consequences at play here. Obesity and sedentary lifestyles are consistently associated with premature mortality and type 2 diabetes, and are significant risk factors for cardiovascular disease. Moreover, childhood obesity is likely to result in adult obesity and related ill health and disease. We also know that some groups are more likely to be overweight or obese. Obesity rates are 76 per cent higher in socioeconomically disadvantaged areas of Queensland, compared to advantaged areas. Obesity rates are also higher in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander populations. Those living in rural and remote areas of Queensland are more likely to be overweight.

These are not easy issues to address. We do know that people need to have control over their own lives, to positively influence their own health behaviours and that of their families. That can only happen when the conditions in which people are born, grow up, live, work and age are favourable. Without addressing the underlying conditions and supporting children and families with the resources to be healthy, risky behaviours such as physical inactivity and poor nutrition are unlikely to change. That is why we are establishing an independent commission that will do things differently and be a champion for change at the individual and local levels, as well as advocate for system and environmental changes that will make a difference in disadvantaged communities.

The Healthy Futures Commission Queensland Bill 2017 will look to establish the Healthy Futures Commission Queensland as an independent statutory body that can work across boundaries to promote health equity by funding and coordinating efforts to address the factors that prevent Queensland children and families from being active and healthy. The overarching purpose of the commission is to support the capacity of children and families to adopt a healthy lifestyle through a focus on promoting physical activity and healthy eating. In this way, the commission will focus on two headline measures of success in the Palaszczuk government's vision for Queensland Health, *My health, Queensland's future: advancing health 2026*, relating to obesity in children and physical activity. They are, firstly, reducing childhood obesity by 10 per cent and, secondly, increasing levels of adult physical activity—in fact, increasing the physical activity of all Queenslanders—for health benefits by 20 per cent.

There are already many initiatives in our community and within government to target this issue. The commission will build on this to bring business, community groups and researchers together to ensure collaboration across the sectors. By providing grants and developing partnerships, the commission will be the spark to change the conditions in which children and their families live, work and play to encourage them to adopt a healthy lifestyle. Linking in with researchers and academics, the commission will focus on funding and supporting evidence based initiatives that will make a difference to the health of children, families and vulnerable communities. Supported by funding and investment in research, the commission will be able to promote a multisector approach to health promotion. The commission will make a positive and sustainable difference in this traditionally difficult area of changing individual behaviour and social norms.

As a statutory body, the commission will be a separate legal entity, directly accountable to the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services for its performance. The commission will comprise a six-member board, a chief executive officer and up to 15 staff. Board members will be appointed by the Governor in Council for up to four years. The performance of the commission will be monitored to ensure it is making progress towards reducing obesity and increasing physical activity in the community. The bill specifies that the commission must allocate at least 55 per cent of its total budget to the provision of grants for innovative ideas. Annual project funding plans must be submitted to the Minister for Health for approval each year, identifying the projects, grants, partnership and other arrangements the commission proposes to carry out for the year or the nature of those matters. The bill also requires the minister to ensure an independent review of the commission's performance is undertaken five years from the act commencing.

The Palaszczuk government is committed to making Queenslanders amongst the healthiest people in the world by 2026. Reducing childhood obesity by 10 per cent and increasing levels of physical activity are two key ways in which we can help to achieve this. The causes of obesity are complex and require a multifaceted approach.

The World Health Organisation report of the Commission on Ending Childhood Obesity makes clear that no single intervention can halt obesity. Obesity prevention requires a whole-of-government approach and community partnerships and action from the private sector, non-government organisations and input from universities, academics and researchers. The commission will play an important role in bringing these sectors together to focus on those initiatives that are likely to have the greatest impact. The commission will bring a new way of working, operating outside of the traditional government sphere. The commissioner and board members will be active champions for the commission's mandate, working alongside local communities to tackle these issues.

Giving Queensland children a healthy start will ensure they have the best possible opportunity to reach their full potential and to live a healthy and prosperous life. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (12.51 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Crawford): Order! In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee.

DISTINGUISHED VISITOR

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Honourable members, I am pleased to acknowledge today in the gallery His Excellency Mr Yogesh Punja, High Commissioner of the Republic of Fiji. Welcome to our parliament.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

UNIVERSITY LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

Hon. KJ JONES (Ashgrove—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism, Major Events and the Commonwealth Games) (12.51 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Central Queensland University Act 1998, the Griffith University Act 1998, the James Cook University Act 1997, the Queensland University of Technology Act 1998, the University of Queensland Act 1998, the University of Southern Queensland Act 1998 and the University of the Sunshine Coast Act 1998 for particular purposes. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the Education, Tourism, Innovation and Small Business Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: University Legislation Amendment Bill 2017 [745].

Tabled paper: University Legislation Amendment Bill 2017, explanatory notes [746].

Queensland's universities make a significant contribution to the state through their world-class research and through providing higher education courses to domestic and international students. There are seven public universities established by legislation in Queensland: Central Queensland University; Griffith University; James Cook University; Queensland University of Technology; University of Queensland; University of the Sunshine Coast; and University of Southern Queensland. I was just meeting with the chancellor and vice-chancellor of the Central Queensland University before coming in here.

These universities are established as statutory bodies under their own act and the Queensland government is responsible for overseeing their financial reporting and corporate governance. In 2012 the Australian government, through the establishment of the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency, took over the regulation of higher education courses and providers. Following this change in regulatory responsibility, the university acts were reviewed to identify ways to reduce the regulatory burden and to modernise the legislative framework. The review was conducted in consultation with the seven public universities, the National Tertiary Education Union, the Together union and the National Union of Students.

The bill implements the reforms identified during the review. The bill will remove the capacity for universities to make university statutes. Universities have gradually moved to replace statutes with university policy. Only five universities currently have statutes in place, dealing with matters such as the membership of the convocation or alumni association, the conduct of council elections, the making and notifying of university rules and the publishing of fees. Universities no longer use statutes to provide for student or academic discipline.

The process of making a statute is complex and time consuming for universities. Removing the ability to make statutes will reduce red tape on universities and is expected to have a negligible impact on students. The bill ensures that the transparency and accountability of the election of students and staff members to the university governing body is maintained by imposing an obligation on all universities to develop and publish an election policy for the election process.

The bill will remove limitations on the delegation of powers and functions of university governing bodies. It will enable university governing bodies to delegate decisions about the spending of funds donated to the university or given to the university under a special grant. The bill will also allow university governing bodies, when delegating functions or powers to the vice-chancellor, to permit the vice-chancellor to further delegate that function or power to an appropriately qualified member of the university staff. This amendment is consistent with modern corporate governance and will reduce red tape on the universities. University governing bodies will remain responsible and accountable for the decision-making of delegates.

The bill strengthens the integrity provisions in university acts by requiring members of governing bodies to notify the minister or governing body if they have become disqualified from being a member. This requirement ensures that the governing body is aware of changes in a person's suitability to be a member. Safeguards against the unauthorised use of this information are also included in the bill.

During the review of university acts, it was identified that the James Cook University Council faces particular difficulties ensuring it has the appropriate mix of skills, expertise, experience and corporate knowledge. I acknowledge the work of the members who represent the Townsville community here in this parliament—the member for Townsville, the member for Mundingburra and the member for Thuringowa—in terms of their conversations with me around supporting the reforms in the bill relating to JCU.

When compared to other universities, the JCU Council has the equal largest number of members, 22; the greatest number of elected members, 10; and the lowest number of council appointed members, one. This means that the JCU Council does not have the flexibility needed to ensure it has the right balance of expertise and diversity to provide strategic leadership to the university. We know from the representations of the university itself and the Townsville members of parliament that JCU is one of the biggest employers in Townsville. It is important that we support that university.

JCU was invited to develop a new governance structure, in consultation with its university community, for consideration by the government. Following extensive consultation with its stakeholders, JCU proposed the reform model which has been largely adopted in this bill. The bill allows JCU to make a resolution, passed by a two-thirds majority of its council, about the council's size and composition. The council must have between 11 and 21 members and must include: two to three official members—the chancellor, vice-chancellor and possibly the chairperson of the academic board, depending on whether the vice-chancellor is also the chairperson of the academic board—between three and six members appointed by the Governor in Council; between three and six elected members; and between three and six additional members, two of whom must be graduates of the university.

The elected members on the council must be at least three or 25 per cent of the total number of members on the council and must include at least one elected member of the academic staff, one elected member of the professional and technical staff and one elected student member. This ensures that the views of the staff and students are appropriately represented on the council. This requirement must be adhered to, even during the period of time that the council is transitioning from one governance structure to another.

The bill also ensures that a membership resolution cannot end the term of appointment of an existing member of the council. This prevents a membership resolution being used as a mechanism to remove an existing member from office. The provisions provide an appropriate balance between flexibility, diversity of membership and staff and student representation.

This bill only includes governance reforms to JCU's act because of the particular issues identified during the review of university acts. However, other universities may also benefit from the adoption of this model. If the JCU governance reforms are passed by parliament, I will invite Queensland's other public universities to consider looking at this model as well. Any university seeking to adopt the model will be required to consult widely with its stakeholders, as was the government's requirement of JCU. I wanted to make sure that there was genuine consultation with the people who would be directly affected by the changes outlined in the bill.

As I have outlined, the bill contains important reforms which will modernise the university acts and ensure that Queensland's public universities can continue to provide high-quality research and education that contributes to Queensland's economic and social development. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. KJ JONES (Ashgrove—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism, Major Events and the Commonwealth Games) (12.59 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.

Referral to the Education, Tourism, Innovation and Small Business Committee

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Crawford): Order! In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Education, Tourism, Innovation and Small Business Committee.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 pm to 2.30 pm.

TRANSPORT AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

Hon. JA TRAD (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning) (2.30 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Adult Proof of Age Card Act 2008, the Adult Proof of Age Card Regulation 2010, the Civil Partnerships Regulation 2012, the

Heavy Vehicle National Law Act 2012, the Liquor Act 1992, the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000, the Rail Safety National Law (Queensland) Act 2017, the State Penalties Enforcement Regulation 2014, the Tobacco and Other Smoking Products Act 1998, the Tow Truck Regulation 2009, the Transport Infrastructure Act 1994, the Transport Infrastructure (Dangerous Goods by Rail) Regulation 2008, the Transport Operations (Marine Safety) Act 1994, the Transport Operations (Marine Safety) Regulation 2016, the Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act 1994, the Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Regulation 2005, the Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995, the Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Accreditation and Other Provisions) Regulation 2015, the Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Dangerous Goods) Regulation 2008, the Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Driver Licensing) Regulation 2010, the Transport Planning and Coordination Act 1994, the Transport Security (Counter-Terrorism) Act 2008 and the Working with Children (Risk Management and Screening) Regulation 2011 for particular purposes and to repeal the Transport Operations (Marine Safety) Transitional Regulation 2016. I table the bill and explanatory notes. I nominate the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2017 [747].

Tabled paper: Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2017, explanatory notes [748].

The principal purpose of the bill is to enhance regulatory and administrative efficiency and to continue to provide a positive experience for customers dealing with the Department of Transport and Main Roads. The bill will amend the Adult Proof of Age Card Act 2008 to allow 15- to 17-year-olds to be issued with a photo identification card. Currently, people 18 years or older can be issued with an adult proof-of-age card. This card is a useful form of identification that the person can use to access a very broad range of goods and services. These cards are particularly useful for those people who do not hold a driver's licence.

Adult proof-of-age cards are now recognised as a primary form of identification by banks, telecommunications companies and other government and non-government organisations that require evidence of identity. Feedback to the Department of Transport and Main Roads has indicated that a photo identification card would also be very useful for 15- to 17-year-olds. Young people often begin part-time work when they are 15 and are becoming increasingly independent. The bill will ensure that these young people can have a recognised form of photo identification, allowing them to more easily access services such as opening a bank account.

The bill therefore amends the Adult Proof of Age Card Act to allow cards to be issued to 15- to 17-year-olds. As a result, the bill will also change the name of the cards to photo identification cards and rename the act to become the Photo Identification Card Act 2008. These amendments were developed in consultation with all relevant government departments and agencies, including the Office of Liquor and Gaming Regulation in the Department of Justice and Attorney-General. For the benefit of the House, I indicate that the amendments are not expected to facilitate 15- to 17-year-olds entering licensed premises or purchasing alcohol. That is because 16- and 17-year-olds can already be issued with learner or provisional driver's licence, which means that licensed premises must already check dates of birth on people's driver's licences. These amendments are an important initiative for young people and will greatly assist them in their transition to adulthood.

The bill also contains a number of amendments that, while more minor in nature, will contribute to a reduction in the regulatory burden for customers who wish to transact with the Department of Transport and Main Roads. For example, amendments will remove the requirement for customers to complete application forms when applying for a number of transport products and services under the Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act and the Adult Proof of Age Card Act.

The department has introduced a whole range of initiatives recently to enhance the service provided to its customers. These include new online services, introducing e-correspondence for registration renewal notices and reminders and a range of mobile apps to assist customers go about their business. To ensure that new approaches and new technologies, such as online portals and computer apps, can be adopted quickly to further enhance customers' experience, legislative requirements to use an approved form when dealing with the department are being progressively phased out. As a result, a targeted trial is planned for the second half of 2017, when customers will be able to apply verbally for a driver's licence or to renew their vehicle registration without having to complete an application form. This is a contemporary way of conducting business and not only saves time for the customer but reduces transaction times for customer service centre staff.

The duplication of information that customers provide—for example, name, address and date of birth—will also be eliminated as it will be recorded directly from the customer's supporting documents. It is also anticipated that savings will be realised through a decrease in the number of forms required to be printed, a reduction in warehousing and distribution costs, as well as storage costs associated with the retention of records, not to mention the environmental benefits of ecofriendly application processes.

To truly cater for the customer of the future, the department is transforming from a customer service model focused on transactions to an integrated model where customers play an active role in the design and delivery of our services. We have a strong commitment to meet customers' expectations first time, every time. As a result, the department will continue to explore ways to enhance customer experience by providing more contemporary, flexible and convenient ways for customers to do business with the department. These amendments contribute to that by removing the legislative requirement to apply on an approved form for a restricted driver's licence, or an alcohol ignition interlock exemption, or to nominate a vehicle for the alcohol ignition interlock program.

The bill contains a number of minor amendments to the Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act 1994 which will simplify the legislation. Firstly, changes will clarify that the powers of authorised persons extend to an area adjacent to the public transport infrastructure. This does not extend the circumstances in which an authorised person may use force, which is important to note. An important part of an authorised person's functions is ensuring the safety of the public transport network and the persons using it. Additionally, amendments to the passenger transport act will clarify the circumstances in which a person may be automatically refused driver authorisation by the Department of Transport and Main Roads. Finally, for safety and security reasons, amendments to the passenger transport act will limit the information about a transit officer to be included in a written report given to a person detained by a transit officer.

The bill also makes a number of administrative amendments to the Transport Planning and Coordination Act 1994 to improve the effectiveness of existing provisions—for example, changes designed to enhance the ability of the Department of Transport and Main Roads to plan for and mitigate the impacts of roadworks on public passenger services. Another benefit of these particular changes will be reduced obligations on local government by narrowing the criteria for when they must apply to the Department of Transport and Main Roads for approval to change the management of a local government road. Overall, these amendments will result in improvements to the notification requirements to ensure that the relevant information is easily and publicly available.

Another amendment that streamlines processes are changes the bill makes to the Transport Infrastructure Act 1994 to allow departmental officers to carry out certain consultations on my behalf with a local government railway manager or light rail manager. This clarifies how the process will operate. Amendments to the Transport Security (Counter-Terrorism) Act 2008 to align the maximum penalty applying to a breach of confidentiality provisions with other like provisions in other transport acts provides for improved legislative consistency. This act is also amended to provide for a five-year periodic review of the act to ensure that its provisions remain appropriate.

The bill also makes a number of minor clarifying amendments to legislation dealing with heavy vehicles, the transport of dangerous goods, rail safety and marine safety. In particular, the Heavy Vehicle National Law Act 2012 is being amended to clarify that fees under the national law can be specified in a regulation. The Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995 and the Transport Infrastructure Act 1994 are being amended to update and clarify the provision that deals with small quantities of dangerous goods that are exempt from the legislation. The Rail Safety National Law (Queensland) Act 2017 is being amended to delete a redundant definition, and the Transport Operations (Marine Safety) Act 1994 is being amended to ensure that vessels which are not regulated under the national domestic commercial vessel national law continue to be appropriately regulated under Queensland legislation. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. JA TRAD (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning) (2.41 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.

Referral to the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

School Group Tours

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order! Before I call the next speaker, I would like to acknowledge that we have had in the gallery today students from Alexandra Hills State High School from the electorate of Capalaba and students from Citipointe Christian College from the electorate of Mansfield.

LAND ACCESS OMBUDSMAN BILL

Introduction

Hon. AJ LYNHAM (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (2.41 pm): I present a bill for an act to provide for a Land Access Ombudsman to investigate and facilitate the resolution of disputes about conduct and compensation agreements and make good agreements, and to amend this act, the Coal Mining Safety and Health Act 1999, the Integrity Act 2009, the Mineral and Energy Resources (Common Provisions) Act 2014, the Mineral Resources Regulation 2013, the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004 and the Public Service Act 2008 for particular purposes. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Land Access Ombudsman Bill 2017 [749].

Tabled paper: Land Access Ombudsman Bill 2017, explanatory notes [750].

I am pleased to introduce the Land Access Ombudsman Bill 2017. This bill provides for the creation of a Land Access Ombudsman to investigate and facilitate the resolution of disputes about conduct and compensation agreements and make-good agreements; the saving of existing provisions contained in the Mineral and Energy Resources (Common Provisions) Transitional Regulation 2016 that will expire in September 2017; and the inserting of new provisions relating to the overlapping tenure framework contained in the Mineral and Energy Resources (Common Provisions) Transitional Regulation 2016.

It is a fundamental tenet of Australian law that the state's mineral and energy resources belong to all Queenslanders. The production of these resources provides for royalty streams which contribute to the state's hospitals, roads, schools, police and other vital services for the people of Queensland. The state authorises access to land for resource companies to undertake the activities necessary to explore for, and subsequently produce, these resources where it is economically feasible to do so. In 2010, the Queensland government introduced the land access framework to balance the rights and responsibilities of landholders and resource companies seeking access to private land. This framework now applies to all resource authorities except mining leases, mining claims and prospecting permits, which operate under a different regulatory framework.

Under Queensland's land access framework, resource companies are required to enter into a conduct and compensation agreement with landholders prior to entering land to carry out advanced—that is, high impact—activities. Conduct and compensation agreements contain provisions regarding the conduct of activities on landholders' land and set out compensation arrangements negotiated by the parties.

In 2010, the Queensland government also established a regulatory framework requiring petroleum tenure holders to monitor and manage the impacts caused by the exercise of underground water rights on water bores. This includes the responsibility to make good on any impairments caused to a private bore owner. Make-good agreements are an arrangement between resource companies and water bore owners for the purpose of ensuring private water bore owners impacted by resource activities are able to maintain access to a reasonable supply of water for the authorised use and purpose of their water bore. A resource company is required to enter into a make-good agreement where a water bore assessment has determined that, as a result of resource activities, a water bore has or is likely to have an impaired capacity. The agreement details the measures the resource company must take to make good the impact of their resource activities.

This underground water management framework was expanded to include the mining sector from 6 December 2016 with the commencement of the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014. The Land Access Ombudsman Bill 2017 will enhance the existing land access and make-good frameworks by establishing an independent statutory office of the Land Access Ombudsman. The Land Access Ombudsman's primary function will be to help resolve disputes between landholders and resource companies who are parties to conduct and compensation and make-good agreements. It will help resolve them quickly, simply and at no cost to the parties to the dispute, providing an alternative to lengthy and expensive arbitration or court actions.

The Land Access Ombudsman will be a first port of call option for a party provided they have already made some reasonable attempt to try to resolve the dispute. The idea is to have a relatively simple, cost-free process to nip the problem in the bud so that all parties can quickly resolve the dispute and get on with their lives and their jobs. The proposal to establish the Land Access Ombudsman arises from a recommendation in the report of the independent review of the Gasfields Commission Queensland, which was completed last year by retired Land Court member Mr Robert Scott. The Gasfields Commission Queensland review report noted that, once any dispute resolution mechanisms in the agreement are exhausted, the only legal remedy for a breach of a conduct and compensation agreement is resort to a court of competent jurisdiction.

In coming to his recommendations in the Gasfields Commission Queensland review report, Mr Scott interviewed dozens of stakeholders including landholders, industry and community groups, peak producer groups and industry peak bodies, as well as government agencies and local governments. In doing so, he gained a good feel for the approach needed to help people resolve these types of disputes which otherwise can have a significant economic and emotional toll on the parties concerned. I thank Mr Scott for his work and his important insights on these issues.

To address the concerns raised by stakeholders, the review recommended the establishment of an independent statutory body that has the power to investigate and facilitate the resolution of disputes between parties to conduct and compensation and make-good agreements. The government supported this recommendation and considered the best model to deliver this recommendation would be through the creation of a Land Access Ombudsman.

This office will achieve the same outcome as contemplated in the Gasfields Commission Queensland review report, which, in effect, is a role that could be delivered by an ombudsman. As outlined by the Australian and New Zealand Ombudsman Association, the fundamental role of an ombudsman is the independent resolution, redress and prevention of disputes. The role of an ombudsman should not be confused with that of a regulatory body in that it should not have regulatory, disciplinary and/or prosecutorial functions.

The primary function of the Land Access Ombudsman will be to investigate disputes about existing conduct and compensation and make-good agreements and to facilitate the resolution of these disputes. A party to a conduct and compensation or make-good agreement will be entitled to refer a dispute to the Land Access Ombudsman without having to first exhaust the dispute resolution mechanisms contained in their agreement. Access to the Land Access Ombudsman will be free to both parties. Referred disputes will be dealt with in a facilitative and conciliatory manner and may involve meeting with the parties, hearing their views, offering advice on the merits of each party's position and making recommendations on how the dispute could be resolved.

The Land Access Ombudsman will not have the power to make binding decisions on the parties. It is not an alternative to a court or arbitration. Consistent with Mr Scott's view that the position provide a holistic service, the Land Access Ombudsman will also be able to provide parties with information about relevant health services. This is to assist in lowering the stress that may arise over the dispute. In order to ensure the Land Access Ombudsman has access to relevant information to help facilitate dispute resolution, the Land Access Ombudsman will have powers to compel production of documents by the parties and to answer questions. Where necessary, the Land Access Ombudsman will also have powers to enter the land subject to the dispute to perform an investigation. Where the Land Access Ombudsman reasonably believes that a resource authority holder or a resource tenure holder has contravened a resource act, a condition of an environmental authority, the Water Act 2000 or the Environmental Protection Act 1994, the Land Access Ombudsman can make recommendations to the relevant department that the matter be investigated.

The Land Access Ombudsman will also be able to identify systemic issues arising out of disputes and provide advice to government about these issues. This is an important feedback loop alerting the government to broader issues, facilitating early government intervention. The Land Access

Ombudsman will not be subject to direction by a minister, a chief executive or government about the way its functions are performed, the priority it gives to investigations or the advice it gives to parties, or the systemic regulatory issues it identifies during the course of its investigations. However, to ensure appropriate transparency and accountability, the Land Access Ombudsman will be required to provide an annual report to the responsible minister, which must be published on the ombudsman's website. This annual report will provide a description of:

- land access dispute referrals made;
- land access dispute referrals that the Land Access Ombudsman has decided not to investigate or continue to investigate;
- land access dispute referrals the ombudsman has investigated;
- written notices provided to the parties under clause 51 of the bill;
- notices given to a chief executive under clauses 53 to 55 of the bill; and
- details of other functions performed by the ombudsman during the year.

The enabling legislation also provides for the process for appointment of the Land Access Ombudsman and conditions of the appointment and the administration and staffing of the Office of the Land Access Ombudsman.

A second objective of this bill is to further simplify the dispute resolution processes available to parties to a conduct and compensation agreement by providing the Land Court with exclusive jurisdiction to deal with alleged breaches of a conduct and compensation agreement. Currently, parties are required to apply to a court of competent jurisdiction for resolution of these disputes. By providing exclusive jurisdiction to the Land Court, it will become the sole court parties need to interact with to resolve disputes both before and after entering into a conduct and compensation agreement. This change is consistent with the dispute resolution approach for make-good agreements.

In summary, the Land Access Ombudsman will give landholders and resource companies a trusted, easily accessible and independent person to help resolve problems before they escalate into full-blown legal disputes, and it does this in a more streamlined dispute resolution process which is cost effective and efficient. Importantly, by listening to people's concerns and offering advice on ways to resolve them, the Land Access Ombudsman will provide a valuable service to landholders and the resources sector. Helping parties resolve their disputes early will not only reduce personal stress for landholders and those in the resource industry but it will also help support and grow our multibillion dollar agriculture and LNG industries.

Finally, this bill also includes amendments to save provisions contained in the Mineral and Energy Resources (Common Provisions) Transitional Regulation 2016—MER(CP) Transitional Regulation—which will expire in September 2017. The MER(CP) Transitional Regulation contains provisions relating to the land access framework for resource authorities and the industry developed overlapping tenure framework for coal and coal seam gas tenures. The bill also inserts additional provisions into the MER(CP) Act that are required as a consequence of saving the overlapping tenure provisions contained in the MER(CP) Transitional Regulation, which relate to when a petroleum lease tender is released over a coal tenure. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. AJ LYNHAM (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (2.53 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.

Referral to the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee

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

CORRECTIVE SERVICES (PAROLE BOARD) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from 9 May (see p. 984), on motion of Mr Ryan—

That the bill be now read a second time.

Mr DICKSON (Buderim—PHON) (2.54 pm): I rise to speak to the Corrective Services (Parole Board) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. This bill amends the Corrective Services Act 2006, the Judges (Pensions and Long Leave) Act 1957, Parole Orders (Transfer) Act 1984 and a number of other acts. However, the primary objective of the bill is to amend the Corrective Services Act 2006 to establish the Parole Board Queensland and to also make technical and clarifying amendments to the Corrective Services Act to facilitate the electronic monitoring of persons released to parole, whether court ordered parole or board ordered parole. I will make a short contribution regarding the amendments in relation to the electronic monitoring of parolees and also a submission by the Queensland Homicide Victims' Support Group.

Recommendation 60 of the 2016 Sofronoff review report identified that the application of GPS monitoring of paroled offenders in appropriate circumstances based on assessed risk could assist in both improving the reintegration of parolees into the community and reducing reoffending. The Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee examined the bill. I note that the bill proposes to implement the parole review report recommendations that the global positioning device—GPS—monitoring of parolees be undertaken. I understand from the committee report that the government views the implementation of these recommendations as a priority, and I support the government on this.

The bill provides that a parole order may contain a condition that the prisoner must follow directions given by a corrective services officer that may restrict the prisoner or enable the prisoner to be monitored; and a corrective services officer may give a direction to a prisoner to remain in a stated place for a stated period—a curfew direction—and wear a stated device and permit the installation of a device or equipment at the place where the released prisoner resides, a monitoring direction. Failure to comply with these directions can be actionable as a breach of that parole.

The Gold Coast Centre Against Sexual Violence supports monitoring some parolees via electronic devices based on the assessed risk of each parolee. The Queensland Homicide Victims' Support Group also support this provision, noting—

The use of GPS tracking devices to help regulate the movement of parolees will help to provide warnings both to the homicide victim families and to alert Police in situations where the parolee is detected as in danger of breeching parole conditions.

The Queensland Homicide Victims' Support Group also consider that the victim of a crime should be alerted when the perpetrator of the crime is about to be released on parole wearing a GPS device for the simple fact that it then allows the person to protect themselves if that is deemed necessary. They stated—

... in those cases where the families know and have a very real fear that they are in danger, giving them the opportunity to respond to that and to remove themselves from the situation, a warning, just time—even an hour or 24 hours sometimes is enough—to remove yourself from the vicinity of the perpetrator.

I note from the committee report that a couple of groups were not in favour of the electronic monitoring options. The reason for their views included that this—

... is an intrusive process that does not actually prevent people on parole from committing further offences. It is also inappropriate for the requirement to wear a GPS tracking device or permit the installation of a monitoring device be imposed by a corrective services officer, rather than the Parole Board.

The concerns regarding the powers given to a Corrective Services officer rather than the Parole Board was a view also shared by the Bar Association of Queensland. However, it also considered that the Corrective Services officer could make a direction with immediate effect providing it expires after a certain number of days and the Parole Board would then be responsible for any potential extension or amendment to that direction. I think that the safety of the community must be the absolute priority in the release of prisoners on parole. In that regard, if the wearing of electronic monitoring devices is deemed appropriate, then that is what we must undertake.

Finally, I note that buried on page 22 of the committee's report is a note regarding a reference to a further submission made by the Queensland Homicide Victims' Support Group in relation to a bill that I believe is now before the House, so I will not go into any detail on that. I will table the One Nation policy document that we put out in April of this year which relates to that.

Tabled paper: Pamphlet titled 'Queensland—It's in your hands' outlining One Nation policy [753].

While I am on my feet—and I know you will not hear this too often in the House—I would like to thank the Deputy Premier for calling in the key resource area. The Maroochydore community was impacted because there was a court case going on. The Deputy Premier has done a very good job and I thank her. I would also like the Deputy Premier to have a look at the Twin Waters West development because it is planning to—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Member for Buderim, as much as your compliments I am sure will be gratefully received, let us keep within the long title of the bill. I call the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services.

Hon. MT RYAN (Morayfield—ALP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services) (3.00 pm), in reply: I would like to take this opportunity to thank honourable members of this House for their contributions to the debate on the Corrective Services (Parole Board) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2017. I am very proud to be part of the formulation of this bill, which will be instrumental in strengthening the safety of all Queenslanders.

By accepting 89 of the 91 recommendations in the Sofronoff review, the Palaszczuk government is committed to these sweeping reforms, which will ensure that Queensland's parole system operates as effectively as possible to ensure community safety. As part of our commitment to reform the probation and parole system, we have dedicated an additional $265 million over six years. Included in this package of reforms will be an increase in the number and diversity of rehabilitation programs, including drug and alcohol strategies and education courses which are designed to reduce recidivism and keep Queenslanders safe.

This bill delivers on the review's key recommendations through the establishment of a single body to determine parole matters in Queensland with the exception of the imposition of court ordered parole. The new Parole Board Queensland replaces the three boards that currently operate in Queensland: the Queensland Parole Board and two other regional boards. The new Parole Board Queensland will be led by a full-time president and two full-time deputy presidents. The people who are appointed to these key positions will be former judicial officers or will have the qualifications, experience or standing equivalent to a judicial officer. Full-time professional board members will be drawn from diverse backgrounds and have university or professional qualifications relevant to the functions of the Parole Board. As well as police and Public Service representatives, the Queensland community will be represented by community board members. The calibre and diversity of membership on the new board is true to the vision of the Sofronoff view of a professionalised single parole board which employs rigorous and well-informed decision-making on parole matters. The bill ensures balanced gender membership and the representation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people on the Parole Board.

Madam Deputy Speaker, as I said in my second reading speech, the bill also provides greater scope for Corrective Services officers to monitor paroled prisoners via electronic devices. The bill strengthens existing powers to monitor paroled prisoners by empowering Corrective Services officers to give a direction to a paroled prisoner to remain at a stated place for stated periods, to wear a GPS monitoring device and to permit the installation of a device or equipment at the place where the released prisoner resides.

I will now take this opportunity to address some of the remarks made by members opposite during the course of this debate. During the debate we heard a claim that there was a plan by those opposite to build 650 beds in correctional centres in Queensland. I am pleased to say that once Borallon is fully commissioned in a way that is safe for prisoners over 650 additional beds in our correctional centres will have been delivered over the last few years. In addition, we recently announced a $200 million, 164-bed expansion of the Capricornia Correctional Centre which will ensure that we have additional capacity in our prisons.

We go beyond expanding infrastructure capacity in Queensland and we look at restoring the diversion programs and diversionary courts that those opposite cut when they were in government. When you talk about prison capacity it is not just about infrastructure: it is about diversion programs, rehabilitation programs and reducing recidivism, because when you rehabilitate people, when you reduce recidivism and reduce reoffending, you create a safer community. This government is very proud to be restoring the Murri Court, the Drug Court and the Special Circumstances Court and we are investing in those programs in our prisons. We have followed that up with real money—$265 million over six years—and this will make a real difference to the safety of the people of Queensland because it will reduce recidivism, it will reduce reoffending, it will lead to reduced crime and it will ensure that Queenslanders are safe.

I am very, very proud of not only this package of reforms but the legislation and the infrastructure expansion that we are continuing to roll out. I would like to reinforce that our government has a plan not only in the short term but also the medium and long term to continue to expand prison infrastructure and invest in measures that help keep Queenslanders safe.

It is important to note that the new Parole Board Queensland will include representatives from regional and remote communities. This bill provides that, when a person is recommended to the Governor in Council for appointment as a board member, regard must be had to providing for balanced gender representation and the representation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people on the board. Moreover, when a person is appointed as a community board member or a professional board member, the bill expressly provides that regard must also be had to ensuring that the Parole Board represents the diversity of the Queensland community. I know that in their contributions a number of members requested feedback with regard to ensuring that regional representation was a consideration with respect to the diversity of the constitution of the Parole Board Queensland.

I would also like to point out to members of this House that, importantly, a professional member is not limited to a person with legal qualifications but rather relates to a person who has a university or professional qualification which is relevant to the functions of the Parole Board. These requirements will ensure that the new Parole Board will be comprised of a variety of people with a variety of experiences and be representative of all communities in Queensland.

When this bill was introduced I highlighted the importance of fundamental reform following the release of the Sofronoff review and the restructuring of the new Parole Board Queensland. This bill will bring our probation and parole system into the 21st century. It will have a big impact on the safety of Queenslanders. It will ensure that we have a single professionalised streamlined Parole Board Queensland which will contribute overall not only to the operation of our parole system in Queensland but also to the safety of Queenslanders. I encourage all members to support the bill. I commend the bill to the House.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1 to 4, as read, agreed to.

Clause 5—

Mr MANDER (3.08 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Division: Question put—That leave be granted.

AYES, 44:

LNP, 39—Barton, 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, Smith, 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, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

Pairs: Byrne, Simpson; Miller, Seeney.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Mr MANDER: I move the following amendment—

1 Clause 5 (Amendment of s 193 (Decision of parole board))

Page 7, after line 8—

insert—

(4) Section 193—

insert—

(4A) If the prisoner is serving a period of imprisonment for an offence of murder or an offence of manslaughter, the parole board must refuse to grant the application unless the board is satisfied the prisoner has satisfactorily cooperated with the investigation of the offence.

(4B) For subsection (4A), the cooperation may have happened before or after the prisoner was sentenced to imprisonment for the offence.

(4C) In deciding whether the prisoner has satisfactorily cooperated with the investigation of the offence, the parole board must take into account the following matters—

(a) the nature and extent of the prisoner's cooperation;

(b) the timeliness of the cooperation;

(c) the truthfulness, completeness and reliability of any information or evidence provided by the prisoner;

(d) the significance and usefulness of the prisoner's cooperation.

(5) Section 193—

insert—

(6) In this section—

offence of manslaughter includes counselling or procuring the commission of an offence of manslaughter.

offence of murder includes the following—

(a) counselling or procuring the commission of an offence of murder;

(b) an offence against the Criminal Code, section 307;

(c) an offence against the Criminal Code, section 309 if the murder is committed.

I table the explanatory notes to my amendments.

Tabled paper: Corrective Services (Parole Board) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2017, explanatory notes to Mr Tim Mander's amendments [751].

We have introduced this amendment to give effect to the no-body no-parole policy. This is a policy that families of victims have been asking for for years. We have travelled around the state and heard some very—

Mr Costigan: Harrowing.

Mr MANDER: I take that interjection—harrowing stories of families whose pain and anguish from losing a loved one through some horrendous crime is exaggerated a hundred fold by the fact that they have never found their loved one's remains.

Simply, we have introduced something the government should have done. A review was done of the parole system—a system that was very overdue for a review. One of Mr Sofronoff's recommendations was for the introduction of a no-body no-parole policy. The no-body no-parole policy was not included in the first suite of changes introduced by the minister. We have listened to the people of Queensland and have sought to give effect to the recommendation so that some people in the community can have some relief.

There is no need for this to go any further. Mr Sofronoff included this proposal in his review report. He engaged with stakeholders. He spoke to people about the matter. The purpose of a review is to go through different scenarios and come up with recommendations. This is the recommendation he came up with and we agree with it wholeheartedly.

We need to give some comfort and relief—right now—to victims' families who are still mourning the loss of their loved ones. That loss has been exacerbated by the fact that the person who has been convicted of the homicide is not cooperating with police and divulging the whereabouts of the remains. We call on the government to unite with us so that the parliament as a whole can show the community that we know that this is a policy people want and that we need to implement immediately.

Mr DICKSON: It is fortuitous that I can now finish my speech. The Homicide Victims' Support Group submitted that a person accused of murder or manslaughter should only ever be eligible for parole for a period of two years following the last of the legal appeals 'during which—

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Buderim, I need to make sure that your speech is relevant to the amendment.

Mr DICKSON: Absolutely, Mr Speaker; this relates to no-body no-parole—'the prisoner be directed to reveal where the body of the deceased can be found. After that period the offer of future parole be denied.' The Homicide Victims' Support Group made that suggestion to ensure homicide victims' families have the best chance possible to retrieve their loved one's body. I note the report states—

The absence of such a restriction on the offer of parole in exchange for a prisoner disclosing the location of the victim's body risks, for example, development or construction that makes it impossible to locate a body.

I would have to agree with the victims' support group. I do think, however, that the comment that development or construction may make it impossible to locate a victim's body is a bit of a cop-out. I also note in relation to this submission that there is no formal response from the department contained in that report.

A no-body no-parole provision, as detailed in One Nation's policy booklet, is a priority of One Nation in Queensland. Our provisions will apply retrospectively. I think that is a shortcoming of the amendment moved today. We support retrospective legislation in this instance. From a quick reading of it, I think retrospectivity is an element of the government's bill. That is where my vote will go at the end of the day. This legislation has to apply retrospectively, to people who have already committed murder. We have to think of victims' families and loved ones. They want to know the location of the remains of their loved ones so that they can pay a great deal of respect to them. I think that is the difference between the two propositions being put on the table today. I am sorry to say that I will have to support the government on this one.

Mr RYAN: Thank you for the opportunity to discuss this matter with the House. As members may be aware, there is a bill before the House which fundamentally addresses the very nature of this amendment, but it is different in some respects.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, you will all have a chance to talk to the amendment.

Mr RYAN: The model contained in the government bill before the House addresses a number of fundamental flaws in the member for Everton's amendment. The model contained in the government bill is no-body no-parole, as opposed to no-cooperation no-parole. Unfortunately, the amendment moved by the member for Everton fails to link the requirement for cooperation for that person seeking parole to the location of the body. The amendment moved by the member for Everton also does not properly define the offences to which this no-body no-parole model should apply. In particular, I note the comments made by the Attorney-General in her contribution when introducing her bill about the amendment moved by the member for Everton failing to define 'murder'.

In addition, there is no requirement in the amendment moved by the member for Everton requiring the Parole Board to seek feedback from the Police Commissioner, or from Corrective Services, on the extent of cooperation from the person seeking parole. In addition, transitional issues are not properly covered. This issue is particularly relevant to the point raised by the member for Buderim. To ensure that a no-body no-parole model is retrospective and applies to people who are already in jail, we must properly address the transitional issues. We must properly address the retrospective issues. The advice that we have been provided is that the amendment moved by the member for Everton is unclear on that point, whereas the model that the government has put forward not only ensures that it is very clear but also provides certainty.

To me, the most important issue is the preparation that the member for Everton has put into this amendment. Not only do we see in his explanatory notes that fundamental legal principles have not been addressed, have not been articulated, but also we see that there has been no consultation on the proposal. We have heard from victim support groups—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr RYAN: This is feedback that we have heard from members—

Mr SPEAKER: Members, we are not going to have an argument. If you want to speak to the amendment, I ask you to let me know and you will get the call.

Mr RYAN: We have heard from victim support groups—the Queensland Homicide Victims' Support Group, Bruce and Denise Morcombe as well as Fiona Splitt. They want the opportunity for the community—

Mrs D'Ath: The Queensland Law Society.

Mr RYAN: I take that interjection from the Attorney-General. We heard from those key stakeholder groups that they want the opportunity to have their say. The amendment moved by the member for Everton denies those stakeholder groups, those victim support groups, the opportunity to have their say. This is so important to those stakeholder groups that they want to make sure that we get it right. The proposed amendment of the member for Everton does not get it right. This is an opportunity for our parliament to get this right, to listen to key stakeholders and to ensure that we have a no-body no-parole system that works and not a no-body no-parole system that does not refer to identification of the body, does not refer to the offence of murder and does not ensure retrospectivity.

It is incumbent on all members of the House to ensure that this important issue not only receives community consultation but also works. I encourage all members of the House to oppose the amendment.

Mr CRIPPS: I rise to speak in support of the amendment moved by the member for Everton, principally because what we saw before lunch with the introduction of a bill by the Attorney-General was a bit of a political tantrum. In the previous sitting of this parliament, during the course of the debate on the Corrective Services (Parole Board) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2017 the member for Everton, as the shadow minister, caught the government with its pants down. The government should have done the work associated with implementing the recommendations that were contained in Walter Sofronoff's report in relation to no-body no-parole and had the provisions included in the bill presented to the House by the Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services and failed to do so.

In relation to this recommendation in Mr Sofronoff's report, the member for Everton did not fail to take action, the LNP did not fail to take action. During the debate on this bill during the previous sitting of parliament, the amendment was foreshadowed in good faith by the member for Everton. That was a fortnight ago. If the government had any concerns about what the member for Everton foreshadowed, it ought to have come into this House in good faith with an amendment to address any shortcomings in the member's amendment. It has not done that. The government has come in here and performed another political stunt.

Before lunch, we saw the Attorney-General grandstanding on this issue, chastising the member for Everton, having a hissy fit, just because the member for Everton caught the government with its pants down. The member for Everton got stuck in and did the work that the community expects. It is to the ongoing shame of the government that it continues to pull these political stunts when the opposition consistently presents practical and common-sense solutions to the concerns of the community.

Ms Bates interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Hinchinbrook, I apologise for interrupting. Member for Mudgeeraba, you are warned under standing order 253A. You are trying to talk over the top of the member for Hinchinbrook, who is on your side. If you want to participate, I will give you the call.

Mr CRIPPS: The government adjourned the debate on the bill before the House because the member for Everton foreshadowed this amendment. It has had two weeks in which to do some work and get organised with amendments of its own that would address any perceived shortcomings of the amendment foreshadowed by the member for Everton. In relation to this important policy issue, we have a lazy, out-of-touch government that is desperately trying to retrieve some political credibility. In my opinion, it has failed dismally.

In relation to the government's lack of action, there are members in this House who have an opportunity to give the government a bit of discipline and support the amendment moved by the member for Everton. It deserves to be supported. Action needs to be taken on this issue. The laziness of the Attorney-General and the government has been exposed.

Mrs D'ATH: I pick up the point that the member for Hinchinbrook raised: why did the government not come in here and simply move amendments to the opposition's amendment? My question to the opposition is: why did it not give stakeholders, including the homicide victims' group and family members of victims, the opportunity to have input into its amendment? Over the past week, every stakeholder, every family, every group I have spoken to have said that they want the opportunity to have input into this model. Why is the opposition choosing not to give those victims' families a say?

The Walter Sofronoff review did not state that we should implement the South Australian model. It said that there was a model—in South Australia—but to look at other models as well. We did that. The opposition has failed to look at any other jurisdictions. It has chosen the one that achieves the least aim. What are we trying to achieve? To find the body or remains for victims' families—except we have an amendment that fails to state that you have to find the body, or remains; that does not have a proper way of getting the information to the Parole Board to make the decision; that fails to define 'murder'; and does not contain retrospectivity, which means that it will apply only to people being charged and sentenced in the future and not those serving sentences right now.

Mr Mander: That's not true.

Mrs D'ATH: It is true. Member for Everton, I do not know who you are getting your legal advice from, but the fact is it is flawed. There are no transitional provisions in the amended bill. Simply by mentioning it in explanatory notes is not sufficient.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Members, I want to hear the Attorney-General. Member for Everton, you have already spoken.

Mrs D'ATH: The basic rules around interpretation are that the court will not turn to the explanatory notes if the legislation is very clear. It is completely silent on any transitional provisions. In other words, there are no transitional provisions so it does not apply retrospectively. It fails completely on this. I keep hearing, 'Why don't we just fix this up now?' Because of the homicide victims' group, because of the Law Society, because of the Morcombe's—I chatted with Denise and Bruce Morcombe about this. They want to make sure we get this right. They believe it is important to have a proper process. They said, 'We would rather this take a few more weeks and we get it right than see it rushed through and have a flawed law.' My question to everyone on that side who is backing this is what are you going to do when that first person applies for parole, they are rejected under this amendment and the court overturns it? I can guarantee that is exactly what will happen. What will those opposite say to that family when that person walks?

Mr WALKER: I want to address two issues—one the issue of so-called retrospectivity and the other the issue of consultation. Retrospectivity is being thrown around here really without proper thought as to what we are talking about. We are not actually talking about retrospectivity. I think what the member for Buderim is talking about, and rightly so, is that he wants to be sure that this bill catches those who are presently convicted but yet to apply for parole. That is the group that we are concerned about. There is no retrospectivity in the sense of the legislation going backwards. This is forward looking legislation to those who will apply for parole, but it does apply to those who are presently convicted. In my view that satisfies the very reasonable concern of the member for Buderim with respect to the issue of ensuring that those who are presently in jail but will in future apply for parole are caught by the legislation.

The other point I wanted to make is the point that I think was very well made by the member for Hinchinbrook with respect to issues of consultation. It is important to consult. Consultation has happened. Mr Sofronoff has conducted his review. There were extensive submissions to that. It is quite reasonable for a political party like ours to take a position following that extensive consultation. The member for Everton has done just that and, as the member for Hinchinbrook pointed out, if there were issues that the government had with what the member for Everton brought into the House those opposite have had plenty of time to raise those with him and to prepare amendments. They cannot use their own inactivity on this matter as an excuse to say we need to go to another round of consultation when consultation has clearly already happened. It is political pointscoring.

If the government has concerns—and I heard the Attorney-General say she had concerns—today is the day to put the amendments on the table and deal with any issue rather than just to nod their heads, put through their own routine and not decently and properly engage with ours. The member for Everton has followed Mr Sofronoff's recommendation. He has put a proposal before this House. It deserves proper consideration and not a political tossing out in the way the government is attempting to deal with it.

Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the Leader of the House, Minister for Police and Attorney-General, you have had your opportunity to make a contribution. If other people want to speak, let us listen to them in silence.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I want to address the House in relation to this amendment to highlight that the government's actions have not been entirely the correct actions to deliver for the community and to deliver for those stakeholders in particular what they are seeking out of this question of dealing with a no-body no-parole situation. I want to come to some of the remarks that were made by the member for Mansfield in a moment, but I will first address the contribution from the member for Hinchinbrook.

The member for Hinchinbrook chastised the government for not considering a whole range of different options. We did that. The government considered all the ways in which it could deal with it. That would have involved coming back to this House and coming to this point of consideration in detail with alternative amendments, but that would have failed the stakeholders by not allowing them into the tent, not allowing them to be part of the consultation process—the consultation process that the committee system that this parliament has adopted over the past number of years, that has improved immensely the way this parliament deals with legislative proposals and legislative issues. It is no longer the preserve of those in this chamber to have the only input into the drafting and development of laws for this state. We invite the community into the process through the committee system and that is what this would allow.

I would encourage everyone in the House to reject this amendment, to instead look at other ways of bringing forward laws to ensure that this very important issue for Queenslanders, particularly for the stakeholders who have a very keen and personal and emotional investment in this issue, is dealt with effectively.

I now want to turn to the matters that were raised by the member for Mansfield. The member for Mansfield gives some opinion that the issue of retrospectivity is not an issue. That is not the advice that the government has received. The government has received advice to say that retrospectivity is an issue here, that there are transitional issues if it is not specifically outlined that retrospectivity is dealt with in relation to this issue. That is why we have dealt with that in terms of the alternative option that will be before the House in the coming weeks and will benefit from the opportunity of deep analysis and consideration by the committee in consultation with the community.

Mr SPEAKER: The last speaker is the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr NICHOLLS: This is a policy; this is an amendment; this is an action by this government whose time is well past due. This was a policy that was announced by the LNP in November 2016, well before this government thought about doing it and well before the recommendations made by Mr Sofronoff, now Justice Sofronoff, in his report. It was a result of the LNP listening to the community, planning and acting—something that this government fails to do.

We hear a lot in this place from those on the other side about the spirit of bipartisanship, but today's actions and the actions over the last two weeks show how hollow those words are when they are spoken by this Attorney-General. Where was the bipartisanship when it came to changing the rules about how we vote in this state on 18 minutes notice? Where was the bipartisanship in relation to supporting the domestic violence laws that protect women and children in this place? There was none. This is about an outcome for the families of victims who have suffered the worst crimes—homicide, manslaughter and murder. The spurious crocodile tears wept by those opposite should be shameful to all of them.

Let us deal with a couple of these issues in relation to the legislation. This legislation is actually modelled on legislation that works, legislation that is in place in South Australia, put in place by a Labor government. I think we should give Premier Weatherill a call. He adopts our legislation on bikies and we are following his legislation on no-body no-parole. It is legislation that works, is effective and meets the needs of the families of victims of homicide.

In terms of what we heard from the Leader of the House, he said—and he admits it; he is condemned on his own words—'Yes, we could have brought amendments into this place,' but what did those opposite do? They shut down debate. They would not allow the amendments to be debated. They scurried off. There is a plethora of public servants who are burning up the Telstra airways trying to sort out what it is they do. In their arrogance they thought this amendment would not get up so they have not prepared for it. They have not done anything about it and they are leaving it again to the LNP, hopefully with the support of the crossbenches, to do something for those families of the victims.

In terms of retrospectivity, this is a prospective amendment. If you are currently serving time and you apply for parole it will apply to you. Look at the first words of (4A): 'if the prisoner is serving a period of imprisonment'. If you are in the big house—you are doing time—we want you to help now and give the victims and their families some relief.

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

AYES, 39:

LNP, 39—Barton, 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, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

NOES, 45:

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

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Dickson.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

Pairs: Byrne, Simpson; Miller, Seeney.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Mr Mander) negatived.

Clause 5, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 6 to 10, as read, agreed to.

Clause 11—

Mr RYAN (3.46 pm): I move the following amendment—

1 Clause 11 (Insertion of new ch 5, pt 1, div 5, sdiv 2A)

Page 12, lines 6 to 9, from 'the period'—

omit, insert—

2 business days of the decision being made—

(a) confirm the decision; or

I table the resupplied explanatory notes to my amendments.

Tabled paper: Corrective Services (Parole Board) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2017, explanatory notes to Hon. Mark Ryan's amendments [752].

Amendment No. 1 amends clause 11 to amend new section 208C, 'Parole board must consider suspension', to require the Parole Board to confirm or set aside a decision made by a prescribed board member to suspend a parole order and issue a warrant within two business days of the decision being made. The amendment provides greater certainty in the legislation and means that this time period is no longer to be set by regulation, as is currently provided for under the bill.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 11, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 12—

Mr RYAN (3.47 pm): I move the following amendment—

2 Clause 12 (Replacement of ch 5, pt 2 (Parole boards))

Page 24, lines 6 to 31 and page 25, lines 1 to 13—

omit, insert—

234 Meetings about particular matters relating to parole orders

(1) Subsection (2) applies if, at a meeting of the parole board, the board is to consider—

(a) a prescribed prisoner's application for a parole order; or

(b) the cancellation of a prescribed prisoner's parole order.

(2) The matter must not be considered at the meeting unless the following board members are present at the meeting—

(a) the president or a deputy president;

(b) a professional board member;

(c) a community board member;

(d) a public service representative;

(e) a police representative.

(3) Subsection (4) applies if, at a meeting of the parole board, the board is to consider the suspension of a prescribed prisoner's parole order.

(4) The matter must not be considered at the meeting unless the following board members are present at the meeting—

(a) the president or a deputy president;

(b) a professional board member;

(c) a community board member.

(5) Subsection (6) applies if, at a meeting of the parole board, the board is to consider—

(a) an application for a parole order made by a prisoner other than a prescribed prisoner; or

(b) the amendment of a prisoner's parole order; or

(c) the suspension or cancellation of a parole order for a prisoner other than a prescribed prisoner.

(6) The matter must not be considered at the meeting unless a professional board member, a community board member and at least 1 other board member are present at the meeting.

(7) In this section—

prescribed prisoner means—

(a) a prisoner mentioned in—

(i) section 181(1); or

(ii) section 181A(1); or

(iii) section 182A(1) or (2); or

(iv) section 183(1); or

(v) section 185B(1)(a); or

(b) a prisoner who is imprisoned for—

(i) an offence mentioned in the *Penalties and Sentences Act 1992*, section 161A(a)(i); or

(ii) a serious sexual offence; or

(iii) an offence committed with the circumstance of aggravation stated in the *Penalties and Sentences Act 1992*, section 161Q(1); or

(iv) an offence against the Criminal Code, section 315A.

serious sexual offence see the *Dangerous Prisoners (Sexual Offenders) Act 2003*, schedule.

Amendment No. 2 amends clause 12 in relation to new section 234, 'Meetings about particular matters relating to parole orders', to in effect recast the section to enable a more efficient and effective use of Parole Board resources and its composition. The amendment means that the Parole Board sitting as five members must consider all applications for a parole order or the cancellation of a parole order for a prescribed prisoner. The Parole Board sitting as three members comprised of the president or deputy president, a professional member and a community member must consider any suspensions of a parole order for a prescribed prisoner. The Parole Board sitting as three members comprised of a professional board member, a community member and at least one other member can consider an amendment of a parole order for a prisoner, whether a prescribed prisoner or otherwise. The safeguard is that an amendment application will not result in the cancellation or suspension of a parole order. In these circumstances the prisoner will already be on parole and the issue for consideration will be the addition or modification of existing conditions. The Parole Board sitting as three members comprised of a professional board member, a community board member and at least one other member is to consider the applications for parole and the suspensions or cancellations of a parole order relating to all other prisoners.

Amendment No. 2 also amends the definition of 'prescribed prisoner' under section 234 to add a prisoner imprisoned for the offence of choking, suffocation or strangulation in a domestic setting under section 315A of the Criminal Code. Again, I take this opportunity to thank the Gold Coast Centre Against Sexual Violence for its submission to the committee about the bill, as its submission formed the impetus for the inclusion of this amendment. The definition of 'prescribed prisoner' is also amended to change the reference to 'serious violent offence' to instead 'an offence mentioned in the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992, section 161A(a)(i)'. This is a clarifying amendment to put beyond doubt the intended meaning of the term for the purposes of section 324. It is a reference to a person convicted on indictment of an offence against a provision mentioned in schedule 1, 'Serious violent offences', under the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992 or an offence of counselling or procuring the commission of or attempting or conspiring to commit an offence against a provision mentioned in that schedule.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 12, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 13, as read, agreed to.

Clause 14—

Mr RYAN (3.51 pm): I move the following amendment—

3 Clause 14 (Insertion of new ch 7A, pt 11)

Page 39, after line 25—

insert—

490SA Steps before appointing particular board members

A reference in section 223(2)(c)(i) to the Minister consulting with the president includes a reference to the Minister consulting, before the commencement, with the person whose appointment as the first president takes effect on or after the commencement.

Amendment 3 amends clause 14, insertion of new chapter 7A part 11, of the bill to insert an additional transitional provision, new section 490SA, 'Steps before appointing particular board members'. The new transitional provision ensures that a reference in section 323, appointment, of the bill to the minister consulting with the president about the proposed appointment of professional board members and community board members includes a reference to the minister consulting before the proclamation date with the person whose appointment as the first president takes effect on or after the date of proclamation. This transitional provision will better facilitate the appointment process for the membership of the new Parole Board Queensland and is necessary to ensure the new Parole Board Queensland can be fully constituted at the time of commencement.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 14, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 15 to 24, as read, agreed to.

Schedule 1, as read, agreed to.

Third Reading

Hon. MT RYAN (Morayfield—ALP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services) (3.53 pm): I move—

That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Question put—That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title

Hon. MT RYAN (Morayfield—ALP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services) (3.53 pm): I move—

That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

Question put—That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

PUBLIC HEALTH (INFECTION CONTROL) AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 21 March (see p. 598).

Second Reading

Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (3.54 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I table the government's response to the report of the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee on the bill which was tabled on 15 May. I thank the committee for its careful consideration of the bill and the stakeholders who made submissions to the committee's inquiry.

Tabled paper: Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee: Report No. 37, 55th Parliament—Public Health (Infection Control) Amendment Bill 2017, government response [758].

The bill strengthens the infection control framework for healthcare facilities under the Public Health Act. The need to strengthen this framework was identified following recent incidents at dental clinics. The infection control framework applies to facilities performing invasive procedures or procedures which carry the risk of exposure to blood or other bodily fluids. Given that patients and staff at these facilities risk coming into contact with infectious bloodborne diseases, such as hepatitis and HIV, the act already requires people involved in performing declared health services to take reasonable precautions and care to minimise infection risks.

The act also requires the operators of healthcare facilities to develop detailed infection control management plans showing how infection risks at the facilities will be minimised and to implement and regularly review these plans. However, the act does not empower Queensland Health to properly investigate and take timely enforcement action where these obligations have been breached or to take appropriate action to require noncompliant practices to be rectified. Recent infection control incidents at dental clinics have shown that noncompliance with infection control requirements can place the health and wellbeing of staff and patients at risk. In these cases, the facility's staff and their patients were potentially exposed to diseased caused by the bloodborne viruses.

The bill responds to this highlighted need for better regulation by empowering Queensland Health to take a proportionate approach to monitoring risk and responding to noncompliance. This approach will be proactive in that it will involve Queensland Health continuing to audit healthcare facilities' compliance with their infection control obligations. Informed by a risk assessment, audits have so far been completed for all hospital and health services and for sample groups of dental clinics and non-hospital midwifery services. Planning is underway for the next round of audits focussing on other high-risk facilities. Participation in audits will become mandatory under the bill, which creates penalties for facilities which refuse to provide relevant information to Queensland Health on request.

Queensland Health will continue to respond appropriately to compliance issues identified through its audit program and through complaints received from the public and other regulatory bodies. Again, the bill creates a range of powers to ensure this follow-up is backed up by appropriate enforcement powers and penalties. Queensland Health's approach to infection control will involve targeted monitoring and direct intervention where necessary.

The bill supports a proportionate approach, strengthening the infection control framework and empowering Queensland Health to intervene appropriately in addressing deficient infection control practices. At the same time, it limits as much as reasonably possible the potential adverse impacts of this intervention on affected businesses.

The bill strengthens the infection control framework by facilitating more effective investigation and resolution of noncompliance. Inspectors are already empowered under the act to enter facilities with 24 hours notice to monitor compliance with the infection control framework. The act also allows inspectors to apply for a warrant to enter facilities to investigate, gather information and collect evidence of offences against the act. The bill enhances these powers by permitting inspectors to enter facilities without giving prior notice where a complaint or investigation reveals serious issues requiring urgent intervention.

The bill also empowers inspectors to require the operator of a healthcare facility to provide a copy of the infection control management plan for that facility in addition to any other information about the infection control procedures in place. Where infection control requirements are not met, the bill empowers inspectors to take a range of enforcement actions. The bill allows inspectors to issue improvement notices, requiring the operator of a healthcare facility to take remedial action to comply with the infection control framework.

The notice may also specify the remedial action needed to ensure compliance. For example, an improvement notice may require the operator to improve infection control practices or documentation or to properly train staff in the operation of equipment used at the facility. The bill also allows inspectors to require the operator of a healthcare facility to revise an infection control management plan if it is not up to standard.

In the most serious cases, the bill allows the director-general of Queensland Health to issue a directions notice to the operator of a facility. A directions notice prohibits the operator from providing a particular health service at that facility for up to 30 days while the necessary remedial action is undertaken. The notice may be extended for a further 30 days or an even longer period if approved by a magistrate.

Significant new penalties for breaches of key requirements of the framework are included in the bill. For example, owners of healthcare facilities may be penalised for not ensuring an infection control management plan for the facility is prepared, implemented and periodically reviewed. The bill also makes any person involved in providing declared health services at a facility, including operators, staff and contractors, liable to be prosecuted for failing to take reasonable precautions and care to minimise infection risks.

High penalties also apply where the operator of a healthcare facility disregards a lawful direction to amend an infection control management plan or fails to give effect to an improvement or directions notice. These include penalties of up of $63,075 for failing to amend an infection control management plan as directed, $126,150 for failing to comply with an improvement notice and $378,750 for breaching a directions notice.

Finally, the bill expands the regulation-making head of power in the Public Health Act to allow a regulation to be made prescribing the standards of training and qualifications which must be met by the staff of healthcare facilities. To provide guidance to the operators and staff of healthcare facilities about how to minimise and prevent infection risks, standards will be prescribed under this head of power. Relevant peak industry bodies will be consulted before new standards are made to ensure that they are appropriate and reflect best practice.

Standards will cover a range of matters, including how equipment is to be cleaned, disinfected and sterilised. Other standards will prescribe staff competency and procedures for surface cleaning, waste disposal, and quality assurance monitoring and control. Every person involved in providing declared health services at a healthcare facility will be expected to meet prescribed standards in addition to complying with the infection control management plan for the facility. Doing so will be necessary for the person to discharge their obligation to take reasonable precautions and care to minimise and prevent infection risks. Operators and staff of healthcare facilities should already be meeting these standards. By expressly prescribing them, the amended regulation will assist people to understand and comply with their infection control obligations.

I now turn to the government's response to the parliamentary committee's report. The first recommendation of the committee in their report was that the bill be passed, and I appreciate the committee's support for the bill. The committee recommended that I clarify two matters in the second reading of the bill, which I am now pleased to do.

Recommendation 2 of the committee's report asked how Queensland Health will assure itself a healthcare facility has complied with an improvement or directions notice. The committee also asked how, once satisfied of compliance, Queensland Health will notify the facility of this in a timely manner. It is usual for healthcare facilities to provide a range of health services. When an improvement notice is issued, the facility may continue to provide those health services but must take remedial action to address the infection control deficiency detailed on the notice. For a directions notice, the facility is prohibited from providing the health service to which the notice relates until remedial action is taken to address the infection control deficiency detailed on the notice.

For both improvement and directions notices, the onus rests on the operator of the facility to comply with the notice by taking the remedial action it requires. Queensland Health will, however, undertake appropriate monitoring to ensure the operator is taking appropriate remedial action. Queensland Health will make appropriate follow-up inquiries with the operator to ascertain compliance with a notice. This approach recognises that infection control requirements are widely understood and complied with across the healthcare industry. Guidance about how to manage infection risks is clearly detailed in Australian Standards and in guidelines and other material published by Queensland Health. The bill expands on this knowledge base by allowing relevant training and qualification standards to be prescribed in the regulation.

In addition, an improvement or directions notice must describe the problem to be addressed. As a consequence, operators will be in no doubt as to what they need to do to fix the problem. The bill also allows this remedial action to be detailed on the actual notice. In the case of a directions notice or an improvement notice requiring significant improvements, Queensland Health will use this power to clearly spell out the steps which an owner or operator must take.

Queensland Health will then need to assess whether there has been compliance with an improvement or directions notice. In making this assessment, the inspector or chief executive will have regard to the advice of the operator. In more serious cases, particularly where a directions notice has been issued, Queensland Health will inspect the facility to ensure compliance. If satisfied as to the operator's compliance, the bill requires Queensland Health to provide formal advice to this effect to the operator. Queensland Health will provide this advice as soon as possible.

In their third recommendation, the committee asked why the decision was made not to create a power to apply to the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal to review a decision to issue an improvement or directions notice. I will speak on that issue to explain it, but I do know that the shadow minister, the member for Surfers Paradise, has circulated an amendment to the bill which creates a power for an operator or owner of a healthcare facility who is dissatisfied with an authorised person's decision to give the operator or owner an improvement notice or for an operator of a healthcare facility who is dissatisfied with the chief executive's decision to give the operator a directions notice to apply to QCAT for a review of the decision. I am happy to take advice on that. I am taking advice on that amendment at the moment.

We had some sanctimony in the previous debate about the government jumping the opposition on certain issues. We have had that today as well. Let us not be hypocritical about how the parliament works. This is completely in accordance with the standing orders and rules of the parliament. Let us not have the criticism from the opposition about attempts made by the government to address the very serious and significant flaws in their so-called no-body no-parole amendments in the last bill.

I will take advice on these amendments. We are doing that at the moment. I will take advice on that this afternoon. I can assure the parliament that I will not do anything to frustrate the intent of urgent intervention that is anticipated under this legislation. I will not do anything, including creating a statutory right of review to QCAT, that may intervene, as I have said, with the express intent of the legislation for urgent intervention.

These are serious matters. Bloodborne illnesses, once infection is transmitted, are difficult to deal with in many cases. These are some of the most serious bloodborne infections that we are attempting to protect Queensland against—HIV and hepatitis. Any attempts to frustrate that through a review mechanism will be opposed by the government. I am taking advice on what the impact of this proposed amendment might be and whether it will do that—whether there will be any impact on the clear intent of the government to ensure Queenslanders can remain protected. We will take advice on that.

I make it clear to the parliament that the provisions in the bill, as drafted, are consistent with other non-reviewable public health powers. Specifically, the power to issue an improvement notice is modelled on the existing power under the Public Health Act to issue a water quality improvement notice which is not reviewable. That matter came before the parliament through the parliamentary committee process as well. A decision to issue a public health order under the act is also not subject to QCAT jurisdiction. Why? Because they are urgent and important matters that require rectification. In order to be able to respond decisively to threats to public health, a right of review to QCAT is not included in the bill.

Very importantly, the bill does not exclude judicial review. Affected individuals have a right to have a decision reviewed judicially before a court in Queensland. An individual who feels aggrieved by the decision to impose an improvement notice or a directions notice has the capacity to seek that review. A directions notice will prohibit a particular health service from being provided but is likely to be issued only in an emergency situation requiring immediate intervention to prevent serious harm from occurring. Providing for merits review of the decision to exercise this emergency power could frustrate this purpose. As I have said, I will not see that purpose frustrated. I think that is very important. Improvement notices would be issued in less serious situations. As these notices do not prevent an operator continuing to provide health services, a right of review is not considered necessary.

Of course we often hear that we are a government of reviews, but they are including a review now that could be expensive and time consuming for the party concerned, particularly when the improvement notice is all about improving standards that may not be at the appropriate level in an appropriate practice. Neither notice will be issued in a vacuum. Before issuing an improvement notice an inspector must reasonably believe the operator or owner of a healthcare facility is breaching the act. Similarly, the chief executive must reasonably believe the operator is breaching the act and that that breach is causing a serious risk of harm before issuing a directions notice. It is a very high standard. There must be a serious risk of harm before a directions notice is issued. In both cases a notice will only be issued following an investigation and where there is clear evidence of substandard practice.

There are also additional safeguards around the power to issue a directions notice. The chief executive must reasonably believe an operator is contravening the act and this creates a serious risk of harm. There are strict limitations on who may exercise the power to issue a directions notice and on the length of time a notice may continue in effect before the matter to which it relates must be brought before a court.

The committee report included a statement of reservations by opposition members. Non-government members asked if liability for failure to take reasonable precautions and care will be imposed on all persons involved in providing declared health services. Each person involved in providing a declared health service has a role to play in ensuring that service is provided safely. For this reason the Public Health Act already places the obligation on individuals to take reasonable precautions and care to minimise and prevent infection risks. This obligation is imposed on registered health practitioners providing professional services at healthcare facilities and the operators of facilities. It also captures technical and administrative staff employed in providing ancillary services such as the cleaning and sterilisation of instruments and equipment. The bill does not change this obligation but makes it more easily enforced by allowing for the imposition of penalties. Non-government members suggest this could lead to blame being shifted on to employees of healthcare facilities. This is not possible under the bill, which imposes a non-delegable obligation on owners of healthcare facilities to ensure all declared health services at a healthcare facility are performed in accordance with the infection control management plan for the facility.

It is also expected that prosecutions for failing to prevent or minimise an infection risk will only be taken where there is a serious breach, particularly involving negligent or reckless behaviour or the deliberate refusal to comply with an improvement or directions notice. These are serious matters: negligent behaviour, reckless behaviour or deliberate refusal to comply with an improvement or directions notice. Where an employee has acted in such a manner it may be appropriate to prosecute the employee rather than the operator. That would only be fair in the circumstances. If a medical professional or an employee was acting in a way that was reckless, negligent or deliberately refusing to comply with an improvement or directions notice, then prosecution would be an appropriate option to be considered.

Secondly, non-government members repeat the committee's concerns regarding the availability of review of QCAT decisions to issue an improvement or directions notice, and I have already responded to that issue. The statement of reservations suggests the bill may result in Queensland

Health rewriting deficient infection control management plans for healthcare facilities. This is not the case. The bill provides for Queensland Health to identify the ways in which a plan is insufficient, but the obligation to rewrite a plan is clearly placed on the operator of the facility. Non-government members question whether the threshold created by the bill for entering a healthcare facility without notice, being an imminent infection risk, is too high. As noted by the committee in its report, entry without notice is an exceptional power requiring substantial safeguards. The high threshold is an important safeguard. The act already includes powers to enter a healthcare facility in non-urgent situations including entry under warrant or with 24 hours notice.

Finally, the statement of reservations questions whether Queensland Health has the resources to enforce compliance with the strengthened infection control framework. Rather than requiring more investigations to be conducted, the bill makes the existing obligations to manage infection control risks more easily enforceable and facilitates proper investigation of compliance with those obligations. Most healthcare facilities comply with their obligations under the act. I want to make that point clear again, as I did when the bill was introduced and when I announced this legislative measure. Most healthcare facilities comply with their obligations under the act and comply to a very high standard. The Queensland community can have confidence in the standard of health care that is provided at prescribed healthcare facilities throughout Queensland. It is something that almost every health professional takes very seriously. If those health professionals are not taking infection control seriously in their facilities then one has to question why are they operating that practice and why would they be exposing individuals to risk? The government is seeking to ensure the community can be protected against that risk by having the best possible standards applicable as proposed under this legislation, this draft bill.

The bill ensures that where noncompliance is identified, Queensland Health is equipped to respond quickly and effectively. This response may involve inspectors from the existing public health units in hospital and health services in addition to further Queensland Health experts if required in a particular case. I note, however, that audit and inspection are not the only means by which the department identifies and responds to infection risks. Bloodborne viruses are required to be notified to the Department of Health under the Public Health Act. All newly notified HIV, hepatitis B and hepatitis C cases are actively followed up at notification. Queensland Health has an established process for identifying and gathering further information surrounding newly acquired cases. This surveillance activity provides an objective assurance that clusters of transmission associated with infection control breaches are identified and are investigated in real time. I can advise the House that this framework will not work in isolation. Our public health units will act on complaints and the findings of audits. However, public health compliance responses are also informed by intelligence and data. As with all similar regulatory frameworks, future resourcing decisions will be made in view of evolving demands on the framework.

This bill provides a proportionate, targeted and urgent response to an unacceptable risk of patients and staff of healthcare facilities being exposed to infectious bloodborne diseases. The bill enhances the powers of Queensland Health to investigate the infection control practices of healthcare facilities and to take appropriate enforcement action where noncompliant practices are identified. Importantly, the bill does not simply rely on penalties to enforce compliance. Where noncompliance is capable of being remedied, the new improvement and directions notices powers in the bill provide a means of supporting healthcare facilities to improve their infection control practices.

I again thank the committee for its detailed consideration of the bill and the stakeholders who provided submissions to the committee's inquiry. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr LANGBROEK (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (4.17 pm): I rise to speak to the Public Health (Infection Control) Amendment Bill 2017. I want to thank the minister for his contribution and his explanation, much of which dealt with the report of the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee. I want to thank the committee for their work including the honourable member for Nudgee as the chair and the deputy chair, the member for Caloundra. I want to thank them for their work in assessing this bill. I have certainly looked at the committee report in my consideration of the bill as well.

There is an interesting background to the bill and the situation in which we find ourselves in that I come from the profession of dentistry. I am a registered non-practising dental surgeon and I see that the infection control framework is being extended to areas that have not necessarily been held over in legislation before. It is probably good to consider the history of infection control as it has been applied especially in dentistry.

Talking about the background to the bill I see the committee report mentions the declared health services that are going to be covered by this bill: public hospitals and ambulance services, dental clinics, medical practitioners' private rooms, acupuncturists and Chinese medicine practitioners, sexual health services, home nursing services, midwifery services outside the hospital environment, pathology and blood collection services, retrieval services and vaccine services.

In terms of procedures that dentists perform all the time, dental surgeries provide treatments for people in what is pretty much a day theatre. They are not in a hospital facility, but they are in the equivalent of a day theatre because they are often having procedures such as minor oral surgery. Members would be aware of procedures such as having wisdom teeth removed, which is sometimes done under a general anaesthetic in a day theatre situation but which is often performed in a dental surgery. There are other minor oral procedures such as pedodontics, which is working on children; endodontics, which are root canal treatments; and periodontics, which is treatment of the gums. The point is that many of the procedures which are performed by dental practitioners in general practice situations are the sorts of things that are more commonly done in a hospital situation.

In the years since I began practising we have become increasingly aware of the need for infection control. I first started at university in the 1970s and through the 1980s when the rise of HIV, human immunodeficiency virus, first became evident. Dental practitioners and dental students—as we were at the University of Queensland—suddenly became acutely aware of the situation because the concern was that if someone contracted HIV it could then develop into AIDS. Dental students in the 1980s felt it was almost inevitable we would contract HIV from the aerosol mist that results when a dentist uses the drill. We were concerned that we would contract HIV if that aerosol got in our eyes because, importantly, we did not know how it was transmitted. We now know that it is usually transmitted through blood-to-blood contact or through sexual fluids, but back then in the 1980s we did not know.

The bottom line is that up to then sterilisation procedures were really quite minimal in dental practice situations. I clearly remember talking about glass bead sterilisation, but there was no routine use of autoclaves to sterilise everything that went in or near a patient's mouth. We did not sterilise the triple syringe, which is the instrument that a dentist uses to mix air and water to blow around and clear the visual field they are inspecting. Dentists did not necessarily wear gloves and they did not wear masks. We practised what was called 'wet finger' dentistry. Many patients will recall going to the dentist and having a predominantly male dentist leaning over you—sometimes with pretty bad breath, halitosis—with his moist fingers in your mouth. It really was not a particularly pleasant situation, but I grew up wanting to be a dentist!

The important issue is that we changed our sterilisation processes and procedures as a result of what was happening around the world during the rise of HIV. At dental school at the University of Queensland I clearly remember the way we sterilised dental drill bits between patients. Back then a dental nurse in the clinic would just wipe it over with a cotton bud dipped in methylated spirits, and that was what we did between patients. Now if you go to a dental surgeon you normally find that everything—all the drills and syringes—are covered in disposal plastic and there is once-only local anaesthetic, which is designed to be used only once and then disposed of. It is very important to make sure those things are done. The autoclaving or sterilisation of instruments should now be routine. There has been a significant increase in the number of dental schools since I was at university when there were only five in the whole country, and now we have three in Queensland alone: James Cook, Griffith University and the University of Queensland, so of course we have an increasing number of dental graduates.

I have been referring specifically to dentistry because the changes that the minister has referred to have come about as a result of a situation that happened at Carina in Brisbane a couple of years ago which necessitated the changes to the Public Health Act we are now considering. The important issue is that things have progressed a long way since our initial concern as practitioners with regard to contracting HIV, hepatitis B or hepatitis C. We received recommendations from the Australian Dental Association during those years and one such recommendation was, 'If you know that a patient has a particular disorder like hepatitis B, hepatitis C or HIV, treat them at the end of the day and throw out most of the equipment that you have used on them.' We found that that was not particularly successful, because then patients were loath to tell practitioners that they may have had hepatitis B, hepatitis C or HIV, or they may not have known that they had it. As a profession we then began to treat everyone as though they had everything, and that meant that we had more stringent infection control procedures. That has now led to the situation where a particular surgery may have put thousands of patients at potential risk, even though we know that generally speaking it is very unlikely someone is going to get one of these disorders or diseases from a dental surgeon.

As the minister has mentioned, the incident in Carina has led to a reassessment of the Public Health Act and that is why we are considering the bill before us today. As I said, this kind of breach is rare because dental surgeons and all of the other practitioners mentioned in these facilities would have had infection controls mentioned to them during their education processes, but because of patients coming and going and the need to get changeover happening quite quickly there can be pressure at times. If you have a busy practice, suddenly it can be tempting to cut corners on some of these infection control procedures. That is why it is imperative that we have very high standards so that Queenslanders can be confident the health services they receive are safe and sanitary.

The first part of the bill will make changes to further enable guidance to be provided to the operators and staff of healthcare facilities, HCFs, to minimise infection risks. By the way, I can point out that the HCFs mentioned in this bill should not be confused with a health fund which is called HCF. I think that may confuse some of our speakers later this afternoon or anyone who is reading this later. The healthcare facilities are the things that are referred to in the bill. While the act already provides an infection control framework for HCFs across the state, including over 600 dental practices, the bill before us allows for appropriate adjustments to be made to the regulation-making head of power in the act supported by amendments to the Public Health Regulation 2005 that will allow for mandatory training, competency and infection control standards to be prescribed by regulation.

The second part of the bill will expand the ability of the Department of Health to monitor compliance of the operators and staff of HCFs with their infection control obligations and, where necessary, investigate possible breaches. Heads of power will also be inserted into the framework to allow Queensland Health to require the operator of an HCF to produce a copy of their infection control management plan, the ICMP, or to amend an ICMP. Authorised persons will be empowered to enter premises to investigate infection risks without prior notice.

I note the minister's reassurance that this will not be done lightly. I can report that, if I were to ask most of my dental colleagues whether they have ever had an investigation or a visit from some of those 145 Queensland Health inspectors, I would guess that very few of my colleagues would report that they have ever had a visit from Queensland Health inspectors. I note that the committee raised questions regarding the ability of inspectors to get around to all of the facilities that are mentioned in 2.1 of the committee report, which is all of the various services that are covered.

Public health facilities such as publicly controlled hospitals and ambulance services will usually have their own processes in place because they are often covered by a different regime and inspectors may well have been inspecting those, but as I understand it there have not been many inspections of private dental practices performed by those 145 Department of Health inspectors.

The third part of the bill will increase the power of Queensland Health to enforce compliance by the operators and staff of HCFs with the infection control framework and to prosecute breaches. I note that the minister has assured us, and we are aware of the fact, that these breaches are in the minority, but with an increasing amount of proactive dentistry being done—in other words, a lot of dentists are now offering more commercial type products, whether it is bleaching teeth or crown and bridge cosmetic type dentistry—there will be more procedures being done. It is important to make sure that everyone within the profession understands their responsibilities.

The bill imposes penalties for noncompliance and enables Queensland Health to direct the operator of an HCF to take particular corrective actions or to cease performing a particular health service where that service involves a risk to public health from poor infection control practices. I note that these are the improvement notices and the directions notices to which the minister referred.

I turn now to the reservations as expressed by committee members. I acknowledge the submissions made by the Australian Dental Association Queensland, ADAQ, the Australian Lawyers Alliance and my colleagues on the committee which highlight their concerns about the practical implications of this bill. The ADAQ raised a number of concerns. The first regarded the resourcing of appropriately qualified persons for the task of providing mandatory training, competency and infection control standards that will be prescribed by as-yet-unseen regulation.

The ADAQ is also concerned that the proposed changes would amount to conflicting regulations between the Australian Health Practitioners Regulation Agency—dentists are registered with AHPRA—and its Queensland notification boards, the Office of the Health Ombudsman and now Queensland Health. I understand and accept the committee's report that shows that there is increasing corporatisation in dental practices and that AHPRA and OHO do not cover specifically those corporations and that is why it has been necessary to bring it forward in this form.

The ADAQ also raised the fact that the act only provides for a right of review to the Supreme Court. The minister referred to the amendments I will move subsequent to the second reading debate. The concern is that it is expensive and time consuming for affected registrants. If a power is to be exercised by a senior person in Queensland Health then there needs to be a right of review of that decision because of the catastrophic effect of a directions notice, which can result in the closure of a practice. If a dental practitioner or dental surgeon is directed that their practice is going to close, it is imperative, as the minister has reassured us, that the directions notice and any appeal that might come from the dental surgeon should be dealt with in a timely manner. We are not looking to water down any of the provisions; we are simply saying that an appeal to the highest court in this state would seem to be a rather tough measure for a private practitioner to have to take. That is why the amendment proposes that QCAT could deal with this type of matter.

The ADAQ suggested that a right of review via QCAT should be an option. I note that the committee asked for the minister's clarification and the minister has given a clarification. I will leave the rest of my comments on that matter to the appropriate time. I reassure the minister that any amendment we have foreshadowed is not with a view to watering down what the bill is trying to do. It simply addresses the fact that a process involving the Supreme Court would be more onerous and expensive. I look forward to debating that at the appropriate stage. I will move an amendment which provides a right of appeal or review to QCAT where Queensland Health issues notices under the new provisions.

Concerns have also been raised by the ADAQ and reinforced by my colleagues the members for Caloundra, Cleveland and Gaven regarding the implications of the word 'involved' in clause 5, section 151. Clause 5 provides that a person involved in the provision of a declared health service who fails to take reasonable precautions and care to minimise the risk of infection commits an offence which attracts a maximum penalty of 1,000 penalty units. They rightly pointed out that the word 'involved' is ambiguous and could implicate anyone who is working under the ICMP and could also result in employers shifting the blame to employees. An example provided in the bill is that a nurse collecting blood in a blood bank could be liable for not complying with the ICMP. The question under the bill is: would the individual be liable or would vicarious liability apply? We look forward to clarification of the intent of the word 'involved' in section 151.

My colleagues also raised concerns about the issue of workload, as I have already mentioned, for the 145 authorised officers to effectively enforce the new regime to a level that would justify the changes. We are not clear that they will be able to manage, given that healthcare facilities are numbered in the thousands.

The statement of reservation also raises concerns about the wording of clause 9, proposed new section 156B(b), which deals with the power of an authorised person giving notice that requires the operator to amend the ICMP. Proposed new subsection (3)(b) provides that the notice must state 'the way the ICMP must be amended'. The Australian Lawyers Alliance, ALA, advised that this may be interpreted to suggest that the authorised person must rewrite the ICMP. They propose that it be altered to say 'the reasons the authorised person considers the ICMP does not comply with this part'.

The ALA also recommended providing clarity with regard to clause 13, section 390, which contains the phrase 'an imminent risk of infection to a person at the health care facility'. The organisation believed that this poses a difficult threshold and proposed a lower one before allowing entry to a healthcare facility without notice. I note the minister's reassurance that these sorts of rights of entry will not be taken lightly and will not be just done in an ad hoc fashion.

The LNP will not be opposing the bill. As I have mentioned, we will be moving one amendment, which provides a right of appeal or review to QCAT where Queensland Health issues notices under the new provisions.

In conclusion, as a former dental practitioner I reassure Queenslanders that it is imperative that we have faith in the provisions to do with infection control. In a world where viruses are becoming increasingly difficult to treat, it is important that people who are providing health care maintain the standards they were educated to meet. We need to be able to give confidence to Queenslanders, or people who visit Queensland and are seeing someone they do not know—people from different jurisdictions often visited my practice in Surfers Paradise—that infection control procedures are being carried out to the highest level and that ethical responsibility is taken very seriously. I know that most practitioners do, but those involved in dentistry or in professions in the other fields that are mentioned do not have the same level of oversight as happens in our public hospital system and in our clinics, which are oversighted by different authorities.

These are matters that were often raised through the Health Quality and Complaints Commission, which succeeded the Health Rights Commission. Many of the agencies that were covered by the then Health Quality and Complaints Commission felt frustrated about the duplication of regulation, given that they were already complying with regulation from other authorities. In private practice, these sorts of regulations have often been determined by the individuals themselves and making sure they are complying. I can understand and support the need for more oversight, given what has happened with a plethora of other practices opening medical and quasi-medical type operations. As a population and as legislators, we need to make sure that everyone going to these types of facilities can be confident in the type of infection control that is being carried out by the practitioners.

Ms LINARD (Nudgee—ALP) (4.38 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Public Health (Infection Control) Amendment Bill. The bill amends the Public Health Act 2005, which provides for a regulatory framework for controlling infection risks at healthcare facilities such as public hospitals and ambulance services, dental clinics, medical practitioners' private rooms, pathology and blood collection services and vaccine services which provide a declared health service—that is, a service intended to maintain, improve or restore a person's health and involves the performance of an invasive procedure or an activity that exposes the person or another person to blood or another bodily fluid.

The obligations contained in the act for healthcare facilities reflect general community expectations and the duty of care owed by such facilities. During the committee process, Queensland Health estimated that there are thousands of healthcare facilities to which the act applies in Queensland, including facilities operated by hospital and health services and approximately 600 dental practices.

Currently, in recognition of the inherent risk of patients and staff at these facilities coming into contact with infectious bloodborne diseases such as hepatitis and HIV, the act requires people involved in performing declared health services to take reasonable caution and care to minimise infection risks. Currently, the act requires the owner or operator of a healthcare facility defined under the act to implement an infection control management plan—a documented plan to prevent or minimise the risk of infection for persons receiving services, working at, or who may be at risk of infection at such a facility.

The bill before the House seeks to strengthen the existing infection control framework. The minister's introductory speech and the explanatory notes identify the genesis of the bill being a recent incident involving substandard infection control practices at a Brisbane dental clinic, which highlighted shortcomings in the existing infection control framework. During her briefing to the committee, the Chief Health Officer outlined that the incident involved a dental clinic that had re-used single-use items, including without sterilising those items; inadequately sterilised other items on which bacteria was found; inadequately trained staff; and the facility had an inadequate infection control management plan. A second incident at a dental clinic had been reported at the time the committee was briefed by the department. In both instances, the dental clinics were found to have substandard infection control practices, placing staff and patients at risk of coming into contact with infectious diseases such as hepatitis C and HIV.

The initial incident that gave rise to the bill led to the department seeking to and successfully making contact with the majority of the 5,000 patients who had attended that clinic since it opened in 2014 to alert them to the possible risk of infection. That would have involved a significant effort on the part of Queensland Health—and vitally so given the potential risk. As a health consumer, I found the extent of the department's response in this case reassuring and, today, I would like to acknowledge their efforts.

These incidents revealed shortcomings in the infection control framework, in particular, that the framework does not adequately empower Queensland Health to investigate complaints and other concerns about infection control practices in a timely and independent manner, potentially limiting the ability of Queensland Health to identify and subsequently take swift remedial action in the public interest. The current act also does not enable Queensland Health to enforce the framework, or to require healthcare facilities to remedy deficient practices.

The objective of this bill is to strengthen the infection control framework in Queensland to provide that mandatory training, competency and infection control standards may be prescribed by regulation and that an authorised person may enter premises to investigate infection risks without prior notice, which I think is a key public safety measure. The bill will allow that the department may direct the operator of a healthcare facility to take remedial action or cease performing a particular health service and that penalties may be imposed for noncompliance.

The majority of submitters to the committee inquiry process supported the general approach of the bill to strengthen Queensland's infection control framework. However, the Queensland Nurses and Midwives' Union, the Australian Dental Association of Queensland and the Australian Medical Association Queensland raised some reservations about the proposed amendments, which gave rise to the three recommendations contained in the committee's report. Firstly, the committee recommended that the bill be passed. Secondly, in response to questions raised by the Australian Dental Association Queensland and the Dental Hygienists Association of Australia, the committee recommended that, during this debate, the minister provide additional clarity about how the department will assure itself that a healthcare facility has complied with an improvement or directions notice and how it will notify a healthcare facility that the department is satisfied that the facility has complied with the notice. Finally, the committee recommended that the minister provide additional clarity in response to an issue raised by the Australian Dental Association of Queensland regarding the absence of a right of review in the bill to the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal in respect to the issuing of notices.

I would like to thank the minister for his response to the committee's recommendation for additional clarity for submitters at the commencement of this debate. I certainly appreciate the additional information that was provided and the clarity. I thank the minister for his comments regarding the importance of not frustrating the department's ability to act decisively when an incident has occurred and it has issued a directions notice. In that regard, I note that the minister is coming back to this House to provide additional information today. This framework and this bill is about ensuring that the public interest is served and risks to public health are minimised. That process should not be frustrated.

I have no doubt that the majority of healthcare facilities are doing the right thing and complying with their existing infection control obligations. However, we know from recent reports that some are not. I understand that as many as one in six dental clinics that participated in a recent self-assessment process conducted by Queensland Health did not have a compliant infection control management plan in place. This finding, in addition to the recent incidents at two dental clinics, have revealed that infection control practices at some facilities are creating a real risk to patients and staff. This bill responds to this noncompliance. It does not impose new obligations on healthcare facilities; rather, it strengthens the power of Queensland Health to investigate breaches of existing obligations and enforces compliance where issues are identified.

The existing infection control framework relies on the staff and operators of healthcare facilities to appropriately manage infection risks at those facilities. The bill continues this approach. However, from time to time operators may require assistance and direction to fully comply with their infection control obligations. This bill creates a range of proportionate measures by which Queensland Health may provide this assistance and direction, such as via the issuing of an improvements or directions notice.

Queensland Health will continue to undertake its current compliance and enforcement activities under the strengthened framework, including undertaking compliance audits of randomly selected healthcare facilities, in particular, high-risk industry sectors; actively investigating complaints; and raising the awareness of healthcare facilities of their obligation under the infection control framework by engaging peak industry and professional registration bodies.

On behalf of the committee, I would like to thank those individuals and organisations who provided written submissions to assist the committee in its deliberations on the bill. I also thank Queensland Health for assisting the committee with its inquiry into the bill. I would like to thank my fellow committee members for their contributions and the committee secretariat for its support during the committee's examination of the bill. This bill will strengthen Queensland's infection control framework to better serve the public interest. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr McARDLE (Caloundra—LNP) (4.46 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the bill before the House. I will start by thanking my fellow committee members for the work that they undertook in the consideration of this bill and acknowledge the work and endeavours of the secretariat, led by Mr Karl Holden.

This bill derives from very poor infection control at a Brisbane dental clinic that opened in 2014, leading to the majority of its 5,000 patients having to be contacted concerning the potential of acquiring a bloodborne virus. In testimony to the committee on 6 April 2017 said, the Chief Health Officer said—

> The practice was re-using single-use items that should only be used once and then disposed of. They were re-using them. Some of those single-use items were not being sterilised between uses. They were not adequately sterilising some surgical instruments that were being used. We found that they had been thought to have been sterilised. Then we tested them for sterility and found bacteria on them. There were a number of issues that we picked up when we went in. Their staff were not adequately trained. They did not have an adequate infection control plan in place. There were a range of issues.

Later, Dr Young said, 'Hepatitis C was my major concern, although hepatitis B and HIV were also of concern.' Clearly, the actions of the operator and/or owner of the clinic were putting patients at risk. One has to wonder the motivation of the operator and/or owner in failing to put in place a process to ensure a safe work and patient environment. Clearly, motivation could only be profit—the drive to acquire a dollar with complete disregard for patients' wellbeing and that of their employees. This complete lack of care and concern can only be condemned, because so many people were put at risk of very serious infection, having life-altering, if not threatening, outcomes.

Until this bill was introduced, the law in this area was at best ad hoc. Queensland Health had no legal capacity to monitor infection control practices, investigate poor practices, enforce compliance, or force noncompliant practices to be rectified. The action taken by Queensland Health in regard to the clinic was, with the cooperation of the Brisbane City Council in issuing a public health order, temporarily closing the clinic to ensure that remedial steps were taken. The fact that action could not be taken quickly to protect the public is of enormous concern. This bill addresses that question.

The current law covers what are called healthcare facilities which provide a declared health service, including dental clinics, pathology services and vaccine services to name a few. The act requires the healthcare facility to develop an infection control management plan, a document which is to prevent or minimise infection risks. As I have said, the act lacks teeth and given we live at a time in society where we are living longer, the necessity to provide a safe medical environment is critical.

The report recommends the bill be passed in that it amends the current act in a number of ways, including compulsory training, the right to enter premises to investigate infection risks without notice and the imposition of penalties for noncompliance of the terms of the act. However, the committee report also recommends two other matters. The first is the Minister for Health clarify how a 'healthcare facility has complied with an improvement or directions notice and is able to provide health services', and to, 'ensure the facility has complied with the notice.' I note the minister in his second reading speech covered both those issues and they are contained also in the government's response to the report of the committee.

The third recommendation goes to the jurisdiction to which an appeal can be lodged by an operator against an order made under the bill by a senior person in Queensland Health. The bill is silent and the department has said that the appeal could be to the Supreme Court by way of a judicial review. This is a lengthy and very expensive exercise and the question is why an appeal to QCAT is not provided in the bill—a much quicker and much less expensive exercise. The minister in his second reading speech referred to looking at this matter, but ensured that he would not allow the amendment as proposed by the shadow health minister to frustrate the intent of the bill. No-one denies that the bill deals with a serious matter and the nature of infection as outlined by the Chief Health Officer indicates how serious it is. However, a court or tribunal will act in accordance with the evidence in front it. The government, in a case of this nature, will present evidence of the nature of the risk and how serious that risk is. Courts and tribunals deal with these matters every day. They deal with them daily. It would not be new or unusual for a court or a tribunal to be dealing with a matter of this nature.

There is no intention to frustrate the terms of the bill, but there is an intention to provide security and safety by allowing an operator of an HCF to actually make an application to QCAT to ensure that the business is protected and the action taken by Queensland Health is right in all the circumstances. By no means would it frustrate, but it would protect the operator where a court or tribunal has the right to oversee or oversight the action by the Queensland Health senior officer.

The non-government members in their statement of reservation raised a number of concerns. Clause 5 deals with the obligation to minimise the risk of infection. The clause starts with the phrase 'a person involved must take reasonable precautions' to reduce the infection risk and gives as an example a registered nurse collecting blood for a blood bank. The point is raised by the Australian Dental Association, or ADAQ, as to what is the meaning of the word 'involved'. The word has a very wide definition and meaning and, as the ADAQ stated in its submission—

> Section 151 as proposed could have the effect of making any person involved in the provision of a declared health service liable.

As such, is there liability to the employee, the operator or the owner or all three? If an employee is charged does this then mean the operator or owner will not be charged? Does it also do away with the issue of vicarious liability? If an employee undertakes an action without the knowledge or consent of the owner operator, is the owner operator still going to be held liable under the terms of the bill or will that owner operator not be held liable and will liability fall purely to the employee? Again the word 'involved' is a very difficult word to define, has a wide definition and could have far-reaching consequences in relation to the actions of an employee or owner operator.

Again in the reservation statement, the non-government members raised clause 9, section 156B(3)(b), dealing with the amendment to the ICMP. The Australian Lawyers Alliance argues the notice to amend the ICMP 'must state' 'the way the ICMP must be amended', and the wording could mean the authorised person is required to rewrite the ICMP. That may be too long a bow to draw, but clearly the wording in the bill should be reconsidered to clearly place the onus of amendment on the healthcare facility or operator, as the wording as it currently stands is open to wide interpretation and places onus on the authorised persons themselves.

What is of concern is the capacity of Queensland Health to conduct ongoing audits of healthcare facilities. In testimony before the committee on 6 April I asked Dr Young how many HCFs are there in Queensland. The reply was, 'They would be in the thousands.' Earlier Dr Young, when dealing with audits, stated—

Since we have become aware of this as being an issue, we have started doing some audits and we are seeing that there are a number of practices that do not have the plans as required.

The concerning point there is, based upon the wording of Dr Young in her testimony, it appears that only now audits are being undertaken by Queensland Health. This prompted me to ask a question as to what the current resources were in relation to both staff and funding in the department and what would be the increases in both staff and funding if the bill was passed. The response was that there are 145 authorised persons appointed under the act, but the answer did not indicate any increase in either funding or manpower to deal with the audits the Chief Health Officer referred to earlier.

If we accept that Queensland Health is going to expand its activities, and given its recent activities and the nature of the amendments that is the inevitable result, how is Queensland Health going to undertake these effectively? Importantly, there are thousands of HCFs and when we consider that 5,000 people had to be contacted in regard to the dental clinic that prompted this bill, one has to worry how this critical process is going to be undertaken in the future. We will continue to see the number of HCFs expand as we continue to age and need access to core services. The real concern is the failure to plan for this growth. There is a possibility that a lack of resources will see a repeat of the fallout from this dental clinic fiasco. Next time the medical outcomes may not be as fortunate as they were in this case. I commend the bill to the House.

Ms DONALDSON (Bundaberg—ALP) (4.56 pm): I rise to contribute to the Public Health (Infection Control) Amendment Bill 2017. Firstly, I congratulate the minister on the bill, my committee colleagues, as well as the secretariat and all who made submissions to the inquiry. Although this is not one of those large and exciting bills that attracts a lot of attention, this is still a bill that is incredibly important to all Queenslanders as we go about our daily lives.

This bill reflects community expectations and the duty of care that is owed to people by health facilities. It is also important to ensure that while complying with their existing infection control obligations, the bill should not lead to additional cost for the majority of healthcare facilities that are complying with their existing infection control obligations.

This bill refers to declared health services. For the purposes of this bill, a declared health service is one which involves invasive procedures or the release of blood or other bodily fluids. The operators of these healthcare facilities are required to show how the risks are to be minimised through a detailed infection control management plan. These plans are meant to be regularly reviewed. As I previously mentioned, the majority of healthcare facilities are doing the right thing and do comply with their infection control obligations that currently exist. Sadly, however, we also know that some facilities are not complying with their obligations and therefore are not complying with the law.

It should be of concern to all Queenslanders that as many as one out of every six dental clinics that participated in a Queensland Health self-assessment process did not have compliant infection control management plans. I think that number should be a huge concern to everybody who has been or has a family member who has been to a dentist. One out of six is astounding. As I previously mentioned, the majority of healthcare facilities are doing the right thing and do comply with infection control obligations that exist. However, it is concerning, as previous speakers have mentioned, that two dental clinics have revealed practices that are creating real risk to both staff and their patients. It is this noncompliance to which this bill responds.

This means that only facilities that are breaching the current obligations and possibly placing patients and employees at risk of exposure to infectious bloodborne disease are the ones that are most likely to have additional costs incurred. Those costs are likely to be incurred in the areas of training, development, other documentation or some procedural changes. I am sure that everybody would agree

that that is fair when we are talking about people's ongoing health and safety in this very important area. As I stated at the outset of my speech, healthcare facilities that are complying should not incur any additional costs.

The bill creates a number of ways in which inspectors from Queensland Health can support and guide some facilities to improve their infection control practices and their documentation. Under the bill, inspectors could issue a facility with an improvement notice. This gives inspectors powers to require that operators make amendments to their infection management plans if they identify that those plans have any deficiencies. Inspectors will have those two new discretionary powers, allowing facilities to become compliant without having to be prosecuted.

The bill also provides an additional head of power to the Public Health Act to make a regulation that prescribes the standards of training and qualifications that healthcare facility staff must meet. The regulations will be made under the new and existing heads of power to help healthcare facilities discharge those obligations. These additional powers are backed up by a range of offences. The penalties that have been mentioned by previous speakers will reflect the existing penalties for breaches and will have a similar purpose of protecting staff and members of the public from public health risks arising from unsafe practices.

I think everyone would agree that it is comforting for Queenslanders who visit a healthcare facility for themselves or for a member of their family to know they are safe and that there are procedures in place to ensure there is a minimum risk of infection and that, if those procedures are found to be inadequate, inspectors have additional discretionary powers to ensure compliance if appropriate or to apply penalties if required. I too would like to thank the minister for his response to the committee's questions and for following up on the issues that were identified. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr CRAMP (Gaven—LNP) (5.02 pm): Today I rise to contribute to the Public Health (Infection Control) Amendment Bill 2017. The first part of the bill will make changes to further enable guidance to be provided to the operators and staff of healthcare facilities, HCFs, to minimise infection risks. The bill allows for appropriate adjustments to be made to the regulation-making head of power in the act, supported by amendments to the Public Health Regulation 2005 that will allow for mandatory training, competency and infection control standards to be prescribed by regulation.

The second part of the bill will expand the ability of the Department of Health to monitor compliance by the operators and staff of HCFs with their infection control obligations and, where necessary, investigate possible breaches. Heads of power will also be inserted into the framework to allow Queensland Health to require the operator of a HCF to produce a copy of their infection control management plan, ICMP, or to amend an ICMP. Authorised persons will be empowered to enter premises and investigate infection risk without prior notice.

The third part of the bill will increase the power of Queensland Health to enforce compliance by the operators and staff of HCFs with the infection control framework and to prosecute breaches. The bill imposes penalties for noncompliance and enables Queensland Health to direct the operator of an HCF to take particular corrective actions or to cease performing a particular health service where that service involves a risk to the public health from poor infection control practices.

As a member of the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee, I take this opportunity to thank all members of the committee for their diligence and effort in the review of this bill and for their continued bipartisan approach to all of the work that our committee undertakes. I thank the committee secretariat for their efforts and especially for their support of the committee during its consideration of this bill and all work that the committee is undertaking during this parliamentary term.

The committee recommended that the bill be passed, but at the same time recommended that the minister clarify how the department will assure itself that a health facility has complied with an improvement or a directions notice and, therefore, is able to provide health services to patients in a safe manner. Secondly, the committee recommended that the minister clarify how a healthcare facility will be notified in a timely manner that the department is satisfied that the facility has complied with the notice. The committee also recommended that the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services inform the House why a decision was taken not to enable operators to apply to the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal, QCAT, to review decisions to issue notices. Non-government members made a statement of reservations in which we specifically raised the issue of workload for the 145 authorised officers to effectively enforce a new regime to a level that would justify the changes. It is not clear how those officers will be able to manage, given that healthcare facilities are numbered in the thousands.

While the non-government members of the committee did support the parliament passing the Public Health (Infection Control) Amendment Bill 2017, we outlined some reservations raised by submitters, which we request the minister address in his second reading of the bill. The Australian Dental Association raised a point in relation to clause 5, section 151, headed 'General obligation to minimise infection risks for declared health services'. The association stated that the sentence, 'A person involved in the provision of a declared health service must take reasonable precautions and care to minimise the risk of infection to other persons,' could lead to unintended consequences. They pointed out that one of the examples given in the bill is that of a nurse who collects blood for a blood bank who could be liable if failing to comply with the ICMP. They question whether it is the intention to hold every person individually responsible or whether the question of vicarious liability is to apply. Secondly, they raised the point that the word 'involved' is nebulous and could lead to a wider interpretation, drawing the net further than required or anticipated. In its submission, the ADAQ states—

Section 151 as proposed could have the effect of making any person involved in the provision of a declared health service liable.

As duly noted in the opposition members' statement of reservations, the minister needs to clarify whether that is the intended outcome. It is easy to imagine circumstances where someone could easily fall foul by inadvertently not complying, but still be held liable under the terms of the bill. Additionally, there will be an incentive for owners of premises who are not operators or operators removed from the day-to-day activities of the HCF to shift blame to employees, given the example used in the bill.

As stated in the committee's report, clause 10 of the bill contains no appeal mechanism to deal with an improvement notice, section 156C, or a directions notice, section 156E, and associated sections. This point is highlighted in the submission of the Australian Dental Association of Queensland under the heading 'Review of directions notice'. The association points out that a right of appeal should lie with QCAT. Whilst in its reply the Department of Health stated that under the Judicial Review Act the matter could be dealt with by way of judicial review, there would be significant costs and time involved in such an application, whereas an appeal to QCAT would prove to be not only more timely but also more cost effective.

In its submission, the Australian Lawyers Alliance raised a question regarding clause 9, section 156B, and in particular subsection (3)(b). The section deals with the power of an authorised person giving a notice that requires the operator to amend an infection control management plan. It is a requirement that the notice state 'the way the ICMP must be amended'. The ALA raised the point that this may suggest that the authorised person is to rewrite the ICMP and proposes that it be amended to read 'the reason why the authorised person considers the ICMP does not comply with this part'. The ALA questions clause 13, section 390, and whether the phrase 'an imminent risk of infection to a person at the health care facility' poses a difficult threshold and proposed a lower one before allowing entry to a healthcare facility without notice.

In an answer to a question at the public hearing on 6 April 2017, the Chief Health Officer, when asked how many HCFs there are in Queensland, stated, 'They would be in the thousands.' During the same public hearing the Chief Health Officer made this comment—

Since we have become aware of this as being an issue, we have started doing some audits and we are seeing that there are a number of practices that do not have the plans as required.

It is clear, given the full testimony of the Chief Health Officer and the intent of the bill, that Queensland Health will undertake a more active approach in regard to the monitoring of infection control practices, investigating complaints for poor practices, enforcing compliance and requiring noncompliant practices to be rectified.

It is noted that the director-general was asked to advise what current resources were available, including the staff and funding, to meet current requirements and if they would be increased due to the bill. The director-general stated that there are 145 authorised officers available to investigate complaints and take action under the Public Health Act. He stated that if required additional resources may also be made available on a case-by-case basis to respond to emergent issues. Given that there will be a greater role for Queensland Health under this bill and there are thousands of HCFs, the answer provided indicates that there will be no additional resources nor funding available for what is clearly a more vigorous and interventionist approach.

It can be assumed that the 145 officers are all actively and fully engaged by Queensland Health under a regime that is not as rigorous as that proposed. Therefore, it must be questioned how those 145 people will cover thousands of HCFs if, as referred to by the Chief Health Officer, 'they have started doing some audits'.

The LNP will not oppose the bill being passed. However, there have been several issues identified as needing to be overcome regarding adequate resourcing and the process applied to ensure healthcare facilities comply with this legislation. Otherwise this will become just another example of this Labor government wasting Queensland taxpayers' money through their usual poor planning and lack of diligence.

Mr KELLY (Greenslopes—ALP) (5.11 pm): I rise in support of the Public Health (Infection Control) Amendment Bill. I start by thanking the committee and submitters for the good work they have done in relation to this matter. This bill was generated in response to an infection control issue in a dental clinic not terribly far from the electorate that I represent. I thank and congratulate the minister and the department for their speedy response to that initiating issue. While it was good that they dealt with the immediate issue, it is better that they have looked at the issue and brought legislation into the House very quickly.

I start by reassuring the community that healthcare professionals—dentists, nurses, doctors, allied health professionals—all take infection control extremely seriously. Perhaps the best protection that patients have is the very high ethical standards that all of those people operate by. In my last job as a nurse before being elected I worked at QEII Hospital. I was a hand hygiene hero. This was a role that involved a significant amount of training. It involved—

Mr Dick: It's very important.

Mr KELLY: A very important role. If people speak to anybody in health care they will tell them that the No. 1 intervention that has saved more lives in the history of health care than anything else is good hand washing. It was a role that I certainly took very seriously. It was a role that demonstrated to me that all sections of the healthcare community, including those people who are not working as professionals but who work in support roles, take this matter very seriously.

For health professionals there are key things that drive our practice in this area. Our practice is guided by evidence and it is adjusted and updated constantly. As I have already noted, the very high ethical standards that all health practitioners operate by guide what we do on a day-to-day basis. While legislative frameworks are certainly essential—and we need to make sure that there are guidelines, inspections and enforcement—ultimately what drives most healthcare professionals to do the right thing all the time is their ethical code.

The final thing that drives most healthcare professionals—it certainly drove me and all of the professionals that I worked with—is a deep sense of care and responsibility for patients. Healthcare professionals have all seen the impacts of infectious disease. We know that with good procedures we can limit or prevent most infectious diseases. I certainly pay tribute to all the nurses and doctors who specialise in infection control. They do not just work in our hospitals; they work right across healthcare facilities. They are people who often do not get much recognition. I can certainly tell members that from the perspective of practising nurses we would not have been able to do our jobs effectively and keep patients safe and prevent the spread of some truly serious illnesses without their good work.

Today representatives from Engineers Australia were in the House for their annual visit. I had a chat to some of the engineers. They were half joking about health engineering when they found out my background. The reality is that some of the most significant changes that have led to the greatest health benefits in our society have probably had as much to do with engineering as they have had to do with healthcare professionals. Things like the delivery of clean water and a capacity to have good sanitation practices in our crowded cities has led to an absolute reduction in infectious diseases.

I want to stress and reassure the community that our infection control frameworks for healthcare facilities in this state are good. What this bill will do is make them stronger. Public health officials will have greater powers to investigate potential breaches in a much faster manner and take enforcement action more quickly.

This bill is sensible. It makes our strong infection control processes even stronger. I have no doubt that this bill will be supported by a majority of healthcare professionals. I commend this bill to the House.

Dr ROBINSON (Cleveland—LNP) (5.17 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Public Health (Infection Control) Amendment Bill 2017. The LNP opposition will not be opposing the bill. I do note that the shadow minister will be moving an amendment to provide for a right of appeal or review to the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal where Queensland Health has issued notices under the new provisions.

The stated objectives of the bill are to amend the Public Health Act 2005 to strengthen the statutory infection control framework for healthcare facilities, HCFs. The act provides a regulatory framework for controlling infection risks at the HCFs, such as dental and medical practices, public hospitals, acupuncture clinics and abortion clinics. The act requires persons involved in the delivery of declared health services at a HCF to take reasonable precautions and care to minimise infection risks and requires the operator of the facility to develop and implement an infection control management plan, an ICMP, and to train staff in the operation of their ICMP. A declared health service is any service provided to a person which is intended to maintain, improve or restore the person's health and which involves the performance of an invasive procedure or an activity which exposes the person or another person to blood or another body fluid.

The recent incident at a Brisbane dental clinic at Carina in late 2016 involving lax infection control practices highlighted shortcomings in the framework that could limit the ability of Queensland Health, as a regulator, to minimise unsafe infection control practices or to take timely and appropriate remedial action in response to such practices. In the Carina dental clinic case, a documented pattern of substandard infection control practices was found to be placing staff and patients at risk of coming into contact with infection bloodborne diseases. The concerns for the closure emanated from poor sterilisation practices, resulting in the dentist in charge of the clinic being suspended at the time. The clinic was found to have exposed more than 4,000 patients to potential hepatitis C infection. While a clear risk of infection and breach of practice was identified, there is no suggestion or indication that any infectious or transmissible disease has been contracted by a person.

The incident revealed several shortcomings in the current framework. Firstly, it does not provide guidance about the substantive standards that HCFs are expected to meet in satisfying this obligation. Secondly, it does not adequately support compliance monitoring and investigation. Thirdly, it does not include a direct power to compel HCFs to disclose information about their infection control practices. Fourthly, it is not directly enforceable, with no penalties for noncompliance and no specific power to order HCFs to take particular remedial action. Ultimately, Queensland Health, working with the Brisbane City Council as a co-regulator, was able to issue a public health order under the act, closing the Brisbane dental clinic until specified remedial measures had been implemented.

Other states have had similar and even worse experiences with infection control within HCFs and have also tightened regulations to prevent further incidents from occurring—such as the hepatitis C infections that occurred at a Melbourne abortion clinic. ABC News reported on the story in which a doctor at the Croydon Day Surgery infected 54 women with hepatitis C. Anaesthetist Dr James Peters was jailed for 14 years in 2013 after admitting 55 counts of negligently causing serious injury to patients who had abortions at Croydon Day Surgery between 2008 and 2009. As per the ABC story, the court heard that Peters, who has hepatitis C, was addicted to the painkiller Fentanyl and would inject the drug into himself before using the same syringe on his patients. The victims were awarded $13.75 million in compensation in a class action against the surgery, practice boss Dr Mark Schulberg and the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency. It is clear that such infection risks are very real not only in Victoria but here in Queensland.

The bill makes needed improvements to the infection control framework to better protect HCF patients and staff from the risk of exposure to infectious conditions. Such improvements will provide Queensland Health with the regulatory tools to address deficiencies in the management of infection risks by HCFs so that cases like the Carina dental clinic and Croydon abortion clinic never happen here.

The committee recommended that the bill be passed but that the minister clarify how the department will assure itself that a healthcare facility has complied with an improvement or directions notice and is therefore able to provide health services to patients in a safe manner. It is also recommended that the minister clarify how they will notify a healthcare facility in a timely manner that the department is satisfied that the facility has complied with the notice. The committee further recommended that the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services advise the House why a decision was taken not to enable operators to apply to the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal to review decisions to issue notices.

LNP opposition members of the committee put in a statement of reservation reinforcing some of the concerns of submitters but also raising the issue of workload for the authorised officers to effectively enforce the new regime to a level that would justify the changes. It is important that they are able to manage, given that there are thousands of healthcare facilities. I wish to place on record my thanks to other committee members, the secretariat, the health department officials—in particular, the CHO—and all of the stakeholder groups, such as the Queensland branch of the Australian Dental Association. I support the bill with the LNP opposition amendment.

Mr MADDEN (Ipswich West—ALP) (5.23 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Public Health (Infection Control) Amendment Bill 2017, which amends the Public Health Act 2005 for particular purposes. The bill and the explanatory notes were tabled by the Minister for Health on 21 March 2017 and nominated the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee to consider the bill.

In its report No. 37, dated May 2017, the committee made three recommendations: firstly, that the Public Health (Infection Control) Amendment Bill 2017 be passed; secondly, that the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services clarify during the second reading debate how the Department of Health will assure itself that a healthcare facility has complied with an improvement or directions notice and is therefore able to provide health services to patients in a safer manner and notify a healthcare facility in a timely manner that the department is satisfied that the facility has complied with the notice; and, thirdly, that the minister inform the House during the second reading debate why a decision was taken not to enable operators to apply to the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal to review decisions to issue notices.

Because of the inherent risk to patients and staff at medical facilities coming into contact with infectious bloodborne diseases such as hepatitis and HIV, the act already requires people involved in performing declared health services to take reasonable precautions and care to minimise infection risks. The new powers pursuant to this bill will allow officials to better monitor healthcare facilities, investigate potential breaches faster and take swift enforcement action if unsafe practices are detected.

As the minister outlined in his introductory speech, there had been a recent incident involving substandard infection control practices at a Brisbane dental clinic that revealed the need to strengthen the infection control framework for healthcare facilities under the Public Health Act. Ultimately, Queensland Health, with the agreement of the Brisbane City Council as a co-regulator, was able to issue a public health order under chapter 2 of the Public Health Act, closing the Brisbane dental clinic until specified remedial measures had been implemented to the satisfaction of Queensland Health.

However, while issuing a public health order is an effective measure for controlling particular infection risk once it has occurred and for preventing its recurrence, it is not a suitable means of preventing infection control risks from arising, promoting ongoing improvements in HCF infection control practices, and identifying and minimising emergent infection risks. Therefore, the Public Health (Infection Control) Amendment Bill aims to strengthen the statutory infection control framework for healthcare facilities.

Procedures undertaken at healthcare facilities often involve invasive procedures that might expose a person to blood or other bodily fluids and are known as declared health services under the act. The legislation will allow Queensland Health to be more proactive in monitoring and investigating compliance, allowing inspectors to immediately enter a healthcare facility if they believe it is necessary to control an imminent public health risk. The legislation will also remove the requirement for local government approval, enabling officials to step in before the risk of infection becomes too great.

A wide variety of health services provided across a significant range of settings involve the performance of invasive procedures or the release of blood and other bodily fluids. Under the Public Health Act, these health services are known as declared health services. This is equally the case in a range of services provided at mobile facilities and in workplaces and people's homes—for example, vaccination services and home-birthing services. Declared health services include public hospitals and ambulance services, dental clinics, medical practitioners' private rooms, acupuncturists and Chinese medicine practitioners, sexual health services, home nursing services, midwifery services outside the hospital environment, pathology and blood collection services, retrieval services and vaccine services. If not properly performed, these services pose a risk that staff or patients could be exposed to infectious diseases. That is why the Public Health Act includes a framework regulating the performance of declared health services. This is known as the infection control framework.

In two instances dental health clinics were found to have substandard infection control practices. These practices were placing staff and patients at real risk of coming into contact with infectious conditions such as hepatitis C and HIV. The incidents reveal shortcomings in the infection control framework. In particular, the framework did not adequately empower Queensland Health to investigate complaints and other concerns about infection control practices. The framework also did not enable Queensland Health to enforce it or to require healthcare facilities to remedy deficient practices. The bill rectifies this by creating stronger powers for Queensland Health to investigate infection control practices and to require the operators of facilities providing declared health services to rectify deficient and unsafe practices. In serious cases the bill empowers Queensland Health to prohibit facilities providing particular services until identified deficiencies are remedied. These stronger powers are backed up by a range of

offences. The penalties for these offences will reflect the existing penalties for breaches of other frameworks which have a similar purpose of protecting staff and members of the public from public health risks arising from unsafe practices.

The legislation will require owners and operators of healthcare facilities to comply with specific infection control and training standards. Noncompliance with these standards could see owners and operators of healthcare facilities face penalties of between $121,000 and $365,700 for a range of breaches. The bill closes a gap in the statutory framework by ensuring declared health services are performed in a way which prevents or minimises infection risks. As Dr Sonya Bennett, the Executive Director of Queensland Health's Communicable Diseases Branch, said, the legislation will provide more clarity around expectation and requirements for infection control. There is really no excuse for poor infection control, and these important changes will allow health officials to act quickly, responsively and decisively to manage any risks to the public. They also make abundantly clear what we expect from health practitioners and facilities in terms of infection control standards.

In closing, I would like to thank the members of the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee: the chair, Ms Leanne Linard MP, member for Nudgee; deputy chair, Mr Mark McArdle MP, member for Caloundra; Mr Sid Cramp MP, member for Gaven; Ms Leanne Donaldson MP, member for Bundaberg; Mr Aaron Harper MP, member for Thuringowa; and Dr Mark Robinson MP, member for Cleveland. I also thank the secretariat and the submitters. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr MILLAR (Gregory—LNP) (5.32 pm): I would like to make a short contribution to the Public Health (Infection Control) Amendment Bill 2016. Before I do that I would like to acknowledge the great work that our health professionals in regional Queensland do—from doctors, nurses, ambulance and allied health right down to cleaners and security at our hospitals and healthcare facilities. They do such a fantastic job and an important job for western and regional Queensland. We are fortunate to have some pretty good health boards in the region such as the central west health board led by Jane Williams, who does a fantastic job making sure that we are able to provide the best health care we can in Western Queensland.

Infection control is probably one of the most important jobs in our health system. I know firsthand the importance that our health professionals put on infection control and what they do to maintain the right procedures in hospitals and health clinics to make sure infection control is a priority when it comes to the workplace. It is important. It is the simple things that need to be done and followed through to make sure we control infection in hospitals. We have all heard the stories where infections do get out of control in some areas. It is the simple things that help such as washing hands and making sure that those hospitals are an hygienic place. The staff do a wonderful job from doctors, nurses, professionals and ambulance right down to the cleaners. They do a fantastic job.

The need for this bill came about when Queensland Health in conjunction with the Brisbane City Council closed a Brisbane dental clinic in Carina in 2016. The concern and the closure stemmed from poor sterilisation practices, and the dentist in charge of the clinic was also suspended at the time. I do note that the Chief Health Officer, Dr Jeannette Young, said procedures at the clinic were inadequate. The clinic was subsequently found to have exposed more than 4,000 patients to a potential hepatitis C infection due to poor infection and management practices. When we go to a dentist, a hospital or a clinic, we do expect that it is clean and that everything is done right. It is important that this legislation comes before the House and is dealt with. We have to make sure that we maintain the highest standards in all our health clinics right around Queensland. Whether it is here in Brisbane, in Cape York or Western Queensland, that is very important.

The first part of this bill will make changes to further enable guidance to be provided to the operators and staff at healthcare facilities to minimise infection risk, which is important. The bill also allows for appropriate adjustments to be made to the regulation-making head of power in the act supported by amendments to the Public Health Regulation 2005 that will allow for mandatory training, competency and infection control standards to be prescribed by regulation. The second part of the bill will expand on the ability for the Department of Health to monitor compliance by operators and staff at the HCFs with their infection control obligations and, where necessary, investigate possible breaches. Heads of power will also be inserted into the framework to allow Queensland Health to require the operator of the HCF to produce a copy of their infection control management plan or to amend their infection control management plan. An authorised person will be empowered to enter premises to investigate infection risks without prior notice. A third part of the bill will increase the power of Queensland Health to enforce compliance by the operators and staff of the HCF with the infection control framework and to prosecute breaches.

It is vitally important that we have these regulations in regional Queensland and make sure we do have compliance. The bill imposes penalties for noncompliance, which is important. It enables Queensland Health to direct the operator of a HCF to take particular corrective actions or to cease performing a particular health service where that service involves a risk to public health from poor infection control practices.

I also note that the Australian Dental Association in Queensland has concerns about proposed changes as the issues that need to be addressed with regard to infection control standards will be prescribed by a yet-unseen regulation. The association is not convinced and it remains to be seen what these provisions are. The association is concerned about the resourcing of the appropriately qualified person for these tasks. The proposed changes would amount to conflicting regulations between the association and its Queensland notification board.

An issue that is important—and I know that the member for Surfers Paradise, a dentist himself, will be moving some amendments with regard to this—is that if there is going to be a power exercised by a senior person in Queensland Health, there needs to be a right of appeal to have that decision reviewed because of the catastrophic effects a direction notice can have, which can result in the closure of a practice. Why is that important in regional Queensland where I come from? It is incredibly important because sometimes that is the only practice or service in town. We need to make sure that those services in regional Queensland are protected and continue to operate if they feel they need to appeal. Presently the Public Health Act 2005 does not have any right to review beyond application to the Supreme Court, which is expensive for affected registrants and can be very time consuming. It is very important for people in regional Queensland and Western Queensland and those practices to have the right to appeal. If they feel they have been hard done by and that they need to continue to operate and they are conducting a safe practice and are on top of their infection control, they need to be able to appeal. I think that is very important.

Finally, I would like to pay tribute to the dentists and health professionals in Western Queensland and especially services like the dental van, which operates in regional Queensland. This van—

Ms Leahy: It is critical.

Mr MILLAR:—is critical and it goes around regional areas. It is sponsored by QCoal, and it is through their generosity that the van continues to operate. I have seen it firsthand operating in regions in the electorate of Gregory such as Winton. It just turns up in a town and provides high-class professional dental services to those towns in Western Queensland. I think they do a marvellous job, very much like the Heart of Australia truck. They put critical clinical operations in those small towns and allow people, whether they live in Stonehenge, Jundah, Winton or Clermont, to have access to first-class health facilities. I commend the dental van for what they do; they do a fantastic job.

It is great to see some of those dentists who come out from Brisbane and the city. They get a great experience of Western Queensland life. Not only are they providing a first-class and much needed service in western and regional Queensland but it also gives them an opportunity to get around the state and see that Queensland is bigger than just Brisbane. It is a wonderful state with wonderful people, and it is a great opportunity for those up-and-coming dentists to experience regional Queensland. I certainly commend the bill to the House.

Ms HOWARD (Ipswich—ALP) (5.41 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Public Health (Infection Control) Amendment Bill 2017. Today's bill proposes to amend the Public Health Act 2005 and is designed to strengthen the statutory infection control framework for healthcare facilities, or HCFs. HCFs are important parts of any community, and I know that the vast majority of them take compliance, especially infection control, extremely seriously.

When an HFC provides invasive procedures like the release of blood or other bodily fluids, they become a declared health service. These are our hospitals, medical and dental practices, acupuncture clinics, ambulance services, blood banks and other valued services. Whether performing complex surgery on those closest to us, providing check-ups, or simply making sure that we are operating at the best level possible, healthcare facilities are some of the most valued providers in our community. What happens when our healthcare facilities are not up to scratch? What happens when these providers are not taking every necessary step to ensure that patients are receiving the finest level of care with no added risk to their health?

To most of us here, the idea that some of the most trusted professionals and practitioners in our state could think about performing at a subpar level is not something that we can comprehend. Queensland Health recently conducted a self-assessment process for dental clinics, and we learned

that as many as one in six dental clinics did not have a compliant Infection Control Management Plan in place. We all know of the two dental clinics which revealed that their current infection control processes posed a genuine risk to patients and staff. At the time the Chief Health Officer, Dr Jeannette Young, said that one of the dental clinics would be closed until it could satisfy Queensland Health that the proper infection control standards were being met. While the risk of transmission of viruses such as hepatitis C or HIV was very small, it does not absolve the practice from its responsibility of not placing patients at potential risk. It is never acceptable that there is even the slightest risk of a client, staff or patient contracting a preventable disease due to the mismanagement of staff.

I think I would speak for many when I say that it is concerning to learn that people could be careless with the health and safety of Queenslanders. The Palaszczuk government—in particular our Minister for Health, Cameron Dick—is committed to providing the best quality health care to all Queenslanders, and I commend them for it. Our strong focus is to ensure that all Queenslanders are provided with a common assurance regarding their health care: they will never be left in the dark and they will never be put at preventable risk. While the framework requires HCFs to take reasonable care to minimise infection risks, there is no guidance provided to our healthcare facilities regarding the substantive standards which are expected to be met in satisfying this obligation.

The framework also does not adequately support compliance monitoring and investigations. For patients and Queenslanders in general this means that there is no area under the framework for direct power to compel HCFs to disclose information about their infection control practices. This creates a situation where, even in the event that an HCF does fail in its obligations to the infection control framework, there is no specific power to order healthcare facilities to take particular remedial action, as exemplified in our recent dental clinic episode. By agreement and with the Brisbane City Council as a co-regulator, Queensland Health was able to use a public health order under chapter 2 of the Primary Health Act to close the dental clinic until specified remedial action was taken. This emphasises the fact that our current framework is far better at controlling a public health risk once it has occurred rather than its prevention. To assist with regard to this aspect of the bill the Minister for Health has proposed a number of enhancements to the infection control framework under chapter 4 of the original Public Health Act. These enhancements are emblematic of the steps the government is taking to ensure that health is always on the agenda and never relegated to the B side.

The first aspect of the amendment will be to ensure that there is better guidance provided to the operators and staff of HCFs to minimise infection risks. While this may appear minor at first, this aspect will be incredibly valuable to ensure that all of our HCFs are knowledgeable about our expectations regarding infection control. It will no longer be the case that they can plead ignorance regarding the framework, thus raising Queenslanders' confidence in our HCFs.

Another important addition will be that the department will receive copies of the HCFs' Infection Control Management Plans, ICMPs, or be able to amend an ICMP where necessary. Finally, the bill will impose penalties for noncompliance on HCFs as well as empower Queensland Health to direct the operator of an HCF to take particular remedial action or to cease performing a particular health service where the service involved poses a risk to public health from poor infection control practices. This is a particularly powerful aspect of this legislation, as it will provide another incentive for HCFs to ensure that they are compliant and will not attempt to cut corners which may endanger the lives of Queenslanders.

As a government, particularly one that places such a high level of importance on health, I am proud that we are taking steps and not just being a reactionary force. Today the Palaszczuk government has risen to the challenge and met the expectations that our people have placed on us. We have delivered an amendment bill that will address the prevention of preventable risk. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr BENNETT (Burnett—LNP) (5.47 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Public Health (Infection Control) Amendment Bill 2017. It has been said that the shadow minister proposes an amendment that provides the right of appeal or review to the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal where Queensland Health has issued notices under the new provisions.

The origins of the bill have been widely canvassed tonight. The bill became necessary because Queensland Health, in conjunction with Brisbane City Council, had to close a Brisbane dental clinic due to poor sterilisation practices. It has been reported that there were inadequate infection control practices at the clinic. There was no suggestion or indication that any infectious or transmissible diseases have been contracted by a person, but standards were not met.

The first part of the proposed bill will make changes to enable guidance to be provided to operators and staff of healthcare facilities to minimise infection risks. The bill also provides that appropriate adjustments will be made to the regulation-making head of power in the act, supported by amendments to the Public Health Regulation 2005, to allow for the mandatory training, competency and infection control standards to be prescribed by regulation. As stated in the explanatory notes—

The Bill will enhance the ability of the department to monitor compliance by the operators and staff of HCFs with their infection control obligations and, where necessary, investigate possible breaches. Heads of power will be inserted into the framework to allow Queensland Health to require the operator of an HCF to produce a copy of their ICMP or to amend an ICMP. Authorised persons will be empowered to enter premises to investigate infection risks without prior notice.

The third part of the bill will increase the power of Queensland Health to enforce compliance by the operators and staff of HCFs with the infection control framework and to prosecute breaches. The bill imposes penalties for noncompliance and enables Queensland Health to direct the operators of a healthcare facility to take corrective action or to cease performing particular health services where that service involves a risk to public health from poor infection control practices.

The committee recommended that the bill be passed but at the same time recommended that the minister clarify how the department will assure itself that a healthcare facility has complied with an improvement or directions notice and is therefore able to provide health services to patients in a safe manner. It also recommended that the minister clarify how the department will notify a healthcare facility in a timely manner. I note that those explanations were made during the minister's second reading speech.

Non-government members put in a statement of reservations reinforcing some of the concerns of the submitters but also raised the issue of workload for the 145 authorised officers to effectively enforce the new regime to a level that would justify the changes. It is not clear they will be able to manage, given that the number of healthcare facilities would number in the thousands.

I will now provide some stakeholder feedback on the bill. The Australian Lawyers Alliance raised questions in relation to clause 9, discussing the power of an authorised person giving notice to amend an infection control management plan, and suggested changes be considered. The Australian Dental Association Queensland stated in relation to the achievement of policy objectives for mandatory training, competency and infection control standards that will be prescribed by an as-yet-unseen regulation that it was not convinced and that it remains to be seen what these provisions are. The ADAQ was concerned about the resourcing of the appropriately qualified persons for these tasks.

An issue that needs to be addressed is that if there is going to be a power exercised by a senior person in Queensland Health then there needs to be a right of appeal to have that decision reviewed because of the catastrophic effect of a directions notice, which can result in the closure of a practice. Presently, the Public Health Act 2005 does not have any right of review beyond application to the Supreme Court, which is expensive for affected registrants and can be time consuming.

I take the opportunity afforded by this debate related to healthcare facilities to remind the House that people in the northern parts of my electorate, particularly those living in Agnes Water, continue to face disadvantage with access to public dental services. As a visit to the nearest oral health clinic in Bundaberg involves a lengthy round trip—it is beyond many of our older residents—dental health outcomes are poorer here than in the big cities. Under the LNP, people in Agnes Water had access to dental vouchers for treatment by private dentists, to get off the waiting list for dental care. This scheme has been discontinued, and people in the north of my electorate struggle to get the care they need. They urgently need the reintroduction of the dental voucher scheme for emergency and general public dental care.

The last update from Minister Dick was in December 2015, when he committed that the 'provision of public outreach services and a voucher program will be considered for future planning for the oral health service'. This was a welcome announcement; however, to date there has been no action despite many follow-up letters and appeals from those in my electorate who are desperate for dental services. We again appeal for this service to be reinstated.

Mr HARPER (Thuringowa—ALP) (5.52 pm): I rise to speak on the Public Health (Infection Control) Amendment Bill 2017. This bill was introduced following the startling findings regarding a dental practice in Brisbane that clearly put thousands of patients at very real risk of potential cross-contamination or of acquiring a bloodborne virus. Subsequently it came to light that, as a result of that increasing public risk, the process of closing that dental clinic required collaboration with local council via a public health order. That ultimately closed the clinic, which had, through its poor sterilisation practices, showed a lack of regard for public safety with regard to infection control.

The Public Health Act 2005 provides the regulatory framework for controlling infection risks at healthcare facilities such as public hospitals, dental clinics, sexual health services, home nursing services, retrieval services and pathology and blood collection services which provide a declared health service. A declared health service is defined as a service provided to a person that is intended to maintain, improve or restore a person's health and involves the performance of an invasive procedure or an activity that exposes the person to another person's blood or another bodily fluid. I can speak with a degree of authority on that point as it relates directly to my former role as a paramedic with the Queensland Ambulance Service. I know that infection control is paramount in the delivery of health services. The Department of Health estimated in its briefing that there are thousands of healthcare facilities such as ambulance services and hospital and health services to which the act applies in Queensland including approximately 600 dental practices.

In his introductory speech the health and ambulance services minister stated—

Because of the inherent risk of patients and staff at these facilities coming into contact with infectious bloodborne diseases such as hepatitis and HIV, the act already requires people involved in performing declared health services to take reasonable precautions and care to minimise infection risks.

The act also requires the owner or operator of a healthcare facility to develop and implement an infection control management plan, which is a documented plan to prevent or minimise the risk of infection for persons receiving services at a healthcare facility, persons employed or engaged by a healthcare facility or other persons at risk of infection at that facility. The infection control framework provided for in the act does not apply to private health facilities, which fall under their own Private Health Facilities Act 1999.

The explanatory notes state that a recent incident involving substandard infection control practices at a Brisbane dental clinic highlighted shortcomings in the existing infection control framework. The dental clinic had reused single-use items, including without sterilising those items; inadequately sterilised other items on which bacteria were found; inadequately trained staff; and had an inadequate infection control management plan. That incident raised a significant risk of infection to patients and staff at the clinic. The department advised that it contacted a majority of the 5,000 patients who had attended the clinic since it opened in 2014 to alert them of the very real risk they had potentially acquired a bloodborne virus. Ultimately, the department, with agreement of the Brisbane City Council as co-regulator, was able to issue a public health order closing the clinic until specified remedial measures had been implemented to the department's satisfaction.

Potential shortcomings in the current framework were identified by the department. The power to issue a public health order under the act is shared between the state and local governments. Although the government was able to secure Brisbane City Council's consent to issue a public health order in the recent dental clinic incident, the requirement to negotiate with a second regulator creates undue administrative complexity and may cause delay in taking action.

While the framework requires healthcare facilities to take reasonable care to minimise infectious risks, it does not provide any guidance about the substantive standards healthcare facilities are expected to meet in satisfying this obligation. This will provide a mechanism for the department to work with healthcare facility operators to identify and improve substandard infection control practices. The framework is not directly enforceable, with no penalties for noncompliance or specific powers to compel healthcare facilities to take remedial action. The explanatory notes state that these shortcomings potentially limit the ability of Queensland Health as a regulator to minimise unsatisfactory and unsafe infection control practices or to identify and subsequently take swift remedial action in response to such practices.

The explanatory notes state that the bill amends the act to strengthen the infection control framework for healthcare facilities by providing mandatory training, competency and infection control standards prescribed by regulation. An authorised person may require the operator of the healthcare facility to produce or amend their infection control management plan. An authorised person may enter premises to investigate infection risks without prior notice. Penalties may be imposed for noncompliance and the department may direct the operator of the healthcare facility to take remedial action or cease performing a particular health service.

The majority of submitters supported the general approach of the bill; however, the Queensland Nurses and Midwives' Union, Australian Dental Association and AMAQ had some reservations about the proposed amendments. The committee recommends that the Minister for Health clarify during his reply to the second reading debate how the Department of Health will assure itself that a healthcare facility has complied with an improvement or directive notice and is therefore able to provide health

services to patients in a safe manner and notify a healthcare facility in a timely manner that the department is satisfied that the facility has complied with the notice. The health and safety of the thousands of health consumers across our state is paramount. Infection control management plans must be in place, understood and followed. I commend the bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Harper, adjourned.

COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Portfolio Committees, Reporting Dates

Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (6.00 pm): I advise the House of determinations made by the Committee of the Legislative Assembly at its meeting today. The committee has resolved, pursuant to standing order 136, that the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee report on the Corrective Services (No Body, No Parole) Amendment Bill 2017 by 24 July 2017; the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee report on the Healthy Futures Commission Queensland Bill 2017 by 24 July 2017; the Education, Tourism, Innovation and Small Business Committee report on the University Legislation Amendment Bill 2017 by 7 August 2017; and the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee report on the Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2017 by 24 July 2017 and the Land Access Ombudsman Bill 2017 by 7 August 2017.

MOTION

Cedar Woods Development

Mr WALKER (Mansfield—LNP) (6.01 pm): I move—

That this House condemns the Palaszczuk government for its rank hypocrisy and planning uncertainty regarding the Cedar Woods development.

Since this government has taken power, we are not unused to crazy things happening within the state planning system. Who can forget that day when Councillor Sri was sitting just up there, looking over the Deputy Premier's shoulder, assuring himself that she would call in the West Village development—a call-in that, firstly, took away the rights of community organisations to have their case heard before the Planning and Environment Court and, secondly, sent a shiver down the spine of the development community in Queensland because of the uncertainty created by the Deputy Premier intervening in a highly political manner in her own backyard. It was a call-in that should not have happened in the way it did. It caused a stir not only among developers but also among community groups, which were also dispossessed because of that decision.

The Cedar Woods decision is no different. This was another political game played with serious planning matters. It was June 2014 when the Cedar Woods development application was lodged. It proposed 1,349 residential lots in Brisbane. Fewer than 10 dwellings per hectare were proposed and 91 hectares of the site were to be given to the council as green space. In December 2014, the council approved the development with a reduced yield of 980 lots per hectare—a 27 per cent reduction in the number of lots. So the council took note of community concerns.

That was not enough for the then Labor candidate for Ashgrove, who wrote to constituents railing against the council's decision, saying how unfair it was and how the lot yield needed to be cut back further. In fact, the member for Ashgrove circulated to electors a document saying that, if she were elected on 31 January, her first act would be to call on the use of the call-in powers so that local concerns would be heard. I table that document.

Tabled paper: Newsletter, undated, from Ms Kate Jones, then candidate for Ashgrove, titled 'My Commitment to The Gap' [754].

Indeed, the member for Ashgrove was elected and, indeed, the matter was called in. In April 2015 the Deputy Premier called in the application. Some months later—in July 2015—the Deputy Premier partially approved it. The Deputy Premier issued a preliminary approval in part but left a balance still to be determined.

There was then a neighbourhood planning process. The wheels of the planning system turned and, eventually, the council received a response from the Deputy Premier with respect to her view on this neighbourhood plan. She did that in a letter of 20 April 2017 to Councillor Simmonds. I table that letter.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 20 April 2017, from the Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning, Hon. Jackie Trad MP, to councillor Julian Simmonds, Chairman for City Planning, Brisbane Council, regarding proposed amendments to the Upper Kedron Neighbourhood Plan [755].

Far from delivering on the commitment that the now member for Ashgrove had made to her constituents at the 2015 election, that letter proposed an increase in density in this development.

Thankfully, someone was looking after the interests of the constituents. Councillor Toomey quickly got a petition going, drawing the attention of the locals to this transgression in terms of what had been promised. Very quickly after that there was a second letter from the Deputy Premier, changing her mind—or in the wonderful bureaucratic speak of the letter, a decision to 'remake' her decision. The Deputy Premier then remade the decision.

Did that decision reduce—as promised by the member for Ashgrove—the density? No. That letter says that the Deputy Premier's position is that 'the density and yield envisaged for the site is a matter for the council'. I table that letter.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 18 May 2017, from the Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning, Hon. Jackie Trad MP, to councillor Julian Simmonds, Chairman for City Planning, Brisbane Council, regarding proposed amendments to the Upper Kedron Neighbourhood Plan [756].

Since the election period in 2015, when the member for Ashgrove promised her constituents that her priority would be a review of this decision by the state government to ensure a reduction in density, the wheels have been spinning. We have come back to the very position that we started with. The member for Ashgrove has failed to deliver for her constituents. She has failed to deliver on that solemn promise. The Deputy Premier has wavered between increasing the density and going back to allowing the Brisbane City Council to determine its own decision in the matter. The member for Ashgrove has misled her constituents. She should hang her head in shame and she should resign from this House.

Hon. JA TRAD (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning) (6.06 pm): I cannot wait until Corrine McMillan is the Labor member for Mansfield in this House. We would then not have to listen to the dribble and the hyperbole from the current member for Mansfield. Let us be clear about what this motion is all about. It is a condemnation of consultation. Once again, the LNP wants to condemn consultation, listening and acting on Queenslanders' concerns. The LNP members come into this place and talk about rank hypocrisy and planning uncertainty for the Cedar Woods development, but let us not mention the member for Callide—the worst planning minister since Russ Hinze. In November 2014, he issued a direction changing his own agency's assessment of the project. Why did he do this? It was a desperate bid to save the former member for Ashgrove, Campbell Newman, whom he does not call by name anymore, who was under pressure from the local community. It was probably the only moment when the Newman government listened to the community, but nothing could save Campbell Newman from Campbell Newman himself—not even the member for Callide. Maybe he was not even trying so hard.

There is nothing wrong with listening to the local community. That is what Labor has done at every turn. During the last state election campaign, the Cedar Woods development was the subject of much debate, with the local community expressing concern about the project and its consistency with the Brisbane City Council plan. It was Kate Jones, now the member for Ashgrove, and Mark Furner, now the member for Ferny Grove, who led the charge to ensure that their communities were consulted genuinely and had a real say in development in their community, particularly in the area adjoining the D'Aguilar National Park.

As a result, I called in the development to ensure that it was consistent with the town plan, which meant that only part of the Cedar Woods development was approved. At the time of the call-in, I also directed the council to review the neighbourhood plan to ensure that the community could have a real say in the future of their neighbourhood. Let me be clear: until the Palaszczuk government intervened, the community was going to have no say—no say—in this significant development, no say in the secret infrastructure agreement negotiated with the council and no say in the original development application that was approved by the council.

When the council's draft plan was submitted to me in December last year, I approved it going to public notification with a number of conditions. What happened next? There was a scare campaign by those opposite claiming that these conditions doubled the density on the site. For the record, those claims are 100 per cent wrong. However, at the request of the member for Ashgrove and the member for Ferny Grove I met with representatives of their local community. They told me that they had deep concerns about development in the area adjoining the D'Aguilar National Park.

It was clear that my conditions should change to ensure that the community's views were properly reflected and there could be no doubt about where the state government stands. I reassessed the draft neighbourhood plan and decided the council may proceed to public consultation, subject to conditions

in relation to bushfire hazards alone. This removes any doubt about the density and yield on the site which are matters for council to decide. This means council's draft neighbourhood plan can now proceed to public consultation as originally proposed and the community can have a say.

It is a real privilege to serve in these jobs, to listen and to work with Queenslanders about the things that matter in their lives. That is exactly what we have done in relation to the Upper Kedron-Ferny Grove Neighbourhood Plan and the Cedar Woods development. Now it is up to council to get on with consulting the community and ensuring that the final town plan reflects the community's views.

Ms DAVIS (Aspley—LNP) (6.10 pm): I rise to speak tonight in support of the motion moved by my colleague the member for Mansfield about the Upper Kedron residential development in the north-west suburbs of Brisbane.

The absolute hypocrisy of the Palaszczuk Labor government is breathtaking. This do-nothing Labor government's backflip on the Cedar Woods development is proof of their hypocrisy, proof that they will say and do anything in order to get elected. In December 2014 the Brisbane City Council approved a master plan for up to 980 lots in Upper Kedron. The member for Ashgrove told residents that this would be an unsustainable megasuburb. We all remember the cries of those opposite, including the now members for Ashgrove and Ferny Grove, that were they to win government they would use special powers to call in and reassess this unsustainable development and how they wanted to save The Gap on behalf of the community. It is clear that this is a case of easier said than done and the facts of the Cedar Woods debacle speak for themselves.

Call in the development they did, and the outcome has been nothing short of a farce. For 2½ years they have gone around in circles and they have effectively landed where they should have in December 2014, something that the members for Ashgrove and Ferny Grove campaigned so strongly against. After palming this development off to the worst infrastructure and planning minister this state has ever had in the hope, indeed promise, the state government would reduce the number of homes at Cedar Woods, the Deputy Premier sent the proposal back to council. That is what she did. She sent it packing to council with instructions that would have seen a change in the plan and an increase—yes, an increase—in the number of new homes from that unsustainable 980 to around 1,500.

The Deputy Premier, the member for Ashgrove and the member for Ferny Grove do not need to purchase tickets to the gymnastics for the Commonwealth Games because what we saw was a gigantic backflip. They have their fingerprints all over this mess and they have no-one else to blame for it but themselves for promising something they could never deliver and then failing to even acknowledge that with their local community.

A *Courier-Mail* article of 19 May this year says it all with the headline, 'Cedar Woods density edict scrapped by State Government.' The article states—

> The State Government has been forced to backflip on a request to increase housing densities in a controversial Brisbane development at the centre of a political dogfight.

It further states—

> Council was ordered to revisit the neighbourhood plan for the area but at a meeting last week it was revealed the State Government had returned the draft plan to council with a directive to increase the housing density by 50 per cent.

That article speaks volumes of the rollercoaster ride this project has been on. The sheer and utter contempt this government, and in particular the member for Ashgrove, has shown for local residents surrounding this development is simply offensive. I wish to remind the House of what the member for Ashgrove said about this development at her campaign launch back in January 2015. She said—

> It's the number one concern in this local community.
>
> ...
>
> There is a stark choice, to vote for someone you can trust or someone who arrogantly dismisses local concerns.

By the member for Ashgrove's own standard, the good people of Ashgrove regrettably voted for someone who has arrogantly dismissed their concerns—indeed, their No. 1 concern. This is merely indicative of what can only be described as a deceptive pattern of behaviour, an arrogant attitude and a broader contempt for everyday Queenslanders.

I would like to congratulate Councillor Steve Toomey, Brisbane City councillor for The Gap ward, for his campaign on the issue and standing up against the misrepresentation being peddled by the members for Ashgrove and Ferny Grove and the faux political community group Save The Gap which was, in fact, established by Labor staffers and members linked with former Brisbane federal member

Arch Bevis. In fact, the group was registered by Shane Bevis, Arch's son and current staffer to Labor minister Shannon Fentiman and also failed candidate for The Gap ward in the 2016 local government elections.

Hon. M FURNER (Ferny Grove—ALP) (Minister for Local Government and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (6.15 pm): I never thought I would see the day or that I would mutter these words: Senator George Brandis is correct. He is right. This mob opposite is only very, very, mediocre and, may I say, hypocritical—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock.

Mr Bleijie: You miss the Senate, don't you?

Mr SPEAKER: I might invite the minister to start again so I can hear and Hansard can hear. Start again, please.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, if you carry on like that, I have indicated in the past what my approach will be. Minister, can you start again so Hansard can hear.

Mr FURNER: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for your protection. I never thought I would see the day that I would say these words, but Senator George Brandis is correct. I hate to disappoint the member for Kawana by not reflecting on my time in the Senate. George Brandis was right when he said the LNP opposition are very, very mediocre. Not only are they very, very mediocre; they are hypocritical in opposition for moving tonight's motion as well.

From the outset the opposition's Brisbane City Council mates have sought to deceive the residents of my electorate over the size and scale of Cedar Woods. The stench of hypocrisy emanating from the Brisbane City Council on Cedar Woods is astounding. It is on the nose and it has infected those opposite, as seen in tonight's motion.

What concerns me deeply is that the Brisbane City Council never, ever had a plan to consult with my community about their secret plans for this massive overdevelopment of Cedar Woods with 1,300 homes. Now the Brisbane City Council want to scaremonger. They want to engage in inaccurate, scurrilous gutter politics by claiming that they are approving 1,500 homes. It is not true. It is part of Councillor Steve Toomey's and Councillor Julian Simmonds' cynical attempt to airbrush their deception from our region's history.

Let us not forget the reason for this development. It was called in in the first place because we considered that it was inappropriate and too much for the area. It was called in by the Palaszczuk government because residents told me and the member for Ashgrove that they wanted their voices heard in their community. They wanted a better result for their community. The Brisbane City Council was not giving them a say in the future of this unique and sensitive area bordering on the D'Aguilar National Park. I am sure members have been up around that range before and seen the beauty of Bellbird Grove in particular. The native fauna in that area is absolutely outstanding. They are the sorts of areas that need to be protected.

The LNP-led council was and still is more interested in looking after the interests of their developer mates than those of local residents. The LNP-led council had no interest in protecting koalas or having a buffer to protect the national park from bushfire risk. They were beholden to developers who wanted squeeze as much concrete and terracotta roofs into Cedar Woods as they could.

Residents do not want their neighbourhood pillaged. They do not want to find out when it is too late that water infrastructure cannot cope. Certainly they do not want traffic congestion, which is inevitable with a development of the size that the Brisbane City Council wants to sneak through in the dead of night. Councillor Toomey knows that, but he does not care. The Brisbane City Council can do better and it really should do better.

I have listened to the community, as have the member for Ashgrove, Kate Jones, and the Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning, Jackie Trad. As the Deputy Premier has already indicated, it was the LNP Newman government that changed the rules for Cedar Woods to take away the residents' right to have their say. Labor has given back that right. Last week I met with the Deputy Premier, the member for Ashgrove and Ross McColm from the community consultation team to discuss the neighbourhood plan. The community consultation team, of which Ross McColm is a member, was formed as a result of the Palaszczuk government's call-in of the Cedar

Woods plans. At the meeting, Mr McColm and the other committee members reflected that they would never have had the opportunity to meet with the deputy premier about a matter of such vital importance when the LNP was in office. That is a fair statement to make.

The LNP does not listen. Only Labor listens to the concerns of the community and it is Labor that has insisted on meaningful consultation on Cedar Woods. That same consultation will occur for the sensible transit orientated development at the Ferny Grove Railway Station. That project will deliver hundreds of jobs and an additional 253 parking spots for train commuters. The project will come before the Brisbane City Council for development approval and community consultation, as it should. I call on those opposite and Brisbane city councillors to get behind these proposals. I for one will be standing shoulder to shoulder with my constituents of Cedar Woods, because I trust their judgement every day of the week against that of the LNP and its members opposite.

(Time expired)

Mr MANDER (Everton—LNP) (6.21 pm): I rise to support the motion moved by my colleague the member for Mansfield. Let us not forget that the Cedar Woods development came about because the Bligh-Beattie government approved it in the first place. The member for Ashgrove was a part of that government and she voted for the South-East Queensland plan that allowed this to take place. We all know that the member for Ashgrove was kicked out in 2012. In the 2012 campaign, what did she have to do? She had to find a local issue. She could not find a local issue, so she had to make one up. What issue did she make up? She made up this issue about overdevelopment in the Upper Kedron/Cedar Woods project.

When they need to make up an issue—and there is nobody better at politics than the member for Ashgrove—the first thing they do is put together an independent group, as mentioned by the member for Aspley. That group was incredibly independent: the main player in the Save The Gap group was Shane Bevis, the son of Arch Bevis. He is a well-known Labor apparatchik. What happened to him next? He ran for The Gap ward in the Brisbane City Council election, but he failed in that election. Where do all failed Labor candidates end up? They end up in a minister's office! They then wait for the next election and are brought out again. They rotate Labor candidates through ministerial offices. Shane Bevis is still posting on Save The Gap, but we have not heard a word—not a whisper—although we have gone back to the original position.

As my colleagues have already mentioned, the Labor Party allowed development in the area. They allowed up to 1,350 lots in the development. The council said that that was too much and the council brought it back to 980 lots. Then the political exercise started: 'Let's go out and scare the community. Let's misrepresent the situation.' The now member for Ferny Grove and the now member for Ashgrove were in the middle of that scare campaign. What has happened? It has been a political stunt! It has been a con job! They conned the people of Upper Kedron and The Gap by scaring them into thinking that they could do something about it. Things had come full circle after the Deputy Premier stuffed it up and allowed 1,500 lots until the member for Ferny Grove and the member for Ashgrove pleaded with her to fix her mistake. Now we have gone back to—

Mr Furner interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Minister for Local Government, you have had your chance. I urge you not to persist or you will get the appropriate warning.

Mr MANDER: Now we are back to the same situation that we were in, which the member for Ashgrove described as a megasuburb that was unsustainable. Nothing has changed. In my opinion, the member for Ferny Grove won his seat on this issue. His scare-mongering con job sucked in the people of Upper Kedron. He won the election under false pretensions. He conned the electorate and now they are left with the member for Ferny Grove—

Mr FURNER: I rise to a point of order. I find the comments of the member for Everton offensive and I ask him to withdraw.

Mr MANDER: I withdraw. In my opinion, the member for Ferny Grove duped the residents of Upper Kedron by misrepresenting the situation, so now the people of Ferny Grove have 'Mr Invisible' as their local member. Everywhere I go I hear, 'We don't see this man; we don't see him anywhere.' I compare him with the former member, Dale Shuttleworth, who was the most hardworking member in this place. Dale Shuttleworth tells me that when he goes to local schools members of the P&C associations hug him and tell him that they wished he was back. Local sporting clubs still ask Dale Shuttleworth to be their patron, because they are so dissatisfied with the current member.

The time of the member for Ferny Grove is limited. He does not want an election in July or October. He wants it in April or May of next year, because after that election he will not be here. In Ferny Grove we have a fantastic candidate, Nick Elston. The contrast could not be more complete: he is a young family man and a former member of the Defence Force who trained at Duntroon. He is hardworking and he is out in his community. The contrast between Nick Elston and the current member is stark. That contrast is even more stark because the ladies tell me that Nick is easy on the eye as well. He is coming for you.

Hon. KJ JONES (Ashgrove—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism, Major Events and the Commonwealth Games) (6.27 pm): I am very proud to represent a community that I love and a special part of Brisbane that really is like no other in our city. I always have and always will fight hard to protect the character and livability of our area against unsustainable development. I believe that The Gap, a suburb right on the doorstep of the D'Aguilar National Park—a national park that I declared in 2009 when I was the environment minister—deserves to be protected. This is in stark contrast to the LNP.

Back in February 2014 the LNP council did a secret deal with a long-term LNP donor, Ian Macallister, enabling the Cedar Woods development to go ahead. I table the secret agreement signed by council on 27 February 2014 that paved the way for him to sell 227 hectares of land bordering The Gap to property developer Cedar Woods for $74 million in May 2014. This infrastructure agreement is so significant because without this secret yet legally binding council infrastructure agreement, which never—never—went through public consultation and completely contravened the local plan, the property was worth only $2.5 million.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 27 February 2014, from Ms Rachel Stewart-Koster, solicitor, Brisbane City Legal Practice, Brisbane City Council, to Mr Ian Macallister, Director, Institutional Investments Pty Ltd, enclosing a copy of the Infrastructure Agreement for Institutional Investments for land at Upper Kedron [757].

This was the betrayal that local residents felt so strongly about—a secret deal signed off by our local council without locals being able to have a say and one that overrode our local plan and jammed 1,350 homes into our neighbourhood. It is why I have consistently stood up against the size and scale of the Cedar Woods development and the LNP support of this development. It is why, only during the dying days of the state election when we as a local community had clearly rejected the development, council finally pared back their plans to 980 houses. Let us be clear that this is not because the LNP saw the light but because locally we made enough noise that they were forced into it, dragged kicking and screaming.

I promised that if a Palaszczuk government were elected—I know the member for Callide thought that was impossible—we would call in the Cedar Woods development to finally give local residents a say. With the election of the Palaszczuk government we delivered on our election commitment.

Mr Mander interjected.

Ms JONES: I take the interjection from the member for Everton. He said earlier that this issue was nonsense, that it was made up. I can tell the member for Everton that this is a genuine concern in my local community. That is why I have called it in. If the Palaszczuk government had not been elected and if we had not followed through on our promise then the reality is that those 980 homes would be being built right now. They would already be under construction.

Mr Mander interjected.

Ms JONES: No change. I take the interjection from the member for—

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Everton, you have had a pretty good go. I have been pretty tolerant of everyone. I am trying to be consistent.

Ms JONES: I take the interjection from the member for Everton, who clearly just said that it will not change—that they will approve 980 homes. He is nodding his head. I want this on the record. What is the point of having a local plan? What is the point of the consultation we are about to do? What is the point of the consultation that the council is about to undertake if the member thinks that the 980 homes have already been approved?

I call on the Lord Mayor of Brisbane to put local residents first. I call on Councillor Toomey and the Lord Mayor to say that they reject the member for Everton's assertions and they will go through genuine community consultation as part of the local plan and that when they call for public submissions and call on the public to have their say they will not do what the member for Everton has just said and they will listen to local residents once and for all. I call on local residents to have their say—to have the say that we have fought so hard for them to have—and not assume that it is a stitched-up deal like the

member for Everton is claiming in the parliament tonight. I call on residents to stand up for our local community and have their say. I call on Councillor Toomey tonight to reject what the member for Everton has said and to genuinely listen to local residents when finally they have their say because of our stand on this development.

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

AYES, 39:

LNP, 39—Barton, 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, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

NOES, 41:

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

INDEPENDENT, 1—Gordon.

Pairs: Byrne, Simpson; Miller, Seeney.

Resolved in the negative.

Sitting suspended from 6.39 pm to 7.40 pm.

PUBLIC HEALTH (INFECTION CONTROL) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 1288, on motion of Mr Dick—

That the bill be now read a second time.

Mr BOOTHMAN (Albert—LNP) (7.40 pm): I rise to make a short contribution to the Public Health (Infection Control) Amendment Bill 2017. Before I start, I promised Chris, who is a good friend of mine and a waiter at the Ashmore Seafood and Steakhouse, I would pass on his comments. I have known Chris for many years. He was very proud of his local dentist. His local dentist happened to be John-Paul Langbroek.

Mr Langbroek: The maitre d'.

Mr BOOTHMAN: Chris has a very nice shining set of pearlers, one could say. He was very upset when Mr Langbroek decided to go into politics because he had to find a new dentist. He put a lot of trust in Mr Langbroek. We used to have some very interesting political debates, but I can say that he does vote for the member for Surfers Paradise, although he did say that if the member ever has a life after politics he should go back to dentistry because he needs his teeth done.

We place an enormous amount of trust in our healthcare providers and we expect the highest standards. When we hear about breaches in healthcare practices, it sends shock waves through our communities and creates a high level of fear. There is nothing more important than having good health care and the ease of which it is available. After all, we have one body and we must do our utmost to protect it.

Upon the news of a forced closure of a dental clinic at Carina due to concerns over sterilisation practices, multiple residents in my region contacted my office expressing their concerns and shock. As one resident put it, how can this happen in the modern age of medicine? The Chief Health Officer, Dr Young, said that issues at the clinic were about inadequate infection control practices against standards. There was no suggestion or indication that a person had contracted any infectious or transmissible disease, but the standards were not met. The failure of infection control procedures potentially exposed more than 4,000 patients to hepatitis C. Having said that, the Australian Dental Association has stated that this type of breach is rare, so this is not to create panic out there.

The bill incorporates appropriate adjustment to the regulation-making head of power in the act. This is supported by the amendments in the Public Health Regulation 2005 that will allow mandatory training in infection control standards which will be prescribed in the regulation. Unfortunately, these changes are not detailed in the brief. Therefore, there are some concerns about how they will impact the department and businesses.

The second part of the bill will enhance the ability of the department to monitor the compliance of healthcare providers to ensure their infection control obligations and, if necessary, investigate possible breaches. It should be noted that the Queensland Branch of the Australian Dental Association

raised the issue of the limited right of appeal for affected businesses. As already stated, the shadow minister will be moving an amendment to provide a right to appeal a decision to the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal.

The third part of the bill will enhance the ability of Queensland Health to ensure compliance of operators with infection control frameworks and prosecute any breaches. I agree with the shadow minister that there does need to be some tweaking around this but that, overall, the bill is fundamentally good.

Ms FARMER (Bulimba—ALP) (7.45 pm): I wish to speak briefly to the Public Health (Infection Control) Amendment Bill, which will give health officials new powers to investigate, shut down and fine facilities putting people at risk of serious infections. The bill amends the Public Health Act 2005 to strengthen the existing infection control framework in light of shortcomings in the framework identified by the Department of Health when responding to a recent incident involving substandard infection control practices at a Brisbane dental clinic.

At the outset, I would like to congratulate you, Madam Deputy Speaker Linard, and all of the members of your committee, for the fine work that you did on this really important issue and to the Minister for Health, who acted so quickly when this public health issue was identified. As the daughter of a GP in a small country town, I grew up helping to sterilise his instruments in the autoclave in his home surgery and in his doctor's surgery. I used to see him reading his medical journals every night to make sure that he was across the latest infection control procedures. I grew up talking about this quite a lot.

In my short contribution I did want to talk about what responsibility this bill will impose on individuals. I think we can say that anyone involved in providing declared health services does have a role to play in ensuring that those services are provided safely. This bill makes that obligation now enforceable. A declared health service is any health service involving invasive procedures or the release of blood or other bodily fluids. These services include dental procedures, vaccinations, acupuncture and home midwifery services.

Because of the risk of patients and staff coming into contact with infectious bloodborne conditions, every person involved in providing declared health services has a role to play in ensuring that they are provided safely. That is why the Public Health Act places an obligation on individuals to take reasonable precautions and care to minimise and prevent infection risks arising from the provision of declared health services. This includes the doctors, nurses, dentists, midwives, speech pathologists, occupational therapists and other healthcare professionals who deliver clinical services, as well as the technical and admin staff who support them. It also includes the operators of facilities which provide declared health services.

I acknowledge the fine work that 99.9 per cent of all of those professionals do and the wonderful service they provide to the community. We know that a small number of staff and operators of healthcare facilities are not complying with the law. It is for this reason that the bill makes their critical obligation enforceable by allowing individuals to be penalised for noncompliance. This is a very important bill and I commend it to the House.

Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (7.48 pm), in reply: I thank all members for their contribution to today's debate on this important legislative measure. Healthcare facilities provide a wide range of critical services to Queenslanders. For this reason, it is essential that the regulatory framework that mitigates infection risk is robust and easily enforced.

The amendments in this bill are straightforward. In summary, they facilitate more effective investigation of infection control practices by empowering Queensland Health to: require facilities to provide information about their infection control practices and in extreme cases enter facilities without giving prior notice; create stronger powers for Queensland Health to intervene in remedying noncompliant infection control practices, including by issuing and enforcing improvement and directions notices; make the infection control framework more enforceable by creating a range of penalties for facilities which breach their existing obligations or notices and other directions issued by Queensland Health; and allow a number of standards to be prescribed to provide greater guidance to healthcare facilities about how to meet their infection control obligations.

This bill implements a proportionate response to a clear public health need demonstrated by recent infection control incidents and, in doing so, strikes a reasonable balance. This is a simple but necessary bill. As the House already appreciates, health care is a well-regulated field. This is as it should be. The staff and patients of healthcare facilities deserve to know the healthcare services on

which we all rely are being provided in a safe and controlled environment. These existing regulatory frameworks all serve different purposes. Together, they support safe and reliable service delivery. However, as I have explained, there is a small but significant gap in this regulatory cover.

The existing complementary regulatory frameworks can be improved to better manage the infection risks arising from the performance of invasive procedures and other procedures involving the release of blood and other bodily fluids known under the Public Health Act as declared health services. I can assure the House this gap in the regulatory framework does not mean there is a substantial unmanaged threat to public safety arising from the performance of these procedures. This would be immediately evident to Queensland Health, which closely monitors and actively follows up all cases involving the transmission of a bloodborne virus. In addition, a number of complementary regulatory frameworks and processes contribute to the safe performance of declared health services and the management of infection risks, for example, the professional standards which apply to the professional performance of registered health practitioners. What it does mean, however, is that it seems there is a level of misunderstanding and noncompliance by some healthcare facilities with their infection control obligations.

Two recent incidents have shown that in extreme cases this noncompliance has the potential to place the health and wellbeing of staff and patients at real risk of harm. This has been borne out by audits of high-risk health services conducted by Queensland Health recently. These audits revealed that a number of healthcare facilities either do not understand or are not complying with their obligations to have an infection control management plan in place. As a result, the staff and contractors of those facilities are not being provided with sufficient guidance about how to recognise, minimise and prevent the particular infection risks which arise in those particular environments. It also means those facilities are inadequately equipped to detect and remedy any potentially harmful noncompliant infection control practices which do emerge. Clearly a statutory response is now required.

This response must be proportionate and targeted. There is no need to duplicate existing monitoring and regulatory functions performed by complementary processes and frameworks. Instead, what is required to close the regulatory gap I have spoken about are the stronger powers contained in this bill to investigate and take appropriate enforcement action in relation to the obligations imposed on the owners, operators and staff of healthcare facilities under the infection control framework. By making healthcare facilities' existing infection control obligations more easily enforceable and by creating new powers to investigate and enforce compliance with these existing obligations, the patients and staff of healthcare facilities can have greater confidence that infection risks are managed appropriately. The changes proposed in this bill will allow Queensland Health to focus its strength and compliance efforts on areas of greatest risk and on identifying and responding proportionately to instances of noncompliance.

Can I say, as I have said previously, most healthcare facilities are already complying with their existing infection control obligations and will not be impacted by this bill. However, I recognise the bill has the potential to impact on those healthcare facilities which do not properly understand or are not fully complying with their infection control obligations. In keeping with the targeted approach it engenders, the bill seeks to minimise the adverse impacts as much as possible. It does this by creating the discretion for Queensland Health to issue improvement and directions notices as an alternative to prosecuting operators for their noncompliance. These notices will make clear the remedial actions required to rectify the noncompliance and will be supported by a range of standards prescribed by regulation.

Operators who receive notices will be able to seek formal assurance from Queensland Health that the remedial actions they have undertaken are sufficient to meet the requirements of notice. The bill also places a range of appropriate limits on the exercise of discretions created by the bill including the discretion to issue notices and the discretion to enter a healthcare facility without prior notice. These limits ensure the impact on affected facilities and on the staff and patients of those facilities is proportionate.

I turn to some of the comments made during the second reading debate. The member for Surfers Paradise asked whether Queensland Health inspectors will have the capacity to enforce the amendments made by the bill. Allow me to assure all members of the House the bill is about working smarter, not harder. The powers created by the bill support targeted intervention by Queensland Health focused on risk and identified compliance issues. These powers will not be implemented in a vacuum but are supported by a range of regulatory frameworks and processes. Queensland Health already has strong monitoring processes in place. What the bill does is empower inspectors to properly investigate

identified issues and to respond swiftly and appropriately. We do not need inspectors looking over operators' shoulders; we need them to be equipped with sufficient powers to respond to risk and identified need. The bill provides those powers.

The member for Surfers Paradise has expressed concern about the possible impact of the proposed standards to be prescribed under the Public Health Act. Queensland Health will work with affected stakeholders including the Australian Dental Association Queensland in developing the proposed amendment regulation. We want to work with industry to provide a useful resource, not impose unnecessary and onerous obligations.

The member reiterated his concerns that appealing a directions notice to the Supreme Court is onerous and expensive and that QCAT should have the power to review a decision to issue a notice. The decision to issue a directions notice will rely on careful and expert consideration of a number of often complex clinical matters. This is not a decision that can be remade easily by QCAT. Review would potentially involve significant costs for all parties.

The member suggested that replacement section 151, which imposes the obligation to take reasonable precautions and care on all persons involved in providing declared health services, is ambiguous. With respect, there is nothing ambiguous about the proposed section 151. It clearly states the duty of care of all persons working in healthcare facilities. All persons have a contribution to make to ensuring services at these facilities are provided safely. The bill does not create this obligation; it already exists in the act. The bill simply provides a penalty for failing to discharge it. That penalty will only be imposed as a last resort, but it needs to be there to make the provision properly enforceable.

The member is also concerned about blame being shifted between employees and operators of healthcare facilities. Let me be very clear: no-one can delegate their obligations under the act. An operator cannot shift blame onto staff for failing to ensure services are provided safely and in accordance with the infection control management plan; nor can staff rely on the fact they are working for someone else to avoid taking responsibility for their own actions and omissions. The member repeated a somewhat tired suggestion that the bill duplicates other regulatory frameworks such as the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law. While my department addressed this comprehensively in its briefings to the committee, let me reiterate for a final time the infection control framework complements other regulatory frameworks working together to ensure complex health services are delivered safely and reliably. As highlighted by the recent incidents involving dental practices, a strengthened infection control framework is essential. It does not duplicate; it closes a clear statutory gap.

The member appears to suggest that unlike medical practitioners, nurses, midwives and dental hygienists, all of whom made submissions in support of the bill, dental practitioners do not believe they should be subject to a reasonable infection control framework. The House should be sceptical about this view having regard to the recent infection control incidents.

The member for Surfers Paradise repeated the suggestion that the bill will inadvertently require Queensland Health to rewrite noncompliant infection control management plans. With respect, this concern is not borne out by the bill. Operators will not be able to avoid their responsibility to develop and implement a compliant ICMP and will face considerable penalties for failing to take this responsibility seriously.

Finally, the member sought my assurance that this right of immediate entry will be used appropriately and will be subject to safeguards. I am pleased to provide that reassurance. The bill requires inspectors to be judicious in their use of this discretion and to be mindful of the potential impact on the staff, patients and reputations of affected facilities.

The member for Cleveland reiterated concerns that Queensland Health is not sufficiently resourced to actively monitor the infection control framework. In doing so, he referred to an incident in Victoria where a doctor infected 50 women with hepatitis C by reusing dirty needles he had used on himself. The House should be aware that Queensland Health already undertakes routine surveillance of bloodborne viruses which are required to be notified to the department under the Public Health Act. Queensland Health has an established process for identifying and gathering further information surrounding newly acquired cases of hepatitis B and C. I am advised that a cluster of the sort referred to by the member would have been detected by the surveillance and would have been subject to active investigation and follow-up. As I have stated on several occasions, the bill will not operate in a vacuum; it will work together with other existing frameworks and processes.

In conclusion, I would again like to thank the members of the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee and the staff of the committee for their detailed consideration of this bill. I would also like to thank the submitters who took the time to

provide feedback on the bill. It was helpful to have the considered input of several of our peak health practitioner bodies, in particular the Australian Medical Association Queensland, the Australian Dental Association Queensland, the Queensland Nurses and Midwives' Union and the Dental Hygienists Association of Australia.

I am pleased that this feedback was supportive overall. Queenslanders benefit from the leadership of peak bodies which recognise that a safe and well-regulated healthcare industry is in both the public and their members' professional interest. I would also like to acknowledge officers from Queensland Health for their work in developing this important bill. My thanks go to the public health policy experts in the Prevention Division, particularly the Chief Health Officer Dr Jeannette Young, Dr Sonya Bennett, Dr Heidi Carroll, Toni McLean and Chris Wold. I also want to thank officers of the Strategy, Policy and Planning Division, in particular Deputy Director Kathleen Forrester, the extremely hardworking David Harmer, Mark Zgrajewski, Ryan Robertson and Rashvin. I commend the bill to the House.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1 to 9, as read, agreed to.

Clause 10—

Mr LANGBROEK (8.01 pm): I move the following amendment—

1 Clause 10 (Insertion of new ch 4, pt 3A)

Page 13, after line 28—

insert—

156J Review of decisions

(1) An operator or owner of a health care facility who is dissatisfied with an authorised person's decision to give the operator or owner an improvement notice may apply, as provided under the QCAT Act, to QCAT for a review of the decision.

(2) An operator of a health care facility who is dissatisfied with the chief executive's decision to give the operator a directions notice may apply, as provided under the QCAT Act, to QCAT for a review of the decision.

I table the explanatory notes to my amendment.

Tabled paper: Public health (Infection Control) Amendment Bill 2017, explanatory notes to Mr John-Paul Langbroek's amendments [759].

The minister referred to this issue in his reply. The right of review to the Supreme Court is currently provided for in the act, but it is an expensive method of doing things. I note with concern that the minister seemed to suggest that going to QCAT would almost be too onerous, or he does not show a lot of confidence in QCAT being able to review a decision concerning whether a directions notice should be overturned. The Australian Dental Association, on behalf of private practitioners, expressed concern about a direction that a practice be closed, and I note that the member for Gregory also expressed a concern about practices in regional areas being directed to close.

We believe that QCAT would be an appropriate authority to review this because in Queensland the Supreme Court is the most expensive jurisdiction in which to review matters such as this, and that is why I have moved this amendment. I note that the committee report states—

The department confirmed that the decision to issue a directions notice will be reviewable under the Judicial Review Act 1991 and, therefore, that decision may be stayed or overturned by a court.

After receiving advice from the ADA, I suggest that it does not have to be the highest court in the state. The committee report further states—

The department also advised that 'As a further safeguard against its possible overuse, the Bill limits delegation of this power to senior, appropriately-qualified executives of the department only'.

I think this proposed amendment is quite reasonable. QCAT was brought in over the last number of years under the minister's former portfolio and I think it is quite appropriate. It would be very rarely used, but the Supreme Court is not necessarily the appropriate place for a practitioner to have to go to get a directions notice overturned, and that is why we move this amendment.

Mr DICK: I have considered the amendment circulated in the member for Surfers Paradise's name. As I have already explained in my reply, a right of review to QCAT has the potential to frustrate the department's ability to intervene immediately and with certainty where a serious threat to public health has arisen. It is for this reason that it is uncommon for public health powers to be subject to a right of review. For example, the power to issue a public health order, which is similarly available to deal with critical situations, is similarly not subject to merit review.

Even if the government were open to accepting the proposed amendment, the drafting of the proposed provision is entirely inappropriate. Rather than requiring an application to be made by a person 'aggrieved' by a decision—the standard test which is well understood in relation to judicial review—the draft amendment simply proposes that a person 'dissatisfied' by the decision may apply. This is unclear. 'Dissatisfied' is a hopelessly low threshold. No owner or operator will be satisfied to receive a directions notice. If accepted, the opposition's amendment would mean that every notice would be liable to be reviewed, rendering the whole framework potentially ineffective.

It is also unclear from the proposed amendment how this right of review would work in practice. QCAT has discretion to stay the operation of reviewable decisions. The availability of this discretion would create uncertainty about whether an operator should give effect to a notice or whether the notice is likely to be stayed. My view is that that would potentially jeopardise public safety. The drafting provides no guidance about the matters to which QCAT would have to have regard in deciding whether to stay a decision to issue a notice. Instead, the amendment, if accepted, would simply leave it open to QCAT to decide whether a stay should be entertained. In making any decision QCAT would have to step into the shoes of senior departmental officers and remake what are sometimes very complex decisions despite not having access to the clinical expertise relied on by departmental decision-makers. This would make reviews slow and costly for applicants.

The existing safeguards around exercise of the power to issue a directions notice, as detailed in the government's response to the committee report, are sufficient to ensure the power to issue a direction is being employed appropriately. Further, the House should be aware that the decision to issue either an improvement or a directions notice is already subject to judicial review. The government does not support the proposed amendment.

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

AYES, 39:

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

NOES, 42:

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

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

Pairs: Byrne, Simpson; de Brenni, Nicholls.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Mr Langbroek) negatived.

Clause 10, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 11 to 16, as read, agreed to.

Third Reading

Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (8.11 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a third time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title

Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (8.11 pm): I move—

That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

Question put—That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

COURT AND CIVIL LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 23 March (see p. 885).

Second Reading

Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (8.12 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I thank the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee for its consideration of the Court and Civil Legislation Amendment Bill 2017. The committee's report No. 55, tabled on 15 May 2017, made a single recommendation: that the bill be passed. I also take this opportunity to thank those who made submissions to the committee and those who appeared as witnesses as part of the committee's inquiry.

The bill proposes amendments to over 30 acts. As I outlined in my introductory speech, its objectives are to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the courts and justice agencies and otherwise clarify, strengthen and update Justice portfolio legislation. Some of the proposals were previously included in the lapsed Justice and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014.

Some key amendments are to the Appeal Costs Fund Act 1973 to clarify the basis on which costs are recoverable from the Appeal Costs Fund and that a person convicted of an indictment is entitled to payment from the fund if an appeal succeeds on the grounds that there was a miscarriage of justice; the Classification of Computer Games and Images Act 1995, the Classification of Films Act 1991 and the Classification of Publications Act 1991 to align with corresponding Commonwealth legislation and remove all references to classification officers; the Information Privacy Act 2009 to not restrict the disclosure of personal information to the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation in appropriate cases; the Invasion of Privacy Act 1971 to provide appropriate protections from prosecution for police or emergency services communications centre operators who record private conversations in circumstances associated with risk to the safety and wellbeing of a public safety entity officer; the Land Court Act 2000 to clarify its operation in relation to the Land Appeal Court, strengthen the alternative dispute resolution processes in the Land Court and incorporate the provisions of the Land Court (Transitional) Regulation 2017 in relation to the application of the act to the exercise by the court of its administrative functions; the Legal Aid Queensland Act 1997 to modernise the eligibility requirements for the chief executive officer of Legal Aid Queensland and strengthen its secrecy provisions; the Ombudsman Act 2001 to implement the recommendations of the 2011-12 strategic review of the Office of the Queensland Ombudsman, subsequently supported by the then Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee report No. 15 of 2012, and to increase the interval between strategic reviews from five to seven years; the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992 to allow domestic violence notations to be automatically made on a person's criminal history or a formal record of conviction, subject to a contrary court order, and to clarify that the prosecution bears the onus of proving that an offence is a domestic violence offence and that domestic violence notations do not apply to a person's traffic history; the Property Law Act 1974 to prohibit statutory instruments other than prescribed subordinate legislation from rendering void, unenforceable or subject to termination contracts or dealings concerning property that are made, entered into or effected contrary to the statutory instrument; the Prostitution Act 1999 to make improvements to the governance arrangements for the Prostitution Licensing Authority; the Public Guardian Act 2014 to clarify that the functions and powers of the Public Guardian in relation to a relevant child can be exercised from the time an application for an order under the Child Protection Act 1999 is filed until the application is finalised and arrangements are no longer in place for that child; the Retail Shop Leases Act 1994 to give permanent effect to a transitional regulation and correct an inadvertent omission effected when the act was last amended; the Right to Information Act 2009 to prevent the release of documents associated with the administration of the judicial appointments protocol; the

Succession Act 1981 to clarify for family provision applications that the relationship of stepchild and step-parent stops when the civil partnership or de facto relationship between the deceased and the stepchild's parent ends and provide for the effect of the end of a de facto relationship on a will in line with the current provisions for revocation of a will on the ending of a marriage or civil partnership; the Trusts Act 1973 to remove the requirement for a delegation of the administration of a trust to be made by power of attorney executed as a deed and provide transactional certainty by retrospectively validating any delegations of trusteeship made using the approved form for a general power of attorney under the Powers of Attorney Act 1998 and provide that where a notice of a proposed distribution of trust property or an estate is included in a notice of intention to apply for a grant of probate it will be sufficient for the trustee to obtain statutory protection if the notice is published in a publication approved by the Chief Justice under a practice direction and provide that a trustee will otherwise be afforded statutory protection if the notice is published in a newspaper circulating throughout the state and sold at least once each week; and various statutes to allow for website notification of notices in place of or as an alternative to gazettal.

I take this opportunity to clarify that the amendment to the Magistrates Act 1991 to increase the age limit for acting magistrates to 75 years only applies to acting magistrates who are retired magistrates. The explanatory notes to the bill did not make this clear; however, clause 167 of the bill clearly refers to a retired magistrate. This amendment will allow the Chief Magistrate increased flexibility in the management of the heavy workloads of the Magistrates Courts across the state by drawing on the valuable expertise and experience of retired magistrates who have not reached the age of 75 years but wish to continue working.

I will now turn to reservations expressed in relation to some of these amendments by opposition committee members. Opposition members have noted the Queensland Law Society's concern regarding the proposed changes to the eligibility requirements for the role of the chief executive officer of Legal Aid Queensland in clause 150 of the bill. The bill removes the current requirement for the CEO of Legal Aid to be a lawyer with at least five years experience and provides instead for the eligibility of a person who has qualifications, experience or standing appropriate to perform the role of CEO. This, of course, would not preclude a lawyer from eligibility for the role.

The proposed eligibility amendment is directed to allowing the Legal Aid board flexibility to draw from a wider field of candidates for the CEO position including with regard to the size and scope of Legal Aid Queensland's contemporary budget and service delivery program. The amendment is consistent with the position in New South Wales and Victoria, where the legal aid agency legislation does not require the CEO to be a lawyer.

The bill also makes consequential amendments to the Legal Aid Queensland Act to ensure that if a non-lawyer CEO is appointed his or her functions in relation to the provision of legal services and as holder of Legal Aid Queensland's principal's practising certificate are the responsibility of a Legal Aid lawyer with appropriate experience and qualifications.

The change to the eligibility requirement was requested by the former chair of the Legal Aid board, Mr Brian Stewart and, as stated by the current CEO, Mr Anthony Reilly, in his evidence to the committee, the amendments are supported by the Legal Aid board.

The Queensland Law Society is also concerned that, if the proposed amendments proceed, there needs to be a clear delineation between the CEO and the person nominated as holder of Legal Aid Queensland's principal practising certificate to avoid compromising privilege or the integrity of the work that Legal Aid performs along with proper oversight and consideration of who appears publicly on behalf of Legal Aid Queensland. Clearly, these are operational matters for Legal Aid Queensland rather than legislatively prescriptive.

The statement of reservation by the opposition members of the committee also indicates support for concerns raised by the Queensland Law Society in its submission to the committee on clause 220 of the bill. That clause amends section 21F of the Retail Shop Leases Act 1994 to reinstate a rider provision that was omitted inadvertently by the Retail Shop Leases Amendment Act 2016, which qualifies a lessee's statutory entitlement to terminate a lease based on defective lessor disclosure.

Before turning to the concerns stated by the Queensland Law Society and the opposition members of the committee, it is instructive to outline briefly to the House the context of clause 220. The rider provision to be reinstated by clause 220 is in the same terms as former section 22(5) of the Retail Shop Leases Act, which had been in operation since 2006—that is, the lessee cannot terminate based on defective lessor disclosure if the lessor acted honestly and reasonably in giving the disclosure

statement and the lessee is in substantially as good a position as they would be if the disclosure statement was not defective. This pre-existing rider provision was not identified as problematic for lessees throughout the reference group consultation process for the statutory review that preceded the introduction of the Retail Shop Leases Amendment Bill 2015. The Queensland Law Society was a key contributor and reference group stakeholder for that review, as were lessee stakeholder representatives.

Section 21F of the act was amended during the consideration in detail of the Retail Shop Leases Amendment Bill 2015 to remove the proposed new lessor objection and dispute provisions based on the Queensland Law Society's concerns about prescribing an objection process that were raised at the committee deliberation stage of that bill. The proposed objection and dispute provisions, which included the rider provision and which were based on a similar process in other state jurisdictions, were supported by key industry stakeholders representing both lessee and lessor interests. The same provisions were also included in the former government's lapsed Retail Shop Leases Amendment Bill 2014.

As stated in the government's response to recommendation 6 of the Education, Tourism and Small Business Committee report No. 9 on the Retail Shop Leases Amendment Bill 2015, and in my second reading speech and speech in reply, the intention in removing the lessor objection and dispute provisions was to maintain the status quo under the act. To maintain the status quo, the rider provision in connection with a lessee's entitlement to terminate based on defective disclosure needs to be retained. Contrary to the indication contained in the statement of reservation by the opposition members of the committee, neither this intent nor issue with the operation or effect of the rider provision itself were the subject of debate before the House where bipartisan support was given for the Retail Shop Leases Amendment Bill in May 2016.

I also draw to the attention of the House that an equivalent or similar rider provision has been and is included in retail leases legislation in most other jurisdictions, including New South Wales, Western Australia and Victoria. It is perhaps notable that no change was made to the same rider provision in the New South Wales Retail Leases Act following a recent statutory review process that commenced in 2013 and culminated in the passage of amending legislation earlier this year. Given the like position of other jurisdictions and that the retention of the rider provision was an outcome—with the support of the lessee and lessor reference group representatives—of the recent statutory review of the Retail Shop Leases Act, which was completed under the previous government, the government is not persuaded that a case has been made for its removal.

Another concern that was raised by the Queensland Law Society, and which is the subject of reservation by opposition members of the committee, relates to clause 160 of the bill, which amends section 330(7) of the Legal Profession Act 2007 to enable a law practice to give a bill electronically if the client consents. The society has requested an amendment to allow for the electronic conveyance of bills as of right. This has not been accepted. Consent to receive bills electronically is an important safeguard for clients of law practices from both a cost recovery and privacy perspective, particularly where processes for disputed bills are time sensitive. This should be the choice of the client, as opposed to any individual law firm.

Finally, I foreshadow that, in response to the submission to the committee by the Anti-Discrimination Commission Queensland, I intend to move an amendment to the Anti-Discrimination Act 1991 during consideration in detail to clarify that an agreement filed with QCAT under sections 164(2) or 189(2) of the Anti-Discrimination Act is enforceable as if the agreement were a final decision of QCAT. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr WALKER (Mansfield—LNP) (8.25 pm): I rise to address the Court and Civil Legislation Amendment Bill 2017, which was introduced into this House on 23 March by the Attorney-General and subsequently considered by the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee. At the outset, I thank the committee members for their deliberations on what is a wide range of minor legislative amendments contained in this bill. They were outlined in the explanatory notes as being 'to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the courts and agencies and clarify, strengthen and update that legislation.'

I also want to reiterate the points raised by the non-government members of the committee in their statement of reservation regarding some key concerns raised by the Queensland Law Society about a couple of provisions in the bill. Although we will not be opposing the greater part of the legislation before the House, we are concerned about those key issues that were raised in the statement of reservation by the non-government members of the committee.

The first of those issues relates to the new appointment qualifications for the chief executive officer position for Legal Aid and the second relates to changes in the Retail Shop Leases Act, where we still do not believe that the government has maintained the appropriate safeguards for lessees or small business owners. The Queensland Law Society outlined its concerns in its submission to the committee as follows—

The Society opposes amendments to this Act to allow the appointment of a CEO of Legal Aid Queensland who is not a lawyer. The rationale for our opposition is founded in the Legal Aid Queensland Act 1997 ... itself.

Firstly, section 3 of the LAQ Act provides that one of that the LAQ Act's main objectives is 'giving legal assistance to financially disadvantaged persons in the most effective, efficient and economical way.'

'Legal assistance' is defined in section 5 to mean the, 'giving of a legal service, including legal advice.' It is therefore imperative that the CEO of the body established to perform these functions is a lawyer, capable of giving and administering legal advice.

We note that the current wording of section 65 says that a CEO must not only be a lawyer but must have at least 5 years' experience as a lawyer.

There is significant value in having a lawyer as the CEO of Legal Aid Queensland. Lawyers owe and understand their duties to the Court, to their client and understand the rule of law. A lawyer will be able to comprehend the intricacies of the work that Legal Aid Queensland performs and is equipped to assess the merits, quality and risks of the services provided. A CEO who is a lawyer will also appreciate the consequences of decisions made by the CEO on the legal and ethical obligations of the lawyers, both within and outside the organisation.

We do not believe that our concerns will be addressed by the proposal for a Legal Aid lawyer, whether a 'primary holder' or a 'reserve holder', to hold a practising certificate. This additional position is unnecessary duplication which could be avoided if the CEO was legally qualified.

The concept of a non-lawyer CEO has been around for some time. Private legal firms have struggled with this concept and some have tried a non-legal CEO. It has not worked very often. The experience has been that large legal firms need a CEO who, although they have administrative talents and capabilities, is attuned to the law and the way in which a law firm operates.

Legal Aid Queensland is, in fact, a large law firm. It has a particular charter, but it is a large law firm. I believe that the experience of the private profession can be taken across to Legal Aid Queensland and that the Law Society's reservations in this matter are well held. I take the point made by the Attorney-General that the Legal Aid Queensland Board supports it and some in the private legal profession support it—it is an arguable case—but I believe that, on balance, it is better to stick with the situation where the CEO of Legal Aid Queensland is a qualified lawyer.

I hope there are no ulterior motives. I hope there is not someone waiting in the shadows to be appointed who fits the qualifications and the clause has been modified for their benefit. I think on principle, however, we do have to stick with the idea of a lawyer being CEO of Legal Aid Queensland. We think anything else significantly undermines the leadership of such an important organisation as Legal Aid Queensland. Let us not forget that this is an organisation responsible for providing legal advice and services to some of the most vulnerable Queenslanders so that they have equal access to justice, as they well should. To us it is an unjustified change and we will not be supporting it.

The other key issue that I wanted to address relates to changes to the Retail Shop Leases Act regarding defective disclosure statements. The Attorney-General has explained the new provisions and how they will work. The Law Society takes this up in its submission. It states—

Whilst this seems reasonable in theory, the practical effect is to deprive retail lessees of any real remedy if an inaccurate disclosure statement is given, except in cases of blatant fraudulent behaviour. In the Society's view, this is contrary to the underlying principles of the legislation.

There is already a provision in the bill which allows lessees appropriate remedies in the case of disclosure statements. These disclosure statements are the statements that are given by a landlord to a tenant as they enter into a lease setting out very essential terms of the lease: the rent, the area of the premises, how the rent will be altered from time to time, what percentage of outgoings are payable. They are pretty critical things. The lessee at the moment has the right to terminate within a six-month period if that disclosure statement is incomplete in any material particular or if it contains information that is false or misleading in a material particular.

That seems to me, and to the opposition, to give adequate rights to the lessee and adequate protection to the lessor. A lessor who gives an incomplete statement in a material particular or a lessor who gives a statement that contains information that is false or misleading in a material particular should be at risk because that statement is something that is relied on heavily by tenants as they move into shopping centres. We know from previous debates in this House, not only during the term of this

parliament or the previous parliament but many parliaments gone by, that the balance of power in those arrangements is generally well in favour of the landlord and it is important, in our view, that the lessee's rights are protected.

The Chamber of Commerce & Industry Queensland supports the QLS position, as it stated in its submission. It believes that the proposed amendment will result in the lessee, which is more often than not, of course, a small business owner, being worse off if this legislation is passed due to the nature of the wording requiring the lessee to prove the mindset of the lessor—that is, that the lessor acted honestly and reasonably—and that the lessee is indeed worse off. There is an assessment going to be made balancing up whether the lessee is 'in substantially as good a position' as the lessee would have been otherwise. The CCIQ takes the view that small business owners must, where possible, be afforded legislative protection against the commercially predatory behaviour of landlords. This goes to the issue of competition and true competition, of course, is based on a level and even playing field. The Retail Shop Leases Act amendments proposed by the government in this bill we believe tilt the playing field too far away from the small business person—from the lessee—and we will not be supporting them. The government really does need to go back to the drawing board and sit down again with the relevant stakeholders if it thinks this current provision does need to be changed.

The Queensland Law Society, as the Attorney pointed out, also raised an issue about amendments to the Legal Profession Act in relation to the electronic conveyance of bills as of right. They claim—

> There is no difference between an email and a posted letter insofar as a client has provided these details as his or her contact details. Posted mail is just as likely, and we submit even more likely, to be ignored or misplaced or seen by someone other than the client, than an email. No consent however, is needed from the client before a letter or bill is posted to them.

We will not be opposing these changes, but we do want to reiterate the Law Society's concern. It seems odd to us that there needs to be a particular mechanism for the delivery of legal bills, that they are only valid if they have gone by post. Much business these days is done electronically and it seems to us to be a smooth way of doing legal business and an unnecessary burden and red-tape provision for legal bills to go by post.

The Attorney has outlined the other acts that are amended for particular purposes and I will not go through those. There are numerous provisions. As I said, most of them are of a mechanical nature and do not concern the opposition in a negative sense. There were 11 submissions to the bill raised with the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee. Amongst those, one of the contentious issues raised which was noted by submitters was that relating to the Ombudsman Act. The Brisbane City Council raised concerns relating to new powers for the Ombudsman to direct principal officers of agencies in relation to the tabling of reports. That is purported to improve transparency when matters of the Ombudsman are investigated from complaints raised. We note the concerns of the Brisbane City Council and we will certainly monitor the impact of those changes. What is important, though, is that people have confidence in the Ombudsman and the system around investigating complaints made against the conduct of government agencies.

As outlined on their website, the Ombudsman has three key roles: firstly, to give people a timely, effective and independent way to have administrative actions of agencies investigated; secondly, to improve the quality of decision-making and administrative practice in government agencies; thirdly, oversight of the Public Interest Disclosure Act 2010. The Ombudsman is a statutory appointment accountable to the parliament. Transparency and integrity is fundamental to the public confidence in the agency and that is why we certainly intend to monitor the impact of the changes in this bill to ensure that public confidence is, indeed, retained and hopefully enhanced.

Protect All Children Today also made a submission to the committee about changes in the bill which, firstly, clarify the definition of 'relevant child' for the purposes of the powers and functions of community visitors and, secondly, enhance and clarify classification of films information and provide better community education. We also note that the bill implements reforms to strengthen domestic violence legislation by allowing notations to be administratively made on a person's criminal history or a formal record of conviction where the person is convicted of an offence for which the charge has been noted as a domestic violence offence unless the court orders otherwise. This was not recommended as part of the *Not now, not ever* report but we do recognise the merit in the changes and ensuring that the court has a full knowledge of an offender's prior history. This is an important factor in domestic violence offences which has a higher prevalence of repeat offenders than other criminal matters.

This is, by and large, a fairly uncontroversial bill, except for those provisions I have outlined and those are the two that we will oppose: that relating to the CEO of Legal Aid and that relating to the disclosure statement under the Retail Shop Leases Act.

Mr PEGG (Stretton—ALP) (8.38 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Court and Civil Legislation Amendment Bill 2017. I would like to start by thanking the Attorney-General for introducing the bill, the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee for its consideration of the bill, the secretariat and all those individuals and organisations who lodged written submissions on the bill or appeared before the committee. It is worth noting that after careful consideration the committee has recommended that this bill be passed.

This bill makes miscellaneous amendments to over 30 acts within the Justice portfolio. The objective of the bill is to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the courts and agencies and also strengthen Justice portfolio legislation. I would like to acknowledge the presence in the gallery of John and Hilary De Bruyn this evening. I know that they are people who are very committed to the proper administration of justice in this state. I will proceed to outline the key amendments of this bill. I first wanted to address the amendments to the Land Court Act 2000. These amendments ensure that orders of the Land Appeal Court may be enforced in the Supreme Court, clarify the powers and jurisdiction of the Land Appeal Court, allow for the appointment of part-time or acting judicial registrars, strengthen the alternative dispute resolution processes and incorporate the provisions of the Land Court Act (Transitional Regulation) 2017.

In several recent cases, the Land Appeal Court has expressed doubt about whether it has jurisdiction to determine costs for the previous Land Court hearing. To remove any doubt, the amendments also ensure that the Land Appeal Court has the jurisdiction and power to award costs in respect of a previous Land Court hearing where the Land Court has not previously determined costs.

The bill also makes amendments to the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992. It amends section 12A of the act to allow domestic violence notations to be administratively made on a person's criminal history or a formal record of conviction where the person is convicted of an offence for which the charge has been noted as a domestic violence offence. However, the court will have the power to make an order that a notation not be made if it is not satisfied that the offence is a domestic violence offence.

Importantly, the bill makes amendments to strengthen the Ombudsman Act 2001. These amendments strengthen the management and procedures of the Ombudsman by requiring agencies to give the Ombudsman reasonable help in the conduct of informal investigations, strengthening the Ombudsman's ability to protect complainants and witnesses, improving the Ombudsman's ability to obtain and control the release of sensitive information and enabling the Ombudsman to require the principal officer of a local government to table a report by the Ombudsman about the local government at a local government meeting. The bill also clarifies that a corporation may be appointed to undertake strategic reviews of the Ombudsman Office and the Office of the Information Commissioner under the Right to Information Act 2009 and increases the interval between strategic reviews under the Ombudsman Act from five to seven years.

The amendments to the Prostitution Act 1999 enable the Governor in Council to appoint a member of the Prostitution Licensing Authority to act as chairperson when the chairperson is unavailable, remove the chief executive as a member of the authority and reduce the quorum for meetings of the authority. The authority is supportive of the amendments to the act as they will improve its operational efficiency.

A substantial part of the bill relates to amendments to the Classification of Computer Games and Images Act 1995, the Classification of Films Act 1991 and the Classification of Publications Act 1991. These amendments are intended to align with corresponding Commonwealth legislation and remove all references to classification officers. It also proposes to make consequential changes to the Criminal Code. The amendment to remove references to classification officers will not result in any job losses, as Queensland currently has no classification officers. The amendments to these acts were supported by stakeholders as they strengthen classification laws, ensure consistency with Commonwealth legislation and increase the protection of vulnerable children through the identification and disclosure of age-inappropriate games, films, images and other publications.

The bill makes amendments to the Legal Aid Queensland Act 1997 after Legal Aid Queensland requested the amendments and were consulted on them by the government. The amendments modernise the eligibility requirements for the chief executive officer of Legal Aid Queensland; extend the secrecy provisions to approved students, volunteers and researchers and external legal practitioners who conduct reviews of legal assistance decisions; and further clarify and strengthen the confidentiality provisions.

I noted with interest the contribution of the member for Mansfield in relation to the changes to the eligibility requirements for the chief executive officer of Legal Aid Queensland. Generally the member for Mansfield is kind of heart, but very occasionally he is prone to conspiracy theories. We heard a conspiracy theory from the member for Mansfield. I am very glad that the member for Mansfield has put that conspiracy theory on the record. History will judge whether or not his conspiracy theory proves to be correct. I note that the member for Mansfield is nodding. History will be the judge in relation to that matter.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr PEGG: I will look forward with avid interest to what happens, as will other members present who are being very vocal today.

Other amendments in the bill include increasing the age limit for acting magistrates to 75 years; providing for enhanced equity and clarity as to the basis of payments from the Appeals Costs Fund; clarifying the functions and powers of the Public Guardian in relation to a relevant child under the Child Protection Act 1999; clarifying, updating and strengthening legislation for the regulation of the legal profession; expanding secrecy provisions; and facilitating the disclosure of personal information in certain cases. In addition, the bill will limit the effect of statutory instruments in relation to contracts or dealings concerning property; give permanent effect to a transitional regulation under the Retail Shop Leases Act 1994 and correct an inadvertent omission from the Retail Shop Leases Amendment Act 2016; clarify when the stepchild relationship ends and revoke certain dispositions in a will upon the end of a de facto relationship; remove the requirement that the delegation of the administration of a trust is to be made by power of attorney executed as a deed; and remove redundant legislation and make minor and technical amendments of a corrective or clarifying nature.

The bill makes amendments to over 30 acts across a broad spectrum of subject matter. Overall, it improves the efficiency and effectiveness of the courts and agencies and strengthens our commitment to the administration of justice. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr CRANDON (Coomera—LNP) (8.45 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Court and Civil Legislation Amendment Bill 2017, which was considered by the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee. The committee has presented to the parliament its report No. 55. First of all, I thank the secretariat. We have been rather busy with several bills and reports running at the same time. Once again, the secretariat has come up trumps and done an extremely good job. I thank all committee members for the manner in which we dealt with this particular report.

Certainly the policy objectives of the bill are numerous. As has been mentioned several times, the bill proposes to make changes that will affect in excess of 30 pieces of legislation. As is noted in our report, much of the bill is based on the Justice and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014 that was introduced into the Queensland parliament on 26 November 2014 by the then attorney-general and minister for justice. Therefore, it is fairly obvious why we support much of the bill. Most stakeholders were also supportive of the Court and Civil Legislation Amendment Bill.

The areas of concern have already been well outlined by the member for Mansfield, so I will not go into that in detail. We appreciate that the Court and Civil Legislation Amendment Bill 2017 is designed to amend legislation within the Justice portfolio to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of courts and agencies and to clarify relevant legislation. However, non-government members made a statement of reservations which is included in the committee's report. It states—

> We do not support the proposed amendments regarding the changes to the qualifications for a candidate to be considered worthy of nomination as Chief Executive Officer of Legal Aid Queensland. The current requirement is that a candidate must be a lawyer of at least 5 years' experience.

It is worth reading the witness statement provided by the QLS to get a fuller understanding of where those issues lie. Clearly we support the QLS submission to the committee.

The QLS outlined a number of other issues that need clarification. They suggest that the Legal Profession Act 2007 be amended to allow for the electronic conveyancing of bills as of right. That seems more than appropriate to us, particularly given the nature of conveyancing in a modern technological and digital world. We support their suggestion in that regard.

In relation to the amendments to the Retail Shop Leases Act 1994, we note that the QLS states that new clause 220 does not address its concerns and goes against the fundamental principles of the act. In its submission the QLS states—

> The proposed changes are, in the Society's opinion, unnecessary and significantly detract from the intended purpose of the disclosure statement as a small business protection measure.

It is interesting when one looks at the committee report to find that early on in the report there is a list of organisations, including the QLS, consulted by the government. It really beggars belief that the QLS would not have brought this up with the Attorney-General and the others involved in the development of the bill. I think the Bar Association could have taken a similar view, although we will not know for sure.

Only time will tell in terms of the comments made by the member for Mansfield with regard to the possibility of someone already being lined up for a role. We will see what comes of that. I will conclude there. Given that the majority of the bill is supported by us, I will commend the bill to the House with the hope that some amendments will be made during consideration in detail.

Mr BROWN (Capalaba—ALP) (8.50 pm): I rise tonight to make a short contribution to the bill before the House. Firstly, I would like to thank my fellow committee members on the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee.

Mr Minnikin interjected.

Mr BROWN: He always likes a short speech. I want to touch on a part of the bill—and the member for Mansfield mentioned this also—which will improve protections in the area of domestic violence. This provision was not one of the recommendations in the *Not now, not ever* report, but it will strengthen the protections. I refer to the amendment to the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992 which will allow domestic violence notations to be administratively made on a person's criminal history or a formal record of conviction where the person is convicted of an offence for which the charge has been noted as a domestic violence offence, unless the court orders that the notation not be made because it is not satisfied that the offence is a domestic violence offence; clarify that the prosecution bears the onus of proving that an offence is a domestic violence offence; and clarify that domestic violence notations do not apply to a person's traffic history.

I note that Soroptimist International expressed strong support for the proposal in the bill to facilitate the making of domestic violence notations on a person's criminal history or formal record of conviction. It was of the view that recording these convictions will support the recently strengthened domestic violence legislation and ongoing legislative amendment to help eradicate domestic and family violence. Protect All Children Today Inc. and the Ending Violence Against Women Queensland also expressed support for the provisions. PACT stated that the amendment is likely to lead to the better protection of vulnerable children involved in domestic violence situations.

I also want to touch on the fact that the opposition have stated that they are against the changes in terms of the CEO of Legal Aid. Some may say that the QLS is a member driven organisation. It is no wonder they put in a submission making sure they protect the jobs of every single lawyer out there. What is heartening is that the opposition is siding with a member organisation in this case. Despite it being about one CEO job, it gives me heart that in the future they will side with workers and support all jobs. It gives me a ray of hope that into the future they could sign up to more union driven campaigns to protect workers' jobs.

The bill also strengthens the provisions around the Ombudsman Act, which I think is a good thing. I also point out that the Magistrates Court is now recognising that 75 is the new 70. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr DICKSON (Buderim—PHON) (8.53 pm): I rise to speak in the debate on the Court and Civil Legislation Amendment Bill. I can see that the bill seeks to make amendments to more than 30 acts of parliament. However, I would like to make a short contribution in relation to just a couple of those amendments.

I note that the bill makes amendments to the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992 in an aim to reduce administrative burdens on our courts. It removes the necessity to have a specific domestic violence order for notations which reflect criminal offending but instead allow domestic violence notations to be made automatically on a person's criminal antecedents or a formal record of conviction. This is the case as long as the person is convicted of an offence which has been noted as a domestic violence offence. I understand that the court can make an order that the notation not be made if the court is not satisfied that the offence is a domestic violence offence. The amendment in the bill will not affect the process for making domestic violence notations against a person's past criminal convictions. I note that the prosecution bears the onus of proving that an offence is a domestic violence offence and obviously domestic violence notations will not apply to a person's driving history.

The bill was examined by the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee. I note from the committee report tabled on 15 May that the Women Lawyers Association of Queensland submitted that the proposed amendment 'addresses two key concerns the WLAQ has, namely the onus of proving a

domestic violence offence and the possible administrative burden for all parties involved'. However, the WLAQ is concerned about the process of information sharing to other states and territories. It submitted—

> The Bill will not achieve its intended purpose if there is not a clear process about this if the Bill is passed. The purpose of the notation, in our view, goes to assisting and protecting the community, the complainant and her/his family. If other Police Services are not aware of the notation, then the intention of the proposed changes may ultimately fail. WLAQ appreciates that this is outside the scope of the Committee and is dependent on the actions of entities outside of Queensland.

The WLAQ also believes that there is scope for this matter to be addressed at a federal level.

Sadly, the incidence of domestic violence is increasing, with very tragic results in some circumstances. Regarding the disclosure of information, there are a number of amendments to the Right to Information Act 2009 to prevent the release of documents associated with the administration of the judicial appointments protocol and to ensure that the Information Privacy Act 2000 does not restrict the disclosure of personal information to ASIO where appropriate.

There are also amendments to the Invasion of Privacy Act 1971. I understand that this is where private conversations are recorded in circumstances associated with risk to safety and wellbeing of a public safety entity officer. This amendment is to protect police officers or other emergency services officers performing their duties in communication centres from committing an offence related to the recording of those conversations. Clause 132 amends section 43 regarding the prohibition on the use of listening devices to provide an additional exemption to the offence under that section. Currently, section 43 provides that a person is guilty of an offence if a person uses a listening device to overhear, record, monitor or listen to a private conversation. Listening devices and private conversations are defined in the act.

The Queensland Police Service, the Queensland Fire and Rescue Services and the Queensland Ambulance Service are known as public safety entities. Those entities are progressively adopting the use of Queensland government network radio. This facility allows public safety entities' communication centre operators to activate an open mic function on a selected officer's radio, allowing the operator to monitor conversations within a range of the radio microphone. Government network radios fall within the definition of a listening device in that act. Remote activation of the open mic function is not likely to occur very often and only in an emergency. Such a function could be used by communication centre operators to check on the welfare of an officer attending a high-risk call-out when contact with the officer has been lost by the communication centre.

The clause will provide that no offence is committed where a communications centre operator who is performing duties at one of the public safety entities does record a private conversation between individuals whilst operating the open mic function of a government network radio. The exemption is limited to circumstances where a duress alarm has been activated, the communications centre operator has been contacted by an officer for assistance or the operator has reasonable grounds to believe that there may be a risk to an individual's life, health or safety.

Mr Deputy Speaker Stewart, the world in 2017 is a very different place to the one that you and I grew up in. In these times where acts of terrorism are a threat, it is necessary for personal, private information in certain circumstances to be provided to security agencies such as ASIO. Also, the safety, security and welfare of our police and other emergency services personnel must be of the absolute highest priority.

Regarding the security and welfare of our police in particular, we have to acknowledge that crime in parts of Queensland is heading towards being out of control. We must consider recent claims by senior police that morale is at an all-time low amongst police personnel. Part of the morale problem is something that One Nation will be addressing, as mentioned in our policy document. If One Nation is elected, we will rebadge the Queensland Police Service as a 'force'. We are totally committed to this.

Returning to something that I was speaking about a little earlier, it is most necessary to protect the police and emergency services' communications centre operators from any legal action when recording conversations as outlined earlier. In that regard, I fully support the amendments contained in the bill.

Mr KRAUSE (Beaudesert—LNP) (9.00 pm): I want to make a few quick comments about the Court and Civil Legislation Amendment Bill as there are some good provisions in it. Firstly, the provision to increase the age limit for acting magistrates to 75 years is very sensible. I know that in my neck of the woods around Beaudesert one of the issues that we face is a shortage of court time for people to be dealt with. Extending that provision to enable acting magistrates to perhaps work more in the town is a good provision and we welcome that.

The main issue I want to discuss and support is the amendment to the Penalties and Sentences Act to allow domestic violence notations to be made on a person's criminal history or a formal record of conviction where the person is convicted of an offence involving domestic violence. It is very important for the parliament to make this change, recognising that domestic violence in many ways constitutes a criminal offence in itself. I have spoken in this place before about the need to investigate very seriously how we can make domestic violence a specific criminal offence in itself. Indeed, it is something that we have examined in the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee's inquiry into other bills and something that many stakeholders support, including the Women's Legal Service, who in another inquiry noted that in many other jurisdictions there are specific offences that criminalise domestic violence in itself. Having a notation about domestic violence on a person's criminal history goes to the protection of the community, enabling people to be aware that domestic violence offenders have a history of a criminal nature involving domestic violence. Obviously, the prosecution bears the onus of proving that an offence is a domestic violence offence, but we welcome that amendment.

In dealing with domestic violence cases not only is it important to deal with those offences in a very serious and strict way but we also need our court resources in all parts of Queensland to be adequately updated and maintained so that victims of domestic violence are confident and have the ability to approach court to make complaints and to be able to feel safe and supported in doing so. In Beaudesert we have a very old courthouse where there are simply inadequate facilities for victims to be able to come to court and feel safe and supported. We have a single courtroom, which is very small, and people literally come out the door and go down the steps outside the building, and people wait around outside. In that scenario there is simply no separation between victims of domestic violence and in many cases the people that they are accusing of domestic violence.

I have been calling for many, many years—ever since I have been here—for an upgrade to that courthouse, for an extension of the courthouse and for investigations to take place by the Department of Justice and Attorney-General, the Department of Housing and Public Works and also the Queensland Police Service, which sits right next door to the courthouse, to improve those facilities. It is simply not good enough when we are talking about domestic violence so much that an offender and a victim should be standing side by side outside the Beaudesert courthouse to have their matters heard. I welcome that provision, but I need to make the point that more needs to be done not just in a service sense but also in terms of physical resourcing of our courthouses.

I note the comments from the member for Capalaba about the member for Mansfield's comments about the CEO of Legal Aid Queensland not being required to be a lawyer under this bill. I point out to the member for Capalaba that Legal Aid Queensland is like a law firm. If he wants to equate it with a union, it would be like putting a member of the Liberal Party in charge of the CFMEU. They would not do it and nor should it be done with Legal Aid Queensland. It is a law firm. It is a legal service. There should be a lawyer running a legal service. It just makes sense. I take on board the comments of the member for Mansfield and the comments of the Queensland Law Society. If the member for Capalaba wants to hold to his hypothesis put here tonight, I am always willing to be in charge of the CFMEU one day. I am sure that we could straighten them out and put some law and order into the CFMEU. We might even make them a bit more efficient. We might even get some more work done, but—

Mr Mander: 'I digress.'

Mr KRAUSE: Indeed. I take that interjection: I do digress. This is a good bill. We are supporting it.

Mr Pearce interjected.

Mr KRAUSE: I hear the member for Mirani chirping up the back. We know he loves the CFMEU. My grandfather was a member of the miners union at Rosewood. Like the member for Bundamba, I have heritage in the coalmines. I am a coalminer's grandson. We hear a lot from the member for Bundamba—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Member for Beaudesert, can I bring you back to the long title of the bill, please.

Mr KRAUSE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I was just telling a story. The member for Bundamba is a coalminer's daughter; I am a coalminer's grandson, and I am proud of that. He was a member of the Liberal Party and they got a lot of work done in that coalmine. The last point I want to touch on is the amendments to the retail—

Mr Hinchliffe: Was he a member of the union? Did he join the union?

Mr KRAUSE: He was a member of the union. In fact, he was the secretary of the union, but he was not a voter for the Labor Party because he liked to work for a living.

The last amendments I want to talk about are those to the Retail Shop Leases Act. I think the member for Mansfield has probably made some mention of them and the fact that the amendments in this bill will weaken the ability of tenants against landlords. I think that is a retrograde step, especially in the current retail environment. There has been media this week illustrating the pressure that tenants are under in some of our larger shopping centres around South-East Queensland and probably around the whole of Queensland. Weakening retail shop lease provisions to give landlords more power over those retail shop tenants is not a good way to go. I think we need to take a closer look at those provisions in the future.

I have concluded my contribution to the bill. I thank the committee for its work—the members for Capalaba, Stretton, Coomera and Currumbin. I commend the bill to the House.

Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (9.08 pm), in reply: I am not sure how I follow that.

Honourable members interjected.

Mrs D'ATH: With a history lesson? No. At the outset I would like to thank all of the members who have contributed to the debate on the Court and Civil Legislation Amendment Bill. As I have indicated in my earlier speeches, the bill proposes miscellaneous amendments to over 30 acts within the Justice portfolio and across a broad spectrum of subject matter. The significant focus of the bill is on strengthening the administration of justice, improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the courts and agencies, and otherwise clarifying, improving and updating the diverse Justice portfolio legislation.

A substantial part of the bill relates to amendments to the Classification of Computer Games and Images Act 1995, the Classification of Films Act 1991 and the Classification of Publications Act 1991, updating each of these acts to align with corresponding Commonwealth legislation. The bill also includes amendments to the legislation governing various statutory offices and entities and regulatory schemes within the Justice portfolio. This includes strengthening the Ombudsman Act 2001 through implementing recommendations from the last strategic review of Queensland's Ombudsman Office, improved governance arrangements for the Prostitution Licensing Authority and the modernisation of the eligibility requirements for the chief executive officer of Legal Aid Queensland.

The bill clarifies the operation of various provisions across the statute book. Importantly, the bill amends the Public Guardian Act 2014 to clarify that the functions and powers of the Public Guardian in relation to a relevant child can be exercised from the time an application for an order under the Child Protection Act 1999 is filed until the application is finalised and arrangements are no longer in place for that child.

Amendments to the Right to Information Act 2009 ensure that the Information Privacy Act 2009 does not restrict the disclosure of personal information to the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation—ASIO—in appropriate cases. The bill also includes amendments directed to clarifying and streamlining aspects of Queensland's succession, trust and property legislation—for example, amendments to the Succession Act 1981 to clarify for family provision applications that the relationship of stepchild and step-parent stops when the civil partnership or de facto relationship between the deceased and the stepchild's parent ends and to provide for the effect of the end of a de facto relationship on a will.

I would like to now address comments made in the second reading debate and particularly the two clauses that members of the opposition have gone to. As I already stated, in relation to clause 150 dealing with the chief executive officer of Legal Aid Queensland, the bill removes the current requirement for the Legal Aid Queensland CEO to be a lawyer with at least five years experience and provides instead for the eligibility of a person who has qualifications, experience or standing appropriate to perform the role of the CEO. This criteria of course would not per se preclude a lawyer from eligibility for the role. The removal of the mandatory requirement for a person to be legally qualified in order to be considered by the Legal Aid board for nomination for appointment as CEO was sought by the former chair of the Legal Aid board, Mr Brian Stewart. As the committee heard, the current CEO, Mr Anthony Reilly, in his evidence to the committee's public hearing on the bill, advised that the proposed amendments are supported by the Legal Aid board. I take the point made by the member for Mansfield that this is one of those issues that law firms deal with and there are differing views right across the legal profession on this. However, it is one that has been put forward by the Legal Aid board and the CEO and one that we believe is worthy of putting forward.

The proposed amendment is directed to providing the Legal Aid board with the flexibility to draw from a wider range of candidates for the CEO position, in particular, given the size and scope of Legal Aid Queensland's contemporary budget and service delivery program. The proposed amendment will

also serve to keep pace with current practice and standards in respect of senior executive appointments for government and statutory agencies. As already stated in my second reading speech, the change will be consistent with the position in the other two major Legal Aid jurisdictions, being New South Wales and Victoria, where the CEO is not required to be a lawyer.

The government of course acknowledges the importance of the legal and ethical obligations and expertise of duly qualified and experienced lawyers in providing legal assistance to financially disadvantaged Queenslanders. Significantly in this regard, as already canvassed in my second reading speech, the bill also makes consequential amendments to the Legal Aid Queensland Act to ensure that if a non-lawyer CEO is appointed his or her functions in relation to the provision of legal services and as holder of Legal Aid Queensland's principal's practising certificate are the responsibility of a Legal Aid lawyer with appropriate experience and qualifications and who is nominated by the Legal Aid Queensland Board and approved by the Attorney-General. There is also provision in part 17 of the bill for nomination and approval of a person to hold the requisite practising certificate as reserve holders where the chief executive officer is not a lawyer and the primary holder ceases to be a Legal Aid lawyer. A CEO who is not a lawyer will still have an overarching obligation to ensure that the legal services responsibilities of the role are met.

I turn now to clause 220, the retail shop leases rider provision. As I outlined in my second reading speech, clause 220 of the bill will simply reinstate a rider provision inadvertently omitted by the Retail Shop Leases Amendment Act 2016 which qualifies a lessee's statutory entitlement to terminate a lease based on defective lessor disclosure. I just want to clarify this because I heard the member for Beaudesert also saying that there is concern that this somehow weakens the protections of small business. The fact is: this is simply seeking to reinstate a rider that has been in there since 2006 and was inadvertently omitted from the 2016 act and was not raised by any of the stakeholders other than the Queensland Law Society. All of the lessee or lessor representatives over many, many years, including the time that the LNP was in government—in fact, as I understand it, this rider appeared in the LNP's retail bill. It was in there from 2006; it was in the LNP's bill. It was inadvertently omitted from the 2016 bill, so I am very surprised that there are concerns about this rider being there. I should say that if the Queensland Law Society submits, which it has, that the rider provision should not be reinstated as it is problematic for lessees—and there has not been the evidence put forward to show that it is problematic and it is in just about all other jurisdictions. As I was saying, New South Wales has just gone through a significant statutory review as well and has left the rider in there, so it has not been shown to be problematic in other jurisdictions.

The society's submission is technical and in our view requires clarification and detailed consideration including in consultation with retail industry stakeholders and other interested professional stakeholders. To not reinstate this provision creates more problems than to leave it out. Leaving it out would require significant consultation with all those stakeholders who were more than comfortable and never raised this as a concern all the way through the review. It is a lot more problematic to leave it out when it was simply an inadvertent omission.

If we were to consider the Law Society's views going forward, what we would say to the Queensland Law Society is matters for consultation would include whether the broader review, experience and practice in Queensland and in other jurisdictions support the society's concerns that the rider provision leaves lessees without a remedy except in cases of blatant fraudulent behaviour; the existing safeguards in the Retail Shop Leases Act for small business lessees who are required to obtain both a professional legal advice report and a professional financial advice report before entering into a lease; and consideration of appropriate alternative provisions to address the society's concerns around protecting lessees from adverse wrongful termination outcomes and matters of statutory and legal interpretation while balancing the commercial rights and interests of lessees and lessors and narrowing termination disputes including minimising associated legal and business costs for the benefit of both lease parties. I say that because the parties actually asked for these particular changes around the disputes to actually minimise associated legal and business costs. Not supporting this amendment will have consequences that are worthy of going back to the lessee and lessor representatives to have that consultation.

Those are all the issues that would need to be considered if this amendment does not go through this evening and if the opposition opposes it. As I say, it is simply seeking to rectify an omission that occurred back in 2016. It formed part of the LNP's bill. It has been in the act since 2006. It is in line with many other jurisdictions and for that reason we believe that the LNP should support our amendment as it is outlined in the bill.

The member for Beaudesert talked about courthouses. I understand his frustration. We have many courthouses across this state that are very old buildings. It is difficult to try to retrofit them—and some of them are heritage listed. They were purpose-built for their time, but they are not purpose-built for the needs we have today. Especially in the domestic and family violence space, we know that that is an issue. We cannot retrofit or rebuild every courthouse at once. It is a significant job and it comes at a significant cost. It is a challenge for whomever is in government. It is work we are undertaking progressively, and we are looking at those busiest courts where we have the largest increase in domestic and family violence work. I can understand that the member for Beaudesert is wanting to look after his local courthouse in his local community. I certainly acknowledge his comments on that and I understand that there are frustrations out there with these challenges of trying to retrofit our courthouses. I will continue to do what I can to work through our auditing of our courthouses and see what we can do, whether it is minor changes, temporary structures—whatever we can do—to try to make it that little bit easier for victims coming into courthouses. It is a challenge and it comes at a great cost to the budget.

In conclusion, the amendments in this bill are expected to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the courts and justice agencies and clarify, update, modernise and improve diverse legislation across the Justice portfolio. I commend the bill to the House.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1 to 10, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Mrs D'ATH (9.21 pm): I move the following amendment—

1 After clause 10

Page 23, after line 21—

insert—

10A Amendment of schedule (Dictionary)

Schedule—

insert—

order, of the tribunal, in relation to an agreement, the terms of which are recorded in a document filed under section 164 or 189, means—

(a) if the document is filed with the industrial relations commission—a decision of the commission under the IR Act; or

(b) if the document is filed with QCAT—a final decision of QCAT in a proceeding under the QCAT Act.

I table the explanatory notes to my amendment.

Tabled paper: Court and Civil Legislation Amendment Bill 2017, explanatory notes to Hon. Yvette D'Ath's amendments [760].

As I foreshadowed in my second reading speech, it is proposed to move one amendment during consideration in detail of the bill in response to the Anti-Discrimination Commission of Queensland's submission to the committee.

The bill amends the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2009 to streamline the procedural requirements for enforcing a final decision of the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal. In its submission to the committee on the bill the Anti-Discrimination Commission of Queensland sought a further amendment to make it clear that the process for enforcing QCAT's final decisions includes conciliation agreements filed with QCAT under section 164 of the Anti-Discrimination Act 1991 and predetermination settlement agreements filed with QCAT under section 189 of that act.

Amendment No. 1 clarifies that an agreement filed with QCAT under section 164 or section 189 of the Anti-Discrimination Act is enforceable as if it is a final decision of QCAT.

Amendment agreed to.

Clauses 11 to 149, as read, agreed to.

Clause 150—

Mr WALKER (9.22 pm): This is the first of the amendments that deals with the requirement that the CEO of the Legal Aid office must be a lawyer. For the reasons that I set out in my second reading speech, we oppose this provision and the others that follow from it.

Mrs D'ATH: This was outlined in my second reading speech and also in my reply. This has come about at the request of the former chair. It is also supported by the board and is consistent with other jurisdictions in relation to Legal Aid, and we believe that it should be supported.

Division: Question put—That clause 150, as read, stand part of the bill.

AYES, 43:

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

PHON, 1—Dickson.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 39:

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

Pairs: Byrne, Simpson; de Brenni, Nicholls.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 150, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 151 to 219, as read, agreed to.

Clause 220—

Mr WALKER (9.31 pm): This is the provision which relates to the Retail Shop Leases Act. As I explained in my speech at the second reading stage, we believe, in accordance with the submission of the Queensland Law Society and CCIQ, that this weakens the position of tenants. I have heard what the Attorney-General had to say about the history of the matter. Despite the history, an assessment of it shows that this will weaken the position of tenants and the opposition therefore will be opposing this clause.

Mrs D'ATH: As I said in my reply, I am quite surprised at the opposition's response on this, because this is simply seeking to reinsert a provision that was omitted from the 2016 bill in error. It is supported by all of the lessee and lessor representatives. It had been in the act since 2006. It was in the LNP's lapsed Retail Shop Leases Amendment Bill 2014. It was to be in the 2016 bill. It has never been raised as an issue by any of the lessee or lessor representatives who spent many years working through this particular bill. There has been no evidence put up about how this may be detrimental. It is a provision that exists in just about every other jurisdiction, including those jurisdictions that have recently gone through significant statutory review and have retained this provision. To not support this creates more of a problem than it seeks to rectify. I do have concerns about that. It means that the LNP is opposing its own amendments. We recommend that it should support something it had in its own bill in 2014 and has been in the act since 2006, because it is just logical to do so.

Division: Question put—That clause 220, as read, stand part of the bill.

AYES, 43:

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

PHON, 1—Dickson.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 39:

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

Pairs: Byrne, Simpson; de Brenni, Nicholls.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 220, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 221 to 258, as read, agreed to.

Schedule 1, as read, agreed to.

Third Reading

Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (9.40 pm): I move—

That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Question put—That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title

Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (9.40 pm): I move—

That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

Question put—That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (9.40 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Mount Ommaney, Small Business Awards

Mrs SMITH (Mount Ommaney—LNP) (9.41 pm): I was pleased to launch the Mount Ommaney Small Business Awards for 2017 last Monday, when both the Leader of the Opposition, Tim Nicholls, and the shadow Treasurer, Scott Emerson, joined me in the electorate of Mount Ommaney. This is the third year I have partnered with the Centenary & Districts Chamber of Commerce. Where better to launch our awards with the chamber president, Steve Pollard, than at one of our great local businesses, Altec at Seventeen Mile Rocks? The owner, Keith Hamilton, has been at the helm and very much a hands-on operator for the past 25 years.

Winners and finalists in previous years have included A Page or Two, a bookstore in Corinda; Man & Moustache, a barber shop at Jindalee; Helloworld at Mount Ommaney; and the Shingle Inn franchise at Mount Ommaney. We have also had the home business base Lacorin and Lewis PT Training. They are some of the great businesses that have benefited from the Mount Ommaney Small Business Awards.

With the Leader of the Opposition and shadow Treasurer in the Mount Ommaney electorate, it was an ideal time to announce the LNP's practical and sensible policy on how we will get out of the way of small businesses. Just like the small business awards, which is about recognising our hardworking business owners and encouraging locals to support local businesses, the LNP knows that, when the government gets out of the way of small business, small business can focus on creating jobs and employing more Queenslanders. The LNP is the only party that understands small business.

The Palaszczuk Labor government has made it harder to do business by increasing red tape, regulation and fees and charges. A Tim Nicholls led LNP government will commit to a 20 per cent red-tape reduction target over six years that will measure the regulatory burden and establish a baseline so that we can map progress against achieving our targets; appoint an industry go-to person to drive regulatory reform; set red-tape-reduction performance targets for ministers and departments; and have the annual red-tape-repeal day set aside every year in parliament for slashing red tape and bureaucracy. That is what is practical for small businesses out there in the electorates. Only an LNP government can provide stability, certainty and consistency so that businesses, both large and small, have the confidence they need.

Kallangur Memorial Bowls Club

Mr KING (Kallangur—ALP) (9.44 pm): Our work in political life has many challenges. We often concentrate on the negatives and pay little attention to the positives. Tonight I want to advise the House of a seriously positive outcome for my community. It is a story of determination, friendship, fighting spirit and community connectedness. It is the story of saving the Kallangur bowls club.

Honourable members may have heard me speak one or two times about the university coming to my electorate. The Moreton Bay Regional Council has been working hard to get the best outcomes for ratepayers by looking at what excess land and infrastructure it has that can be sold to fund future works. I understand these decisions and I respect the council's right to manage its own business. Part of the process was the identification of the Kallangur bowls club on Anzac Avenue as a site for sale.

I have to be honest: the Kallangur bowls club is a favourite spot for me and my community. It has good food and great friends. Many of my neighbours play there. Importantly, the Kallangur bowls club is one of the few grass greens that is available for our top-notch players in our district to play on and practise for top-level events.

Mr Harper: They can't sell it.

Mr KING: They did not. Under the stewardship of the management team, the club has worked hard to turn around its finances and get people back playing and enjoying the facilities. Under threat of sale and potential closure, the Kallangur community and its campaign to save the club was incredible. Petitions took off all over the area. People such as Bruce Jones, Ros Clark and Bill Evans and the entire membership of the bowls club, as well as the players and supporters, delivered the strongest of messages, 'Don't sell our bowls club.' The members of the Pine Rivers Memorial Bowls Club were amazing and other members of local bowls clubs leapt into the fray and collected hundreds of signatures for their fellow club. There were meetings of dozens of supporters, which I attended to support the community. The Hon. Steven Miles stood with me and this community at each step of the way. There is no forgetting the fantastic media stories from the *Pine Rivers Press* and the support it generated.

A government member interjected.

Mr KING: I never needed much convincing that the Kallangur bowls club was not like *Crackerjack* but an important community space and club that we cannot afford to lose. As I said, the council has to manage its own business. I am pleased that Mayor Sutherland and the council were able to step in and deliver the good news that the sale had been withdrawn. My discussions with the mayor only reinforced his emerging view that that was the right thing to do.

The lesson in all of this is that Kallangur has a community voice that is strong and that, together, people can make a difference. Over recent years my community has felt the loss of banks and services moving across the highway to North Lakes, but if there were ever any doubt that the people there will stick together as a community, the recent campaign to save the Kallangur bowls club showed that Kallangur pride is strong. I congratulate everyone who was involved in this campaign and the mayor for his leadership. It is a win all round for my community. I urge the members of my community to continue to support this amazing club and its people in any way they can.

Mount Gravatt East State School, Drum and Fife Marching Band

Mr WALKER (Mansfield—LNP) (9.47 pm): I am glad to stand tonight to speak about one of the small schools in my electorate, the Mount Gravatt East State School, and in particular its fife and drum band. I stand here as a proud alumnus of a fife and drum band—the Camp Hill State School fife and drum band. I was an amazing performer in that band and I like fife and drum bands. Unhappily, they are creatures of the past. I am told by those in the Mount Gravatt East State School fife and drum band that there are only three other state school fife and drum bands in South-East Queensland: at Wooloowin, Nundah and Manly West. Fife and drum bands are a bit of a relic, but those who partake in them enjoy them and they are certainly great contributors to our community.

The Mount Gravatt East State School fife and drum band is in its 52nd year. In 2015 I was very pleased to attend its 50th celebration, which was a big occasion. In its glory days the band had 55 members. In those days the school had 1,000 students. Now, there are only 15 in the band, but the school is a quarter of its size, so the members of the fife and drum band still make up a very healthy part of the school population.

The Mount Gravatt East State School fife and drum band is very active. It plays at local nursing homes, at tattoo and drum major events and it is prominent on Anzac Day. On Anzac Day, the band led us from the Holland Park shops down to the Holland Park-Mount Gravatt RSL. I think it is a very Australian thing to see a school fife and drum band leading the veterans and those members of the community who are gathered to celebrate Anzac Day through the streets of our suburbs. It is a really moving thing to see. The Mount Gravatt East State School fife and drum band also took part in the Mount Thompson crematorium Anzac Day event and the big Anzac Day event at the school itself.

Over years the teachers and parents of the school have made a huge commitment to the band. Bandleader Beryl Rohweder was the leader of the band for 26 years until she died in 1997. Her then assistant, Sandi Meibusch—who is known to the students as Miss Sandi—had been an assistant to Beryl since 1991. Upon Beryl's death in 1997, Sandi took over as leader and she continues in that role today. Sandi leads the band magnificently. She has them well turned out and, as I said, they lead many of the major celebrations within my local community.

The band is forward looking, but it is also always looking back to its past. It has established a Facebook page. For those in my electorate who are listening or reading this, if they go to the Mount Gravatt East State School fife and drum band Facebook page and join that Facebook community they will be able to reminisce about the past days of the band and catch up with what is happening in the band today. The Mount Gravatt East State School fife and drum band is one of the great little organisations in the Mansfield electorate. Tonight I am pleased to stand here and pay credit to it.

Redlands Electorate, Domestic and Family Violence

Mr BROWN (Capalaba—ALP) (9.50 pm): I rise to report to the parliament on the great efforts of our local champions and the Palaszczuk government to deliver in the area of domestic violence and for women in the Redlands. On Saturday, 13 May Mayor Karen Williams and the Redland City Council hosted the annual Diner en Rouge, which raises much needed funds for Redlands emergency accommodation and crisis support centre for women escaping domestic violence run by Valda Carrington and the staff from Maybank. This event was held at the brand-new convention centre at the Alexandra Hills Hotel. I must say, this is a fantastic facility that the McGuires group has delivered for Redlands. I cannot wait for the opening of the accompanying accommodation. This investment means not only local jobs but also much need facilities for Redlands. I know that they will get a workout in the future, if last Saturday night is anything to go by.

The night was well attended by the Minister for Women, Shannon Fentiman; the Police Commissioner, Ian Stewart; Betty Taylor, CEO of the Red Rose Foundation; and Maryann Talia Pau, co-founder of the One million Stars to End Violence Project. Both Betty and Maryann shared their inspirational stories on the night, which moved all in attendance to dig deep. The night raised well over $200,000, with a generous donation from Dan Holzapfel of $100,000 and Zonta's Ros Kinder of $50,000.

As Minister Fentiman stated this morning, the Palaszczuk government committed $130,000 to the Redlands Centre for Women for professional counselling at the centre. I have been working very hard alongside Katrina Beutel and the other great volunteers to ensure they obtain this funding. I know the great work they do across the community and I know the complex and challenging situations that they face every day. I believe that there is a need for those volunteers to debrief with a counsellor.

Again I congratulate the government on delivering on domestic violence resources in the Redlands area. This builds on the WAVSS commitment, the first standalone DV service in Redlands, of $3 million. I again congratulate Mayor Karen Williams on delivering such a great event, Katrina Beutel for her efforts with the Redlands Centre for Women and Valda and the gang at Maybank. The money raised from the night will go towards the emergency crisis centre. I know that the council, Maybank and the government are working together to strike a deal to ensure we create more emergency crisis accommodation for those in the Redlands.

Cleveland State High School

Dr ROBINSON (Cleveland—LNP) (9.53 pm): I rise to speak about the construction work involved with the Cleveland State High School hall. The news of Cleveland High getting its long-awaited hall is welcome. As the school's local member, I am happy to be able to deliver this $6 million indoor sports auditorium for the school community of Cleveland High. The school staff and P&C and I have worked together on this high-priority project for many years, and I pay tribute to them as their persistence and patience have finally paid off. Under the LNP government Cleveland High was provided $9 million to $10 million to build the year 7 classrooms. This multimillion dollar project was the first priority for the school. We also built the $3 million school hall at BayView State School.

The LNP government invested substantial education capital funding in the Cleveland electorate in our time, but it was apparent that the school also required a multipurpose hall. There was an expectation that whoever was in government during the following term—this parliament—hopefully could allocate funds for this much needed piece of infrastructure. To be clear and for the record, this has been a high-priority project since my election to office in March 2009. I have actively supported the

school in its quest for a hall by way of lobbying successive education ministers, by speeches in the parliament, newsletters, phone calls, media releases, petitions, meetings and many school visits. The critical events that tipped the project over the line were the visit to Cleveland State High School of shadow education minister Tracy Davis earlier this year and prior to the announcement and the school e-petition co-sponsored by the school P&C and me.

I acknowledge the good work of the school's P&C representatives, Brad Ward and Lyndsay Byrne. I acknowledge the 2,383 people who signed the petition. There is little doubt that this massive injection of people power helped give the project the final push that it needed to get over the line. The project has been open for tender and construction will start soon.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Members, there is too much discussion. I am having difficulty hearing the member for Cleveland.

Dr ROBINSON: I am very keen to see local businesses and tradies involved in the construction and fitout of the hall as much as possible. I have written to the education minister strongly encouraging her department's backing in this regard. A substantial number of jobs and work will be created, and local contractors and tradies should have fair access. Sadly, the Minister for Education's lack of interest in the project extends to not even replying to my letter. The minister also misled the parliament, along with the member for Capalaba, when they falsely claimed that I did not consider the project was important. They quoted from a survey of major projects, which was feedback from the local community and not a stated view of mine. This was either a misunderstanding on behalf of those opposite or a deliberate misleading of the parliament. I call on the Minister for Education and the member for Capalaba to correct the record in the parliament this week and for the minister to reply to my letter and confirm that she will use local contractors.

Rural Fire Service

Mr MADDEN (Ipswich West—ALP) (9.56 pm): On 17 May I was proud to represent the Minister for Emergency Services, Mr Mark Ryan, for the handover of $16,200 worth of equipment provided through the Energex Rural Fire Service Equipment Program to rural fire brigades in the West Moreton region at the Rural Fire Service headquarters at Fernvale. This was the second year that I had attended this annual ceremony. Present were Belinda Watton, Executive General Manager People, Culture and Safety, Energy Queensland; Mark Bowen, Field Services Manager Western, Energex; Tom Dawson, Assistant Commissioner Rural Fire Service, Queensland Fire and Rescue; Andrew Rose, Fernvale Rural Fire Brigade First Officer; as well as Rural Fire Service staff and volunteers. Master of ceremonies was Alan Gillespie, Superintendent Regional Manager, Rural Fire Service Queensland, South-East Region. Recipients of the equipment included West Moreton Rural Fire Service brigades at Biarra, Central Lockyer, Coominya, Crossdale, Grandchester, Junction View, Moore-Linville, Upper Flagstone and Woodlea. These brigades benefit from this partnership by receiving equipment that will help them save lives and properties.

Each year $75,000 worth of equipment is delivered to brigades in South-East Queensland through the Energex RFS Equipment Program. Over the past eight years this program has delivered more than $600,000 worth of vital equipment to more than 130 rural fire brigades. The equipment included data projectors, LED TVs, collar tanks, chainsaws, fuel spill kits and automated external defibrillators. As Belinda Watton said, Energex crews and RFS volunteers often work side by side in natural disaster situations. Energex crews see firsthand how important the RFS are to their communities, helping to keep them safe during emergencies. I thank Energex for their ongoing support for our rural fire brigades. In doing so they are helping protect the safety and wellbeing of the people of Queensland.

Within the West Moreton Rural Fire Service area there are 41 brigades, 80 appliances, 1,410 volunteers, including 64 volunteer community educators, and 91 fire warden districts. The RFS volunteers work tirelessly to protect the people in this region. They are there for their community when they are needed most and I was very pleased to see their capabilities enhanced through the handover of this vital equipment. The Rural Fire Service is crucial to the safety of communities in rural Queensland. I would like to thank the employers, supporters and family members of RFS volunteers. Finally, I would like to thank all RFS volunteers around Queensland for giving their time and energy so selflessly to support their communities in dealing with often difficult and dangerous situations. The staff and volunteers of the Rural Fire Service should be thanked for their hard work, dedication and commitment which are greatly appreciated by the people of Queensland.

Regional and Rural Queensland

Mr MILLAR (Gregory—LNP) (9.59 pm): Tonight I pay tribute to the Leader of the Opposition, Tim Nicholls, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, Deb Frecklington, and the entire LNP shadow cabinet, who continue to travel throughout regional Queensland. As the Leader of the Opposition continues to demonstrate, regional and rural Queensland is in the LNP's DNA, and we are determined to listen and implement policies that will build a better Queensland. From Cape York to Coolangatta and from Brisbane to Bedourie, the LNP will deliver for all of Queensland.

The Leader of the Opposition, Tim Nicholls, the shadow minister for energy and water, Michael Hart, and the shadow minister for agriculture, Dale Last, spent last Thursday inspecting showpiece agricultural industries in the Emerald irrigation area. We were joined by the Central Highlands Regional Council mayor, Kerry Hayes, the Central Highlands Development Corporation General Manager, Sandra Hobbs, and agricultural adviser Liz Alexander. We visited the Fairbairn Dam, which is the lifeblood of the Emerald area and the Central Highlands. We also visited one of the biggest citrus producers in the southern hemisphere, 2PH Farms. Owner Craig Pressler gave us an opportunity to inspect the state-of-the-art processing facility based in Emerald, which employs over 300 people. 2PH Farms exports mandarins to key destinations such as China and South-East Asia. We also visited many other agricultural areas.

On Friday the whole shadow cabinet attended the Emerald community forum. All shadow cabinet members met with key community groups—which is something that the Labor Party has not done in Emerald—to discuss key issues.

Mr Costigan interjected.

Mr MILLAR: Absolutely. We discussed key issues such as attracting teachers to smaller remote and rural schools, sealing critical roads such as the Tambo-Springsure Road and supporting country racing. We also had the opportunity to show people what the Central Highlands has to offer. The LNP understands regional Queensland and is ready to govern for all of Queensland.

Here is the thing: what is disappointing is the absolute mess that the Labor Party has caused when it comes to the Adani Carmichael mine. What we have is a civil war between the green Labor movement or, as they like to call them, the left and the right of the cabinet.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr MILLAR: I take the interjection. They are winning and they have shut down the Premier.

Mr SPEAKER: I am trying to help you, member for Gregory, so that Hansard can accurately record your contribution. Would you like to continue?

Mr MILLAR: We need a Labor government that is prepared to back the Adani Carmichael mine. I ask: do you back it or don't you back it? They have stopped the mine in its tracks, destroyed regional jobs and shut down any prospects for towns such as Emerald, Clermont, Alpha, Jericho and the list goes on. In Central and North Queensland our opportunities for job growth have been stopped in their tracks by the loony left faction of the Labor Party, which is more interested in winning seats in Brisbane-based areas at the expense of rural and regional Queensland.

(Time expired)

Marchetti, Mr F; Australian South Sea Islanders

Mrs GILBERT (Mackay—ALP) (10.03 pm): On behalf of the entire Mackay community I send our deepest sympathy to the family and friends of Francesco Marchetti, better known as Frank. Sadly, on Sunday Frank, one of Mackay's greatest adventurers, lost his life due to altitude sickness on Mount Everest. Our thoughts and prayers are with you all.

This year in Mackay, Australian South Sea islanders are engaging in several months of activities that include football games, the Australian South Sea islander 150th art exhibition, the launch of the Pacific Island history display, the commemoration of the hurricane lamp at Bluewater Quay and the unveiling of the Mackay Cemetery project. This will be done to mark the 150th anniversary of their arrival on the first ship that was brought up the Pioneer River and tied to the Leichardt Tree. Previously, vessels to Mackay were moored on offshore islands and passengers were loaded onto barges and taken to shore as blackbird labourers.

The anniversary is a significant milestone for the Australian South Sea islander community in Mackay and an important part of Queensland's history. At 9 pm on 14 August 1863, the *Don Juan* arrived at Moreton Island with 67 Pacific islander passengers. The labourers on the *Don Juan* were

generally regarded as the initial participants of Queensland's island labour trade known as blackbirding. The islanders were brought to Queensland from approximately 80 Melanesian islands to work for the state in the cotton and sugar plantations. They were considered a source of cheap labour. Many were kidnapped or tricked by labour traders and many experienced harsh treatment and discrimination.

The 1889 inquiry into the sugar industry noted that between 2,000 and 3,000 white Europeans were employed in the industry, costing approximately £200,000 in wages per annum. By contrast, there were 6,000 South Sea Island labourers on sugar farms in Queensland, costing approximately £50,000 per annum. In 1901, after settling into the community and starting families, the South Sea islanders were harshly targeted for deportation under the White Australia policy, which split up families. South Sea islanders have a unique place in Mackay's history and culture, which should be acknowledged and recognised by all Queenslanders. These resilient Queenslanders play an important role in supporting the economic, social, political and cultural life not only in Mackay but also right across Australia. South Sea islanders work as artists, musicians, members of the Australian Ballet Co., teachers, social workers, academics and solicitors, just to name a few examples of their great work.

(Time expired)

Gold Coast, Crime

Mrs STUCKEY (Currumbin—LNP) (10.06 pm): Earlier this month in my electorate there was a shooting at Coolangatta, and police are investigating whether there are bikie links. On 23 April, at around 4 pm, two men left a Coolangatta hotel and repeatedly kicked and punched a man on the footpath. Task Force Maxima officers identified the two men as Lone Wolf outlaw motorcycle gang members. On 4 May at Helensvale, an attempted carjacking not only terrified the 24-year-old victim and driver of the targeted car but also left one of the perpetrators, a 15-year-old girl, suffering critical injuries. A 12-year-old has been charged over an armed holdup at a Gold Coast service station. Crime is on the rise under this soft-on-crime Labor government. It is extremely worrying that residents have reported triple 0 calls being diverted to New South Wales, with some going unanswered. The Palaszczuk government must get to the bottom of this and find out why Queensland communication centres cannot cope.

However, it is the rising number of our youth, some barely in their teens, who are becoming involved in highly risky and brazen criminal behaviours that should be ringing alarm bells. Tonight I argue the case for school based police officers, which has the support of principals from both high schools in my electorate and local police. However, we all seem to have been given the run-around and told differing information. Last week my office was informed that no new school based police officer positions have been committed to since 2012—that is five years ago. In that time, we have witnessed a frightening escalation in youth crime.

Given the very recent bomb hoax at Palm Beach Currumbin State High School, a school based police officer is warranted. On Wednesday, 3 May, before dawn, an envelope containing white powder and a note was left at the school gate, twice sending the school into lockdown. Students were advised to stay home. During assembly, a message about a potential bomb was sent through AirDrop by someone in close proximity. It was discovered that a 13-year-old was responsible for sending the message but did not leave the envelope at the gate. That perpetrator was still being sought. There is nothing amusing about this cruel prank, especially in light of shocking terrorist attacks that have claimed innocent lives in numerous locations around the world. Only today it was Manchester.

What is deeply disturbing about these incidences is the seriousness of the suggested acts. The hoax was designed to terrify an entire school community and wasted many hours of police, fire and rescue resources, not to mention that of parents and carers who had to alter their work and other routines.

Kids today face many challenges. Social and digital media has changed the way we communicate. More school based police officers are needed and they are needed now. I once again, after letters to my schools and to different departments, urge the minister to please commit to a school based police officer.

Strathpine Railway Station, Upgrade

Ms BOYD (Pine Rivers—ALP) (10.10 pm): Last week commuters in my electorate got the first look at the new Strathpine Railway Station. I, along with a team from Queensland Rail, released the designs of the multimillion dollar upgrade and made them available for people to view right there on the station platform. Following an extensive design process, it was so exciting for me to be able to take these concept designs straight to my community.

Not only will this station upgrade improve transport options for passengers on the Caboolture line, it will also support more than 250 jobs. This upgrade was announced in the first budget of the Palaszczuk government. Sharing the concept designs last week has now kicked off a consultation process that will listen to locals' thoughts on the new station.

This design is long overdue. Access between the platforms is via a rickety 1970s era walkway. I was talking to the ASM for Strathpine, 'Rocket' Rodney Cowles, out there last week. 'Rocket' Rod was telling me that people can actually see evidence of where the platform has been raised to allow for electrification of the Strathpine line. The design looks at the drop-off area, parking and the overall station experience. Currently, they do not match what commuters expect of a 21st century public transport system.

Everybody should be able to easily access safe public transport. That is why this upgrade will deliver lifts and a new kiss-and-ride zone ensuring wheelchair users, the elderly and parents with prams can get on a train at Strathpine station. The improvements will replace the relic of a footbridge with a modern access way between platforms, which will now also be raised in core zones. A facility upgrade and accessible toilets, extended waiting shelters and hearing aid loops will also be part of this upgrade.

The new station will be a hub for the revitalised Strathpine business district, with road upgrades, beautification and the new university campus key features of the strip upgrade that the community has long been calling for. As a community hub, safety at Strathpine station is paramount. I am pleased to note that the upgrade will also provide accessible parking and improved security features, such as better lighting and enclosed CCTV cameras.

Now that the concept is public, and following the community feedback process, it is onto the beginning of early construction works set to commence in November this year. We must next consider bus connectivity with the new campus and station. That is why I have launched my community transport survey. I encourage Pine Rivers residents to visit my website to take the survey and share their views.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.13 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Bailey, Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, 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, Kelly, King, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Lauga, Leahy, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Miles, Millar, Miller, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Perrett, Pitt, Powell, Power, Pyne, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Seeney, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Trad, Walker, Watts, Weir, Wellington, Whiting, Williams