



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

FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-SIXTH PARLIAMENT

Thursday, 3 May 2018

Subject	Page
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	949
Questions Without Notice.....	949
REPORT	949
Auditor-General.....	949
<i>Tabled paper: Auditor-General of Queensland: Report to Parliament No. 14: 2017-18—The National Disability Insurance Scheme.</i>	949
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	949
Ipswich City Council	949
Ipswich City Council	950
Domestic and Family Violence	950
<i>Tabled paper: Domestic and Family Violence Implementation Council—Progress Report—1 Dec 2016-30 Nov 2017.</i>	950
Transport Infrastructure	951
Rail Infrastructure	951
Fly-in Fly-out Workforces	952
Homicide Victims' Support Group	953
TAFE Queensland, Investment.....	953
National Disability Insurance Scheme	954
Fraser Island.....	954
QFES; Jackson, Mr AJR	955
Education, International Students.....	955
Apprenticeships	956
Domestic and Family Violence	957
White Spot Disease.....	957
SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT	958

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	958
Ipswich City Council	958
Ipswich City Council	958
Transport Infrastructure.....	959
Ipswich City Council	960
Palaszczuk Labor Government, Reconciliation.....	961
Ipswich City Council	961
Public Hospitals, Privately Insured Patients.....	962
Speaker's Ruling, Question Out of Order	962
Ipswich City Council	962
Speaker's Ruling, Question Out of Order	962
Public Hospitals, Privately Insured Patients.....	962
Sunshine Coast Rail Duplication.....	963
Education.....	964
Independent Public Schools.....	964
Regional Queensland, International Education.....	965
Political Donations	966
Seniors.....	966
Toowoomba Second Range Crossing.....	967
Manufacturing Industry.....	967
Surf Life Saving Queensland, Drones.....	968
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from the <i>Cairns Post</i> , dated 20 November 2017, titled 'Major parties consider cash for crocodile spotting program'.....	968
Kowanyama	968
VEGETATION MANAGEMENT AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	969
Second Reading	969
Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a second time.....	973
Resolved in the affirmative.....	973
Consideration in Detail.....	973
Clause 1, as read, agreed to.....	973
Clause 2 postponed.....	973
Clause 3, as read, agreed to.....	973
Clause 4—.....	973
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Vegetation Management and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018, explanatory notes to Mr Michael Berkman's amendments.....	973
Non-government amendments (Mr Berkman) negated.....	974
Clause 4, as read, agreed to.....	974
Clause 5, as read, agreed to.....	974
Clause 6—.....	974
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Vegetation Management and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018, explanatory notes to Hon. Dr Anthony Lynham's amendments.....	974
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to.....	977
Resolved in the affirmative.....	977
Division: Question put—That clause 6, as amended, be agreed to.....	978
Resolved in the affirmative.....	978
Clause 6, as amended, agreed to	978
Clause 7—.....	978
Non-government amendment (Mr Berkman) negated.....	979
Clause 7, as read, agreed to.....	979
Clause 8—.....	979
Non-government amendment (Mr Berkman) negated.....	979
Clause 8, as read, agreed to.....	979
Clause 9, as read, agreed to.....	979
Clause 10, as read, agreed to.....	979
Clause 11, as read, agreed to.....	979
Clause 12—.....	980
Non-government amendment (Mr Berkman) negated.....	980
Clause 12, as read, agreed to.....	980
Clause 13, as read, agreed to.....	980
Clause 14—.....	980
Non-government amendment (Mr Berkman) negated.....	980
Clause 14, as read, agreed to.....	980
Insertion of new clauses—.....	980
Non-government amendment (Mr Berkman) negated.....	982
Clause 15, as read, agreed to.....	982
Clause 16—.....	982
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Vegetation Management and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018, explanatory notes to Mr Dale Last's amendments.....	982
PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS.....	986
Sunshine Coast Rail Duplication.....	986
Schy, Mrs B.....	987
Inland Rail.....	987
Vaisakhi Mela.....	988
Youth Crime.....	988
Centenary Learning Alliance of State Schools.....	989

Table of Contents – Thursday, 3 May 2018

M1.....	990
Lytton Electorate, Health Services.....	990
Disability Parking Permits	991
Gold Coast Commonwealth Games	991
Mirani Electorate	992
Casey, Hon. ED.....	992
Burnett Electorate	993
Anzac Day.....	994
Ridgewood Road and Caloundra Road Intersection.....	994
Mount Lindesay Highway	995
Electricity Prices	996
<i>Tabled paper: Document, dated April 2018, by Mr Hugh Grant, Executive Director, ResponseAbility, titled 'The Winners and Losers of the Monopoly Game: How the Queensland Government profits from Queensland's excessive electricity prices'.</i>	996
Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance	996
Sunshine Coast Rail Duplication	997
Premier's Reading Challenge.....	997
DEPUTY SPEAKER'S RULING	998
<i>Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by a Minister.</i>	998
<i>Tabled paper: Letter, dated 6 March 2018, and enclosures, from Leader of the Opposition, Mrs Deb Frecklington MP, to Mr Speaker, Hon. Curtis Pitt, regarding an alleged misleading of the House by the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, Hon. Mark Bailey.</i>	998
<i>Tabled paper: Letter, dated 22 March 2018, from Mr Speaker, Hon. Curtis Pitt, to the Deputy Speaker, Mr Scott Stewart MP, in relation to an alleged misleading of the House by the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, Hon. Mark Bailey.</i>	998
<i>Tabled paper: Letter, dated 19 March 2018, from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, Hon. Mark Bailey, to Mr Speaker, Hon. Curtis Pitt, regarding an alleged misleading of the House.</i> ...	998
COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.....	999
<i>Portfolio Committees, Referral of Auditor-General's Reports and Reporting Date</i>	999
MOTION	1000
<i>Referral to Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee</i>	1000
MOTION	1000
<i>Amendments to Sessional Orders</i>	1000
Division: Question put—That the question be now put.....	1008
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1008
<i>Notice of Motion, Dissent from Deputy Speaker's Ruling</i>	1008
MOTION	1008
<i>Suspension of Standing Orders.....</i>	1008
Division: Question put—That the question be now put.....	1011
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1011
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to.....	1011
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1011
VEGETATION MANAGEMENT AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL.....	1011
<i>Consideration in Detail</i>	1011
<i>Tabled paper: Bag tabled by the member for Clayfield, Mr Tim Nicholls MP.</i>	1014
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to	1020
Resolved in the negative.....	1020
Non-government amendment (Mr Last) negated.....	1020
Clause 16, as read, agreed to.....	1020
Clause 17—.....	1021
Division: Question put—That the debate be now adjourned.....	1028
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1028
MOTION	1028
<i>Suspension of Sessional Orders; Allocation of Time Limit Order</i>	1028
<i>Notice of Motion, Dissent from Speaker's Ruling</i>	1031
Division: Question put—That the question be now put.....	1031
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1033
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to.....	1034
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1034
VEGETATION MANAGEMENT AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL.....	1035
<i>Consideration in Detail</i>	1035
Division: Question put—That the amendments be agreed to	1035
Resolved in the negative.....	1035
Non-government amendments (Mr Last) negated.....	1035
Division: Question put—That clause 17, as read, stand part of the bill.....	1035
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1035
Clause 17, as read, agreed to.....	1035
Clause 18, as read, agreed to.....	1036
Clause 19, as read, agreed to.....	1036
Clause 20—.....	1036
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to	1036
Resolved in the negative.....	1036
Non-government amendment (Mr Last) negated.....	1036

Table of Contents – Thursday, 3 May 2018

Division: Question put—That clause 20, as read, stand part of the bill.	1036
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1036
Clause 20, as read, agreed to.....	1036
Clause 21—.....	1036
PRIVILEGE.....	1037
Alleged Contravention of Parliament's Terms and Conditions of Broadcast.....	1037
<i>Tabled paper: Extract, undated, from Twitter Account of Minister for Transport and Main Roads,</i>	
Hon. Mark Bailey.	1037
DEPUTY SPEAKER'S STATEMENT.....	1037
Error in Division	1037
VEGETATION MANAGEMENT AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	1037
Consideration in Detail.....	1037
Division: Question put—That clause 21, as read, stand part of the bill.	1054
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1054
Clause 21, as read, agreed to.....	1054
Clause 22, as read, agreed to.....	1054
Clause 23, as read, agreed to.....	1054
Clause 24—.....	1054
Division: Question put—That clause 24, as read, stand part of the bill.	1059
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1059
Clause 24, as read, agreed to.....	1059
Clause 25, as read, agreed to.....	1059
Clause 26, as read, agreed to.....	1059
Clause 27, as read, agreed to.....	1059
Clause 28, as read, agreed to.....	1059
Clause 29, as read, agreed to.....	1059
Clause 30, as read, agreed to.....	1059
Clause 31, as read, agreed to.....	1059
Clause 32, as read, agreed to.....	1059
Clause 33, as read, agreed to.....	1059
Clause 34, as read, agreed to.....	1059
Clause 35, as read, agreed to.....	1059
Clause 36, as read, agreed to.....	1059
Clause 37—.....	1059
Non-government amendments (Mr Berkman) negatived.	1060
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to.	1063
Resolved in the negative.....	1064
Non-government amendment (Mr Last) negatived.	1064
Non-government amendment (Mr Berkman) negatived.	1064
Amendment agreed to.	1064
Clause 37, as amended, agreed to.	1064
Clause 38—.....	1064
Division: Question put—That postponed clause 2, clauses 38 to 56 and the minister's amendments Nos 3 to 5, as read, be agreed to.....	1066
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1066
Clause 2, as read, agreed to.....	1066
Amendments 3 to 5 agreed to.....	1066
Clauses 38 to 56, as amended, agreed to.....	1066
Third Reading.....	1066
Division: Question put—That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time.....	1066
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1066
Long Title.....	1067
Division: Question put—That the long title of the bill be agreed to.	1067
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1067
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT.....	1067
Parliamentary Procedure	1067
PRIVILEGE.....	1068
Vegetation Management and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, Correction to <i>Record of Proceedings</i>	1068
ADJOURNMENT	1068
Moggill Electorate, Anzac Day	1068
Anzac Day	1069
Bribie Island Emergency Services Expo	1069
Vaisakhi Festival	1070
Toowoomba Second Range Crossing	1070
Workers' Memorial Day	1071
Gold Coast, Short-Term Holiday Rentals	1072
Mackenroth, Hon. TM; Hansen, Dr J; Foster and Kinship Carers	1072
Theodore Electorate, Anzac Day	1073
<i>Tabled paper: Anzac Day speech, undated.....</i>	1073
Woodridge Electorate, Anzac Day	1073
ATTENDANCE	1074

THURSDAY, 3 MAY 2018

The Legislative Assembly met at 9.30 am.

Mr Speaker (Hon. Curtis Pitt, Mulgrave) read prayers and took the chair.

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I respectfully acknowledge that we are sitting today on the land of Aboriginal people and pay my respects to elders past and present. I thank them, as First Australians, for their careful custodianship of the land over countless generations. We are very fortunate in this country to have two of the world's oldest continuing living cultures in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples whose lands, winds and waters we all now share.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Questions Without Notice

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Further to my ruling yesterday, I have circulated a statement around questions asked of ministers during question time. I seek leave to incorporate the statement into the *Record of Proceedings*.

Leave granted.

Honourable members

I refer to questions asked of Ministers in question time.

All questions should be asked through the Chair which requires the Minister to be addressed in the third person.

A formulation such as:

“Mr Speaker
My question is to the Premier
Will the Premier ...”

is in order.

A formulation such as:

“Mr Speaker
My question is to the Premier
Premier, does ...”

is out of order as the last part of the question is direct to the Premier and not through the Chair.

REPORT

Auditor-General

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I have to report that I have received the Auditor-General's report 14 of 2017-18 titled *The National Disability Insurance Scheme*. I table the report for the information of members.

Tabled paper: Auditor-General of Queensland: Report to Parliament No. 14: 2017-18—The National Disability Insurance Scheme [604].

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Ipswich City Council

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.32 am): The people of Ipswich have lost confidence in their city council. There are too many charges levelled at too many officials for anyone to have confidence in the management of Ipswich City Council. The people of Ipswich come first. In a moment the local government minister will detail actions we are initiating immediately to begin restoring people's faith not just in Ipswich but also in local government everywhere.

Only recently we governed from Ipswich for a week. People came to me with their concerns. They were worried about becoming Australia's dump. We acted with the waste levy. They came to us with their concerns—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order, members. The Premier is not being provocative.

Ms PALASZCZUK: They came to us with their concerns about their local council. We are acting on those concerns.

The work leading us to this day has been underway for some time. Governing is not about being rash; it is about being considered and responsible and taking the right action at the right time. That time is now. Enough is enough. This will stop. I am stopping it. The people of Ipswich deserve better. The Minister for Local Government will now detail the actions that he will take under the act.

Ipswich City Council

 **Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (Minister for Local Government, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (9.34 am): When a community loses faith in its elected leaders, as is the case in Ipswich, it is time to act. The situation we see in Ipswich today is of the gravest concern. The people of Ipswich are shocked by what has happened. Some are angry. Many are outraged. Others are, quite frankly, appalled at what they perceive as the repeated breaches of trust from their elected representatives. The Ipswich community is reeling.

Twelve people, including two mayors and two CEOs, are facing a total of 66 charges. The current Ipswich mayor is facing seven charges of fraud as a result of CCC investigations. Frankly, the eyes of the Ipswich City Council have been off the ball. The impacts we have already seen are devastating on the morale of council staff, including on the personal wellbeing of individuals; on council's ability to deliver good policy outcomes; and on the Ipswich community as a whole.

Based on urgent legal advice, the government will now commence the process of appointing an administrator at the Ipswich City Council, as provided by the Local Government Act. The government has not taken this decision lightly; however, I have reached the conclusion that the Ipswich City Council can no longer function effectively. I acknowledge the support of the Leader of the Opposition and the CEO of the LGAQ for this course of action.

Today I will ask Ipswich City Council to show cause why they should not be dismissed. Next week I will be asking cabinet to consider strengthening the legislative powers of the local government minister to dismiss councils when they have lost the trust of their community. I appreciate that this course of action will impact councillors who were only recently elected; however, I believe this course of action is necessary to restore public confidence in the Ipswich City Council.

Domestic and Family Violence

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.36 am): Last night I gathered with hundreds of Queenslanders at a candlelight vigil on the cliffs of Kangaroo Point to remember dear friends, colleagues and family members who are no longer with us because of domestic and family violence. We also stood committed to take action. It is time for us to take a stand as a community and commit to doing something. Doing something saves lives. Doing this together changes society.

Domestic and family violence affects everyone: men and women, children, extended family members, friends, workplaces and society as a whole. No-one is immune. We all may know someone who has suffered or is suffering, and we all have a responsibility to help them. Last night I was very pleased to present Red Rose Foundation's new domestic violence awareness production by Queenslander Megan Doneman. Today I table the six-month report of the Domestic and Family Violence Implementation Council.

Tabled paper: Domestic and Family Violence Implementation Council—Progress Report—1 Dec 2016-30 Nov 2017 [605].

We are making good progress. There is still more to do. I am pleased to say that, of the 121 recommendations, 90 recommendations have been completed. The remaining 31 recommendations have commenced. This is great news. Key outcomes in this report include finalisation of the evaluation framework for the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Strategy, delivering the 'Stop the Hurting: End Domestic Violence' campaign; and delivery of a train-the-trainer campaign across health sectors.

My government has allocated more than \$320 million to drive a comprehensive program of reform. Our latest campaign, launched last week, focuses on bystanders and seeks to inform, influence and inspire bystanders to help victims. I thank the council—I especially thank chair Kay McGrath—for their outstanding work. I know that together we will bring about long-term, culture-changing solutions that can save lives.

Transport Infrastructure

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.38 am): The government is committed to providing jobs for Queenslanders—more jobs, rewarding jobs and productive jobs. We also want Queenslanders to have more time to spend with their families. That means tackling the causes of congestion, especially in high-growth areas of South-East Queensland. It is why we started work on vital upgrades of the M1 straight after the Commonwealth Games, as we move towards having at least six lanes of motorway from the Tweed to the Brisbane River and on towards the Sunshine Coast. It is why my government is not waiting for Canberra but is pushing ahead on its own with Cross River Rail, the congestion-busting project that will deliver jobs and added public transport capacity for decades to come. My government also wants to progress the duplication of the Beerburum-Nambour rail line. This will be a key priority in our upcoming state budget.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Ms Trad interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order, member for Kawana.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take that interjection from the Treasurer.

Mr SPEAKER: Manager of Opposition Business and Deputy Premier, I will not have a repeat of that sort of interjection and cross-chamber activity. You are both warned under the standing orders.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take the interjection from the Deputy Premier. When the opposition were in government in this state they failed to commit to this project. This long-discussed upgrade will provide much needed additional track capacity and improve reliability for train services to the Sunshine Coast. Further north it will save travel time and allow increased passenger and freight services on the north coast line, but what we need is for the federal government to come to the table.

I see this morning that the Prime Minister may be putting some money on a table, but it is not enough to build this line. It was the federal government that included this corridor in the National Land Transport Network and committed to funding this project on an 80-20 basis. I will watch with interest next week's federal budget to see how much money Canberra will stump up and when it will be made available to our great state. I look forward to seeing a serious commitment from Malcolm Turnbull to provide Canberra's fair share of funding for this project of significance for Queensland and Australia.

Rail Infrastructure

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (9.40 am): I acknowledge the contribution just made by the Premier in relation to the Beerburum-Nambour rail upgrade project on the Sunshine Coast. I also acknowledge the money that has been, as the Premier said, put on the table somewhere in some place by the Turnbull government in relation to this project, but we are yet to see the details around the announcement.

I have to place on record that I am disappointed that the Turnbull government is offering only a 50-50 funding arrangement with the state government for what is a nationally significant piece of infrastructure on the National Land Transport Network. The north coast line is one of Queensland's major economic transport corridors, facilitating freight and passenger movements between Queensland's eastern coastal population centres. The Beerburum-Nambour project, coupled with the delivery of Cross River Rail, will unlock the capacity both on the Sunshine Coast and in the inner city for more rail services. It will allow us to deliver more frequent, more reliable rail services for residents on the Sunshine Coast.

We are fully funding Cross River Rail because the Turnbull LNP government has refused to contribute one single cent to this project. We sought funding from the Commonwealth for the Beerburum-Nambour project. We submitted the business case and they have offered up only 50 per cent of the project costs. We need the Turnbull government to contribute their fair share on this nation-building project.

Ms Simpson: You're copping out!

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, please resume your seat. Members to my left, as I have said repeatedly, this House is not an opportunity for you to just make comments as you would like. It is an opportunity to hear, as per the *Notice Paper*, ministerial statements. There is a time called question time where there is an opportunity to probe the government. I am hearing increasing numbers of interjections. There was nothing provocative from what I could hear in what the Deputy Premier was saying.

Ms TRAD: I will take the interjection from the member for Maroochydore, who said that we are copping out. The only party that copped out when they were in parliament were those opposite. Every single seat on the Sunshine Coast bar one belongs to them. Was one single cent committed to this project? Was a business case progressed? Was anything done in relation to the duplication of the Beerburum-Nambour rail line? Not one single thing was done. We have developed the business case and sent it to the federal government. I am pleased to see money on the table, and we have allocated funds in our state budget. I am waiting for the federal budget to see exactly what the Commonwealth government will be allocating to the whole of Queensland before making a decision around accepting this offer.

What is sensible is that we approach all of our needs around infrastructure funding and infrastructure upgrades throughout our state holistically, not this piecemeal process that the Commonwealth government are engaging in. Let me be really clear about this because we know that sometimes when the federal government talks money they talk funny money. In last year's federal budget they announced a much hyped \$10 billion national rail fund. The only catch was that none of the money would be available until 2019 at the earliest. As I said yesterday, this is the same government that continue to withhold support from the Cross River Rail project based on a flawed Infrastructure Australia report that contained a number of errors and that has been widely ridiculed and criticised. At the same time, they are committing \$5 billion to a rail line in Melbourne that does not have an alignment and that does not have a business case, but that is okay because that is not Queensland. It is one deal for the other states and a different deal for Queensland. New South Wales and Victoria gets billions for infrastructure and we get the spare change.

The Palaszczuk government has a strong record of delivering the transport infrastructure that Queensland needs to support our growing population. We need a federal government that is going to match that commitment and pay its fair share, and one day we may get an LNP opposition that is prepared to stand up to its Canberra masters.

Fly-in Fly-out Workforces

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning) (9.45 am): Friday, 30 March was Good Friday, but it will go down in history as a great Friday to be a worker in Queensland as it marked the commencement of our new laws to regulate fly-in fly-out workforces on Queensland resource projects. From that day, the Strong and Sustainable Resource Communities Act came into operation, and it is delivering on the Queensland government's commitment to prohibit 100 per cent FIFO workforces. Very importantly, large resource projects near regional Queensland communities cannot employ 100 per cent fly-in fly-out workforces.

This is good news for regional communities because it ensures that local residents have access to fair job opportunities and it allows existing workers the choice to live in nearby regional communities. Large resource projects captured by the act are those that have 100 or more workers and an environmental authority and are located within a 125-kilometre radius of a nearby regional community with at least 200 residents. Importantly, the Coordinator-General has the discretionary power under the act to include other projects, for example, that have a smaller workforce or where the regional community is smaller than 200 residents or further away.

Following an extensive consultation process, Queensland's independent Coordinator-General has initially listed 61 large resource projects—43 coal, 15 mineral and three liquefied natural gas projects—and a total of 265 nearby regional communities associated with these projects. This means any project on the list currently operating with a 100 per cent FIFO workforce now has six months to transition away from 100 per cent FIFO and include recruitment of workers from nearby regional communities.

From Good Friday, 30 March 2018, these large resource projects listed are also prohibited from discriminating against residents of nearby regional communities in the future recruitment of operational workers. The new enhanced social impact assessment guideline for future projects going through an EIS will also support local and regional resource communities. Project owners will have to demonstrate to the Coordinator-General that their workforce and supply chain arrangements provide opportunities to build strong and sustainable resource communities.

These are the first laws of their type in Australia and are an important achievement of the Palaszczuk Labor government. They are a particularly powerful legacy of the former member for Mirani, Jim Pearce. I want to pay tribute to his advocacy in this area. I also want to acknowledge the previous minister for state development, the member for Stafford, for his work on this project.

In conclusion, in a debate in the House last night I inadvertently stated that the business case for Nullinga Dam was released in February last year. It was, in fact, February this year.

Mr SPEAKER: Before calling the minister, I want to acknowledge and welcome in the gallery members of the Queensland Homicide Victims' Support Group. Please make them feel welcome.

Homicide Victims' Support Group

 **Hon. MT RYAN** (Morayfield—ALP) (Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services) (9.48 am): Can any human being experience a more profoundly affecting event than the sudden loss of a loved one? The answer quite simply is no. What if that loss is at the hands of someone who acts with cold and callous disregard for the sanctity of human life—someone who is a murderer? The effect on the victim's loved ones is like a stone bruise to the soul—a pain that can never be erased. As you have correctly acknowledged in your remarks, Mr Speaker, in our midst today are people who understand that pain. I warmly welcome members of the Queensland Homicide Victims' Support Group to the gallery today. They are here for a very important reason. Today is homicide victims awareness day—an important day because it reminds us all that nothing can replace the loss of a loved one through homicide. Nothing ever totally heals those scars, but support can make a difference.

For two decades now, the Queensland Homicide Victims' Support Group has been reaching out to families, offering support and care when they need it most. I pay tribute to the Queensland Homicide Victims' Support Group for working with government to drive important laws through this parliament—laws aimed at easing the burden for those left behind. Last year this parliament passed the no-body no-parole legislation. I take this opportunity to thank sincerely the families who played such an influential role in promoting the adoption of this landmark law—advocates like Bruce and Denise Morcombe, the parents of Daniel; Fiona Splitt, whose husband Bruce was murdered north-west of Cairns, and Bruce's body has never been found; and Gary and Leanne Pullen, whose son Tim was murdered in 2012. Tim's body has also never been found.

Despite their grief, these families keep fighting for justice, for closure. Their work is truly inspiring, and today it is fitting to acknowledge the Queensland Homicide Victims' Support Group's hardworking members, supporters and volunteers for reaching out to others in their time of need. Our government provides financial assistance to this organisation to help them deliver crisis response, specialist grief and trauma services, peer support, court support, police support and 24-hour telephone support. We are enormously grateful to them for that work. Finally, I take this opportunity to also acknowledge our hardworking police officers who work so hard to bring the perpetrators of these cruel crimes to justice and for supporting those families when they need it most.

TAFE Queensland, Investment

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Small Business and Minister for Training and Skills Development) (9.51 am): A strong vocational education and training sector is vital if we are to respond to the skills needs of the future, and TAFE Queensland is the premier provider in Queensland, thanks to the actions of the Palaszczuk government. The Palaszczuk government has delivered on our commitment to rescuing TAFE. We are now building on that success by investing in state-of-the-art equipment and facilities across Queensland, providing Queenslanders with the high-quality skills that industry requires.

Last week I announced over \$1 million in investment towards upgrading engineering facilities at the Ashmore TAFE campus on the Gold Coast. Stage 1 is already underway and students will soon have access to state-of-the-art welding bays. Stage 2 will include new welders, LED lighting, 3D printers and even more upgraded equipment. Our investment means that this TAFE will soon be able to offer advanced trade classes that will benefit not only engineering students but also those studying electrical, plumbing and welding.

At TAFE's South Bank campus, I recently announced the Palaszczuk government will support world-class culinary and patisserie training through an investment of \$3.7 million towards a new state-of-the-art commercial kitchen as part of our exciting new partnership with world renowned cooking school Le Cordon Bleu. Providing superior training facilities for our future master chefs will drive our hospitality industry to the next level.

In Townsville the Palaszczuk government recently spent \$1.6 million upgrading the Pimlico TAFE campus. The newly refurbished space has been created to increase student amenities to study, research and be part of the wonderful culture at the Pimlico campus. The \$1.6 million project included the demolition and complete refit of two levels of D Block, refurbishment of the resource centre and construction of two new lecture theatres. This funding is on top of the Palaszczuk Labor government's election commitment, providing \$85 million towards upgrading TAFE campuses across Queensland.

At a time of funding cuts and uncertainty at the federal level, the Palaszczuk government is passionate about making sure that Queenslanders have the training and skills they need to build a career. We want TAFE to be the premium provider of training in this state. Through investments like these, our government will ensure that TAFE facilities are modern, fit-for-purpose and flexible, delivering world-class training for Queenslanders.

National Disability Insurance Scheme

 **Hon. CJ O'ROURKE** (Mundingburra—ALP) (Minister for Communities and Minister for Disability Services and Seniors) (9.54 am): The NDIS is inching closer to its largest and final year of transition. At full scheme, the Queensland government will fund the NDIS approximately \$2.035 billion every year. We are fully committed to the NDIS delivering certainty and great outcomes for Queenslanders with disability for generations to come, and we will pay our state's fair share to make that happen.

In our last term, the Palaszczuk government stood shoulder to shoulder with the disability sector and with people with disability and delivered an early launch for Queensland. The reason we did this was that the Queensland LNP government was the only state government to not trial the NDIS. While people across Queensland are experiencing supports never before received and lives are changing for the better, the federal government has not ensured the on-the-ground support needed to keep up with the larger numbers that are starting from June this year.

I am pleased to report that, in regions that have fully transitioned to the NDIS, every Queenslander who had been receiving disability services from the state has transitioned to the NDIS. However, new participants are being kept at a disadvantage because key NDIS infrastructure is not being delivered on time. Over the past two years, I have been repeatedly raising concerns about the extreme risks created by not having the local area coordinators in transition sites six months before the transition begins. As recently as last Friday, I have written to Minister Tehan—I wrote to minister Porter before him and minister Fifield before him—about the need to have things in place and on time.

The other major concern I have been raising is the delay in rectifying grey areas around mainstream interface issues. Time and time again, the Queensland government has had to step in on big issues like transport and health care where the NDIS has caused a problem. We reinstated the Taxi Subsidy Scheme, early childhood development programs and school transport as well as established an interim system to deliver wound management, catheter care and trachea care. I am now pressing for these interface issues to be resolved as a matter of urgency for the longer term, and I am happy to report that the Disability Reform Council has agreed to this.

The NDIS is a great reform. Every day of the transition brings new successes and new challenges. This government will continue to step up and do what is needed to give Queenslanders with disability the certainty and the opportunity that they deserve.

Fraser Island

 **Hon. LM ENOCH** (Algester—ALP) (Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef, Minister for Science and Minister for the Arts) (9.56 am): K'gari, otherwise known as Fraser Island, is one of the most pristine locations Queensland has to offer. It gives me great pleasure to update the House on the international World Heritage Day celebrations held there recently, as well as my announcement of the 22 new Queensland Indigenous Land and Sea Ranger positions to be funded by the Palaszczuk government.

I can report that 7 December last year marked the 25th anniversary of K'gari's inscription on the World Heritage List—a truly significant achievement. K'gari was listed as a World Heritage area for its ancient sand dunes, forests and freshwater lakes, and its exceptional natural beauty, which traditional

owners have been caretakers of for thousands of generations. Its listing meant that K'gari was now in the same league as the Great Wall of China, Machu Picchu, the Galapagos Islands and the pyramids of Giza.

On 18 April, I joined the Butchulla people, K'gari's traditional owners, conservation advocates and community members to mark the anniversary. We also celebrated the achievements of those who fought to protect K'gari's natural and cultural values—from the first declaration of national park areas on the island in 1971; the cessation of mining in the 1970s and logging in 1991; and the recognition of the Butchulla people's unbroken connection to country with their native title determination in 2014. I was also very pleased to announce that the Butchulla Aboriginal Corporation was one of seven Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander organisations to successfully secure funding for 22 new ranger positions under the expanded Queensland Indigenous Land and Sea Ranger program.

In the 2017-18 budget, the Palaszczuk government announced an additional \$8 million over four years to increase the number of land and sea rangers working on country. This program delivers multiple benefits for first nations communities. These include contributing to Closing the Gap targets in addition to the protection of some of Queensland's most significant ecosystems and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultural heritage. Land and sea ranger teams carry out a range of activities including habitat restoration, feral animal and weed control, species conservation, fire management and community engagement. This includes delivery of the very successful junior ranger program, which has been demonstrated to positively contribute to school attendance.

These new positions are in addition to the existing 76 rangers currently employed across 17 communities in North, Central, West and South-East Queensland. The Queensland government benefits from these partnerships with first nations people who have cared for their country for thousands of generations, and it is exciting to see these partnerships expanding across the state.

QFES; Jackson, Mr AJR

 **Hon. CD CRAWFORD** (Barron River—ALP) (Minister for Fire and Emergency Services) (9.59 am): I would like to take the opportunity to update the House on a significant fire that occurred in the Brisbane suburb of Salisbury on Sunday night that left an elderly man's residence destroyed. Ninety-nine-year-old Arthur James Robert Jackson was a pilot in World War II. He received many medals for his service, including the French government's highest honour, the Legion of Honour. Mr Jackson's Legion of Honour was lost in the fire on Sunday night. Unfortunately, firefighters could not find his medal as they braved the flames. However, they did manage to retrieve other medals awarded to Mr Jackson throughout his World War II career including memorabilia, uniform badges and patches. These medals are extremely important not only for Mr Jackson himself but also as a story that tells a significant part of Australia's history. They have stood the test of time, and it is humbling to see that our firefighters went above and beyond to ensure the house fire did not get this prestigious award.

The medals recovered are now in the safe hands of Mr Jackson's power of attorney. Firefighters have indicated that the fire took hold very quickly and that Mr Jackson was fortunate to get out safely. Thankfully, his house was fitted with a working smoke alarm, which alerted Mr Jackson and his neighbours to the danger. Neighbours rallied, doing a great job helping him get to a point of safety as quickly as possible.

An incident such as this highlights not only how working smoke alarms save lives but also how it is a joint effort from several different areas across QFES. I would like to personally thank the Firecom staff who received the first triple 0 call at 7.13 pm and the 16 firefighters from multiple fire stations, including Acacia Ridge, Kemp Place, Annerley and Rocklea, who quickly arrived on the scene and were immediately thrown into action. A total of eight crews attended, with some crews remaining on scene for nearly five hours. The QFES Fire Investigation unit attended the following morning at 9.45, when they managed to determine the probable cause of the fire.

On behalf of all Queenslanders, I would like to finish by taking this opportunity to thank every person who contributed in their own way at Mr Jackson's place. They should be very proud of their efforts, their selflessness, their professionalism and their dedication.

Education, International Students

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Cooper—ALP) (Minister for Innovation and Tourism Industry Development and Minister for the Commonwealth Games) (10.02 am): I have great news for Queensland. A record number of international students are studying here in Queensland. In the year to February international student enrolments grew by 12.5 per cent to more than 81,000, and we are growing our market share faster than other states like Victoria.

International education generates more than \$4 billion for the Queensland economy and supports more than 19,000 jobs across the state, making it our second largest services export after tourism. Upwards of 120,000 international students from more than 160 countries study here in Queensland, and more than 30 per cent of those students are in regional Queensland.

We are also leveraging the Commonwealth Games to make sure we continue to grow Queensland's international education sector. During the games we worked closely with the team at Study Gold Coast and CEO Shannon Willoughby to promote Queensland to key international education markets like India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. We also brought six digital influencers, who collectively reach an audience of more than 1.2 million potential students, to the Gold Coast to see why we all love it and to share their experiences with their friends and students back home.

Our government has invested heavily in international education through a whole-of-government strategy to grow international students and training. We know that by increasing the number of international students here we will also deliver a significant boost to tourism in our state.

Apprenticeships

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works, Minister for Digital Technology and Minister for Sport) (10.03 am): The Palaszczuk government believes that government employment of apprentices delivers important outcomes for young people, especially in the regions of this state, and that providing these opportunities is an integral part of creating a strong economy. That is why today the Minister for Training and Skills Development and I are announcing that the Palaszczuk Labor government is bringing back the Housing and Public Works apprenticeship program. Government has a critical role to play in the provision of apprenticeships for our young Queenslanders and we are delivering.

We will rebuild methodically. We will start by employing 20 new apprentices this year and another 20 in the following year. Crucially, we are returning to creating quality, secure jobs for the regions. Apprentices will then be on a steady path to lifetime employment. If people have a trade qualification, be it electrical, plumbing, carpentry or any other trade, they have the ability to work literally anywhere in the world because we will always need sparkies, plumbers and builders in every community.

Sadly, not everyone shares that view. In 2011-12, under a Labor government, QBuild employed 294 apprentices, but in July 2013 the then LNP government merged QBuild with the Public Works section of Project Services. They renamed this new, merged service Building and Asset Services and then they gutted it. They cut a devastating number of front-line jobs. In fact, in 2012 QBuild had a workforce of more than 2½ thousand staff—tradespeople and apprentices who had quality, secure jobs right across the state, building vital infrastructure and assisting Queenslanders, particularly in times of natural disaster. After the LNP took their razor to QBuild, in 2015 we were left with just 1,073 BAS staff. The LNP burned QBuild to the ground and put more than half of those workers out of a job.

Then, to add insult to injury, they pulled the rug out from under the apprenticeship program. They stopped the apprenticeship program and stopped taking on new apprentices. Here is the thing: they had sacked so many experienced trade staff that if they had hired apprentices they would not have had anyone left to mentor those apprentices anyway.

I am delighted to announce, along with Minister Fentiman, that from today that is all about to change. Later this week, Queenslanders will see the first advertisements in newspapers across the state calling for new applications. We will be employing apprentices in the trades of electrical, painting, plumbing and stonemasonry. Most importantly, we will be employing these apprentices in regional Queensland. Those apprentices will hit the ground running on 30 July in Atherton, Ayr, Brisbane, Caboolture, Cairns, Kingaroy, Rockhampton, Thursday Island, Toowoomba and Townsville.

Mr Dick: They don't want them in Kingaroy.

Mr de BRENNI: No, they do not. They do not want apprentices. They do not want to directly employ staff at all. These apprentices will be mentored by experienced tradespeople as they learn. They will build vital infrastructure for Queenslanders. They will be among the first responders when natural disasters strike and they will do extraordinary work securing and repairing schools, hospitals and social housing, often before the cyclones hit. Through this program, we will continue to rebuild Building and Asset Services.

Unlike those opposite, this Labor government is a government that does believe in quality, secure jobs. We believe in growing jobs in our regions and building a strong economy. Clearly it is only Labor governments that believe in building a secure future for young Queenslanders.

Domestic and Family Violence

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (10.07 am): As we mark Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month, I would like to update the House on the many legislative reforms the Palaszczuk government has introduced to address these crimes. The Palaszczuk government has zero tolerance for domestic and family violence. That is why we ensured that a circumstance of aggravation of domestic and family violence can be applied to all criminal offences when committed in a domestic violence setting. We amended the Criminal Code in 2015 to ensure that a person's criminal record notes whether an offence was committed in a domestic and family violence context. Importantly, as at the end of March 2018, as a consequence of those changes, almost 28,000 charges lodged across Queensland had been noted as having been committed in a domestic and family violence context.

We introduced into the Queensland Criminal Code the standalone offence of choking, suffocation or strangulation, which carries a maximum penalty of seven years jail. At the end of March, 1,621 charges had been lodged in relation to 1,469 defendants. The Palaszczuk government has increased the maximum penalty for breaches of domestic violence orders and we have streamlined the processing of these DVO applications and allowed courts to increase these orders to up to five years. We have introduced and funded a permanent specialist Domestic and Family Violence Court in Southport. We have extended this specialist court to Townsville, with circuits to Mount Isa and Palm Island, and will also operate a specialist domestic and family violence court at Beenleigh. We have introduced greater protections for victims who appear as witnesses in such hearings.

We recognise there is more to be done and that a true cultural shift is required to prevent domestic violence in the first place. However, I can assure Queenslanders we are committed to legal reforms which protect victims and hold offenders to account.

Mr SPEAKER: I acknowledge in the gallery today school leaders from Hillcrest Christian College in the electorate of Mudgeeraba.

White Spot Disease

 **Hon. ML FURNER** (Ferny Grove—ALP) (Minister for Agricultural Industry Development and Fisheries) (10.09 am): I rise to update the House on the Palaszczuk government's response to white spot disease in prawns. White spot disease has taken a sledgehammer to the seafood industry in the south-east corner, and the effects are being felt right along the supply chain. Three weeks ago our sampling and testing program in Moreton Bay confirmed the presence of a virus in several prawns caught in the waters off the Redcliffe peninsula. As part of the latest round of surveillance, prawn and crab samples were collected from 54 sites in Moreton Bay. Testing has returned positive results for nine of these sites. Five of these sites have been confirmed by the Australian Animal Health Laboratory and the remaining sites are still to be confirmed. All results will soon be available. It is important that we complete the testing from all sites before making any decisions on the future of our white spot disease strategy.

These positive results will place continuing pressure on commercial fishers and prawn farmers who operate within the white spot disease movement restriction area. That is why in late 2017 a working group was formed which includes representatives from the Queensland Seafood Industry Association, Moreton Bay Seafood Industry Association, Queensland Seafood Marketers Association and local commercial operators. The group has been working to combat the impact of white spot disease and implemented a very successful seafood confidence campaign over the recent Easter break to bolster support for our local seafood industry. I thank those industry leaders for taking a constructive position and working with government to address a common problem.

In addition, we have been conducting research into the use of gamma irradiation on bait prawns and soil sediment assessments on prawn farms. We are hoping to identify the minimal effective dose of gamma irradiation that will prevent infection in prawns. A reduced treatment dose would help the industry to continue trading uncooked prawns sourced from Moreton Bay. The soil assessment work will tell us how effective our destruction and decontamination activities have been and broaden our understanding of aquatic disease control and management.

The Palaszczuk government is committed to maintaining open communication with the seafood industry throughout the surveillance, sampling and testing process. We will continue to include industry in discussions about the future of white spot disease management moving forward. I encourage all Queenslanders to consume as much Queensland seafood as possible to support the industry.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (10.12 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until 9.30 am on Tuesday, 15 May 2018.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Mr SPEAKER: I wish to welcome to the gallery Ms Annabel Jellet from Queensland Academies. Ms Jellet is the 2018 YMCA Queensland youth parliament member for Southport. The 2018 YMCA Queensland youth parliament will culminate in a residential sitting week from 23 to 29 September. No doubt Annabel will learn a trick or two from watching question time this morning.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr SPEAKER: Question time will conclude at 11.13 am today.

Ipswich City Council

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (10.13 am): My first question without notice is to the Premier, and I ask: for more than six years now the Premier has been the leader of the Queensland Labor Party—

Government members: Hear, hear!

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Members to my right, I appreciate the enthusiasm but questions will be heard in silence.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Will the Premier tell the House when she was first warned about concerns in Ipswich and what she did about them?

Ms PALASZCZUK: As we know, the CCC has been formally investigating a number of councils. My government has acted today, and I want to thank the Minister for Local Government for taking swift action in relation to the Ipswich City Council. From the outset can I also say to the citizens of Ipswich that we are on their side. I honestly believe that they have been through turmoil. The way in which the people of Ipswich have been let down is bitterly disappointing. As I said very clearly, enough is enough. We support the CCC's investigation 100 per cent, and I think all members of this House support the CCC's investigation. When we receive reports about that and when issues are raised publicly, we take action.

Mr Powell interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, resume your seat. Member for Glass House, if you would like to ask a question then rise to your feet.

Ms PALASZCZUK: As the Minister for Local Government said very clearly today, an administrator will be brought in as quickly as possible so that once again the people of Ipswich can have confidence in the administration of their council.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I rise to a point of order. The question was very clear—

Mr SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The Premier has finished her remarks. Please feel free to ask your next question.

Ipswich City Council

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: My second question without notice is to the Premier. In response to concerns about Ipswich last year the Premier said, 'That's just Jo-Ann being Jo-Ann', and, 'I feel quite hurt and upset.' As it turns out, that warning appears accurate. Will the Premier accept responsibility for the situation in Ipswich?

Ms PALASZCZUK: As I said very clearly, we have an independent watchdog in this state called the CCC which those opposite talked down when they were in government.

Honourable members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is right: they came in here in the dead of night and sacked the committee. That is what the opposition thinks of the CCC. Let me make it very clear: I support the CCC 150 per cent, as do the people of our great state. When the member for Kawana was the attorney-general he was hell-bent on—

Mrs Frecklington: No responsibility with respect to that?

Ms PALASZCZUK: You hated the CCC—

CHAIR: Premier, you will refer your comments through the chair.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Those members opposite always criticised the independent watchdog in this state.

A government member: Always have.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Always criticised. Let me make it very clear: we support the work that Alan MacSporran is doing. He has been gathering evidence, charges have been laid, and as soon as that action has been taken my government has acted swiftly. If you want to talk about allegations, look at Scott Driscoll, the former member for Redcliffe. You just sat there and backed him up.

Ms Trad: Took the money.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is right; I take that interjection. Has the LNP paid back the money? Has the money been paid back by Scott Driscoll? You backed Scott Driscoll 100 per cent and you let him sit here, so do not come out here and lecture me, Leader of the Opposition!

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I will have order in the House! Whilst I was having difficulty hearing the Premier, Premier, I again ask that you refer your comments through the chair. It is critical to ensure that the House functions well.

Ms PALASZCZUK: There is a long history of those opposite being against an anti-corruption watchdog in this state. One only has to look at the election of the Goss government—

Mr BLEIJIE: I rise to a point of order. My point of order is with respect to relevance. The question was about the serious issues in Ipswich, nothing to do with what the Premier is talking about.

Mr SPEAKER: I have been listening very carefully to the Premier's remarks. Certainly from what I can hear in amongst all of the interjections it appears to me that she is being relevant to the context of the question and I will allow her to continue her contribution.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Let me state very clearly: my government backs the CCC in this state. We have seen it do a thorough investigation. The time has come to take swift action in relation to the Ipswich City Council so the people of Ipswich can have confidence in their council once again.

Mr SPEAKER: Members to my left, I will say this once today: I expect that if you are going to be asking questions you will do it at the appropriate time, not be continually asking questions during question time by way of interjection.

Transport Infrastructure

Mrs LAUGA: My question without notice is directed to the Premier. Will the Premier outline some of the government's key transport priorities and how the federal government contributes to these important projects for Queensland?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Keppel for that very important question because we know how important the Bruce Highway is not only in her part of Queensland but also right up and down as the main artery for people to commute and for families and for the delivery of transport right across our great state. During the election campaign I announced that we would be establishing a Bruce Highway Trust with an initial injection of \$175 million and \$200 million annually.

The trust will seek to boost productivity, safety and flood resilience and allow investment certainty for a billion dollars worth of annual investment. We have always seen a partnership on the Bruce Highway with the federal government, and we want to see that partnership continue into the future. Lately we are seeing an alarming disrespect from Malcolm Turnbull and those federally when it comes to funding key infrastructure in this state. Just yesterday we talked about the M1 in that across the border it is 80-20 and as soon as you come into Queensland it is a different formula. It is a different set of rules for Queensland.

Mr Dick: Cross the border and the rules change.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is right; I take that interjection. It is almost a cross-border rule change. We want funding certainty from the federal government and we want our fair share of funding, and our fair share of funding does not mean changing the rules at a whim for their own political purposes. We will continue to fight for our fair share not only when it comes to issues like the M1 but also in relation

to the Beerburum-Nambour rail, because we know that Warren Truss made it very clear when he was deputy prime minister that those non-urban project corridors would be funded at an 80-20 split, and all of a sudden there is a big change of rules. He said—

The Australian government has reintroduced the traditional 80:20 funding split for new road and rail projects on the national network outside of metropolitan areas.

That is what he said. Next week we have the federal budget. I want to see Queensland get its fair share. We pay our taxes. Why should Queensland be treated any differently to New South Wales and any differently to Victoria? It is about time those opposite picked up the phone and did a bit of lobbying on behalf of Queensland as well.

Ipswich City Council

Mr MANDER: My question without notice is directed to the Deputy Premier. For almost six years now the Deputy Premier has represented the Labor Party in this House, including—

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Members to my right, I have already issued a warning. If I find out who is instigating remarks during questions, I will name you under standing orders. Questions will be heard in silence.

Mr MANDER:—being the minister for local government and, prior to that, a senior Labor Party official. My question is: when was the Deputy Premier first warned about concerns in Ipswich and what did the Deputy Premier do about it?

Ms TRAD: I thank the member for Everton for the question. There is a very clear process in this state around—

Honourable members interjected.

Ms TRAD: In Queensland—

Mr Crandon: When did you know?

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Coomera, you are warned under standing orders.

Ms TRAD: In Queensland, as the Premier has already outlined, we have an anti-corruption watchdog. We have the Queensland Police Service. The anti-corruption watchdog, which the Premier referred to, is an organisation—an institution—within Queensland that those opposite have sought to destroy over the course of time.

If people have allegations or if they have issues and concerns around criminal activity, corrupt activity, then they need to be presented to the appropriate authority. Anyone can get up and say whatever they like, but if they do not have evidence then they are hollow words. That is why when those opposite sought to outlaw—to prohibit—anonymous allegations being put to the CCC we brought them back so that anyone can make allegations to the CCC without substantiating their name, without supplying a statutory declaration, so any Ipswich resident who has any concerns, any allegations, any evidence, has witnessed anything suspicious can send it anonymously to the CCC.

Let us go through what those opposite did when they were in power. First of all, they took out the head of the CCC. They ran him to ground and put in someone who would be compliant with the government line—someone who went up to the Premier's office and got riding instructions. What else did they do? They sacked the Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee, of which I was a member, in the dead of the night. What else did they do? They sought to change the rules so that if any Queenslander wanted to make an anonymous allegation to the CCC to be followed up they were prohibited from doing so. They had to supply a statutory declaration.

If they want to come in here and talk about who knew what when, let us talk about what they are prepared to do when it comes to the CCC. I reiterate: anyone can get up and say anything they like, but they need the evidence to back it up—

(Time expired)

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members to my left and the member for Gympie, you have just outed yourself with, I think, a very loud interjection, as did the member for Burleigh during that. Your voices are very distinguishable and you are both warned under standing orders. I would suggest that the member for Toowoomba South and the member for Toowoomba North as well as the member for Chatsworth tread carefully.

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Reconciliation

Ms LUI: My question is directed to the Deputy Premier. Will the Deputy Premier inform the House about what the Palaszczuk government is doing to advance reconciliation in Queensland?

Honourable members interjected.

Ms TRAD: I was just waiting for those opposite to be quiet and pay respect to what is a very important issue in our state. I thank the member for Cook for her question. It is a very important question. We all need to come together in a bipartisan way to walk the reconciliation path, and I acknowledge the many Indigenous communities and first nations people within the member for Cook's electorate. Today I am really pleased and proud to announce that during this month, which is the month when we do honour Reconciliation Week from 27 May to 3 June, we will be funding a number of reconciliation events throughout the state, four of which are in the member for Cook's electorate.

For the first time they have been funded through a reconciliation grants program that has been established by the Palaszczuk Labor government. I thank all the members of this House who have taken the opportunity to work with their communities to seek funding for these events so that they can host very special reconciliation events in their electorates. I look forward to getting around to as many as possible. I am sure the Premier will try to get to as many as her diary can afford to accommodate. We are very proud to be working very hard on the journey to reconciliation.

I wish I could say the same thing about our federal government. Unfortunately, I cannot. In terms of the federal LNP government and its commitment to reconciliation, we know that it boils down to a few words: housing in remote Indigenous communities. Quite frankly, today I am ashamed to be called an Australian because the federal government is walking away from its commitment to fund housing in remote Indigenous communities.

Mr Langbroek interjected.

Ms TRAD: I think the member has a problem with Lebanese people. That was clear from his interjection. Despite many letters from the Premier, from me and from the Minister for Housing, despite the pleas of local councillors and the LGAQ, and despite representation from Indigenous people, the federal LNP government will be refusing to fund the remote Indigenous housing program in Queensland.

This program is not just about providing a roof over people's heads in remote Indigenous communities, which is fundamental to closing the gap; it is also about jobs and skills in those communities. The fundamental start to reconciliation must be with the Commonwealth playing its part.

Ipswich City Council

Ms LEAHY: My question without notice is to the Premier. Today, the Premier said that she will work with the CCC in terms of Ipswich. Will the Premier assure the House that the powerful internal administrative committee of the Labor Party will hand over to investigators all material it had received regarding concerns at Ipswich?

Ms PALASZCZUK: If the CCC wants any information from any source, it can get it. It has the powers of a standing royal commission. We believe in that.

I will go back to a previous answer I gave. Even under the Newman government, concerns were raised about the Ipswich City Council. In fact, the member for Broadwater was the local government minister when the former Ipswich mayor, Paul Pisasale, was referred to the corruption watchdog. This matter goes back even as far as 2014.

What did the LNP refer Mr Pisasale about? He was referred to the CCC over undisclosed political donations of \$150,000. That sounds very familiar to me. After a motion was passed in this House, the LNP is yet to declare about \$100,000 of secret donations to this House.

I spoke earlier about the fact that those opposite have always sought to curtail the powers of the CCC. We saw that clearly when the member for Kawana was the Attorney-General of this state. The LNP members bypassed the requirement for the bipartisan support of the appointment of the CCC chair. How did they get around that? They did that by continuing to appoint an acting chair when that appointment should have received the bipartisan support of both sides of this House. That was very disappointing.

The Deputy Premier spoke at length about how we restored those powers so that anyone can make a complaint with any evidence to the CCC. What did the LNP government want to do? It wanted a signed statutory declaration that curtailed the powers of the public to make complaints. The LNP government also wanted to curtail the CCC. I remember hearing at an estimates committee that the

LNP cut 30 jobs from the CCC, the anti-corruption watchdog in this state. For those members who were not here, in the dead of night the LNP members opposite came in here and sacked the parliamentary CCC committee because they did not like what the parliamentary committee was looking at.

How dare the LNP members opposite come in here and lecture when they have a long history in this state of being against anti-corruption watchdogs in this state. I commend Alan MacSporran and the extraordinary work that he has been doing in this state.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: I ask all members to be conscious of the sub judice rule and not stray into any matter relating to the current pending charges against any person. It should also be noted that the previous question walked a very fine line, because it dealt more with the administrative matters of a party as opposed to the Premier's portfolio responsibilities. However, the Premier was happy to answer that question.

Public Hospitals, Privately Insured Patients

Mr SAUNDERS: I refer to the comments made by the federal Minister for Health, Greg Hunt, that rising private health premiums are due to an increase in the number of private patients in public hospitals. Will the minister outline the impacts on Queenslanders that a federal government limitation on the use of private health insurance in public hospitals will have?

Speaker's Ruling, Question Out of Order

Mr SPEAKER: Member, you have not indicated which minister you were speaking to and you have resumed your seat. I am sorry, but that question is out of order.

Ipswich City Council

Mr JANETZKI: My question is to the Deputy Premier. As the Deputy Premier was a former member of the most important anti-corruption committee in the parliament—

Ms Jones interjected.

Mr JANETZKI:—did the Deputy Premier run a protection racket for Ipswich Labor councillors?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Cooper, you interjected during the question. You are warned under the standing orders.

Mrs D'ATH: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on the ruling that you have just given. As I understand it, that question goes to allegations that are now potentially before the courts.

Speaker's Ruling, Question Out of Order

Mr SPEAKER: I think the question relates to a member's former role with the PCCC. There is also a suggestion that it would breach the sub judice rule. I rule that question out of order.

Public Hospitals, Privately Insured Patients

Ms PEASE: My question is directed to the Minister for Health. I refer to the comments made by the federal Minister for Health, Greg Hunt, that rising private health premiums are due to an increase in the number of private patients in public hospitals. Will the minister outline the impacts on Queenslanders that a federal government limitation on the use of private health insurance in public hospitals will have?

Dr MILES: I thank the member for Lytton for what is an excellent question. I thank both her and the member for Maryborough for their advocacy—

Mr Mander interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the minister had barely commenced his contribution and you were all over him. My goodness! Deputy Leader of the Opposition, you are warned under the standing orders. Members, some of you may not wish to hear the answers to these questions. I do.

Dr MILES: The federal LNP Turnbull government has launched yet another attack on Queensland's public hospitals. Greg Hunt is now suggesting that privately insured patients should not be allowed to use Queensland's public hospitals. The LNP is just doing the bidding of the for-profit private hospital sector, because those private hospitals do not want to compete with Queensland's public hospitals.

In recent years we have seen an exodus of patients out of private hospitals and into public hospitals. In fact, a third of the increase in demand at our public hospitals has come from an increase in patients who would, in the past, have been treated in a private hospital. In part that is because our doctors, nurses and health professionals in our public hospitals are doing a fantastic job but also, in many parts of Queensland, there is not a private hospital for privately insured patients to use; there are only public hospitals.

If the LNP succeeds with its plan to deliver monopoly billing rights to private hospitals, those Queenslanders will have no choice. They will not be able to use their private health insurance, which will mean they will leave their insurance company and costs will go up.

One might wonder why the federal LNP government is so determined to deliver to the private hospital industry? What is its motivation? For the benefit of the House, I can advise that in the lead-up to the last federal election the private hospital industry donated \$755,000 to the federal Liberal Party—three-quarters of a million dollars—to buy Malcolm Turnbull's election and now they are doing their bidding. The fact is we do not know if there were private hospital donations in the \$100,000 you still will not disclose.

Opposition members interjected.

Dr MILES: I call on those opposite, especially those in seats without a private hospital, to stand up to Malcolm Turnbull, stand up for the health care of their constituents, and demand that privately insured patients continue to be allowed to access Queensland's public hospitals.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, some advice: I would like to hear the comments through the chair. We will not refer to members as 'you' in this chamber.

Sunshine Coast Rail Duplication

Mr POWELL: My question is to the Premier. The Premier was former premier Bligh's transport minister and failed to deliver the Sunshine Coast rail duplication after the project was promised by Labor in 2009. Today the Turnbull government has committed \$390 million and asked the Palaszczuk government to match its commitment. Why is the Premier continuing to hold the Sunshine Coast to ransom and will the government finally get on with this important project?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Glass House for that question. Was he not listening to the ministerial statement, the question I received from the member for Keppel, or the ministerial statement that was handed down by the Deputy Premier where we made it very clear that it is a priority of this government? You were a minister in the Newman government.

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, I would ask you to comment through the chair.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Through the chair, the member for Glass House was a minister in the Newman government and a Sunshine Coast member.

Mr Powell interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Glass House, you have asked the question; hear the answer.

Ms PALASZCZUK: How much money did the Newman-Nicholls government allocate for this project? When those opposite were in government how many MPs did they have on the Sunshine Coast? They were good at sacking. They were good at cutting. When I was transport minister I was very pleased to work on the Gold Coast Light Rail. Now look at the Gold Coast Light Rail; it is the best piece of infrastructure on the Gold Coast. Once again it is my government delivering for the people.

As I said very clearly, it is a priority. Let me make it very clear again for the member for Glass House, who obviously was not listening, it used to be funded on an 80-20 split.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The Leader of the Opposition is very rude today, very disrespectful. Here I am trying to repeat an answer I have given in this House twice before—three times if we include the Deputy Premier. The member for Glass House obviously is a little hard of hearing. Those opposite do not listen. They think, 'Here is my question for today. I had better ask this question,' not even knowing that the question had previously been answered. They only have one job: write a question, stand up and read it out.

Unfortunately we are seeing Malcolm Turnbull turn his back on Queensland. It is a funding shortfall. Rather than those opposite standing up for Queensland, they are prepared to just grovel to Canberra and accept anything that comes their way.

Mr Powell interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Glass House, your interjections are designed to disrupt, which is why I did not interrupt the Premier. You are now warned under standing orders.

Education

Mr BROWN: My question is to the Minister for Education. Will the minister advise the House on how the Palaszczuk government has delivered a high-quality education in Queensland despite the ongoing uncertainty at a federal level?

Opposition members interjected.

Ms GRACE: Those opposite might laugh about questions to do with the federal budget and federal funding for Queensland, but on this side of the House it is no laughing matter. It is very important that Queensland gets its fair share under the federal budget. We on this side of the House will fight every day for Queensland to get every single dollar that we can get for the benefit of Queenslanders and we will not be short-changed to give money to Victoria, New South Wales and the other states. You may laugh all you like. You may think this is funny.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister.

Ms GRACE: Through the chair.

Mr SPEAKER: Not just through the chair, you will not refer to those opposite as 'you'. I ask you to put your comments through the chair.

Ms GRACE: Through the chair, those opposite may not like what they hear, but we will not stop fighting for Queensland. That is what we stand for and that is what we will do every single day. We do not care how much they hate hearing about it; we do not care for one minute. I thank the honourable member for the question. I know how important education is in his area. I visited schools with him, and I know that education is a big part of what he believes in.

The Palaszczuk government is delivering a record \$13 billion budget for Education this financial year. The record spend on Education is not just a one-off. The Palaszczuk government is committed to making sure that we give all students in Queensland a great start. That is why our government is also investing more than \$800 million in the Building Future Schools Program. These new schools and classrooms will provide Queensland communities with the vital infrastructure needed to educate the growing numbers of students attending state schools. Let me remind those opposite, so they do not forget, that the biggest education reforms were delivered by the Labor government, such as the introduction of prep, the year 7 into high school and the new senior assessment and tertiary entrance systems due in 2019. The Palaszczuk government has invested around \$73 million in progressing the introduction of the new ATAR while those opposite sat on their hands and did not spend one cent on this fantastic new system.

Yesterday was it not risible to be lectured in this House by the member for Kawana on how to negotiate an agreement with the federal government? Little did he know I had already been in contact with Simon Birmingham on Sunday night regarding the Gonski review. Did he not bell the cat when he was so insistent that IPS schools be left to be independent? What were his words? 'That they make decisions without interference'. Isn't it laughable? It is only when they agree. The minute they do not agree with something they are right in there interfering. They have no idea when it comes to education, but I will give one guarantee to the House: we will fight for every dollar for Queenslanders and we will do it in a professional way.

Independent Public Schools

Mr BLEIJIE: My question without notice is to the Premier. Will the Premier guarantee that all 250 independent public schools will continue to have full autonomy, including the ability to hire—

Ms Jones interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Cooper, I trust you were not speaking during the question.

Mr BLEIJIE: She was.

Mr SPEAKER: I call the member for Kawana.

Mr BLEIJIE: My question without notice is to the Premier. Will the Premier guarantee that all 250 independent public schools will continue to have full autonomy, including the ability to hire, allocate and reallocate staff according to the wishes of the school and leadership?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for the question. I do not have any problems with what the member is saying, because we believe in providing the best quality education to students right across our state. That is something that, as a government, we have been committed to. Unfortunately, it was not necessarily something that they were committed to when they were in government.

I remember when the travelling show school was axed. They stopped the education of children who travelled with their families to perform shows across Queensland, including throughout regional Queensland. That was their attitude towards education. Unlike those opposite, we do not have a list of schools to be shut. They thought it was a great idea to close schools. Under their minister for education, Fortitude Valley State School was marked 'for sale' and was on the closure list. We saved that school, which is going to be turned into an inner-city high school as we partner with QUT to provide great education. Of course, that happened across the state.

There is a very stark contrast between our commitment to education and that of those opposite, who treated staff with disrespect, cut schools and did not fund the travelling show school. On this side of the House, we have brought in record budgets for education because we value our teachers and our principals. We are making sure—

Mr Langbroek: As we did. It's always a record, because schools are getting bigger. There are more students and teachers.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take that interjection from the member for Surfers Paradise, who was the minister for education with the hit list to close schools in this state. It is right that the education sector is growing, yet they wanted to close schools. I put on record my acknowledgement of the excellent work that the education minister is doing in this state and that our former education minister did in this state. We value our students and are inclusive. Education transforms lives. It is the great leveller. A student in the Torres Strait can receive the same education as a person attending a school in the bush or here in Brisbane. It is about giving that opportunity, which is at the cornerstone of Labor values and the cornerstone of this Labor government. We will continue to back education in this state for many years to come.

Regional Queensland, International Education

Mr O'ROURKE: My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Tourism Industry Development and Minister for the Commonwealth Games. Will the minister please update the House on the Palaszczuk government's initiatives to support international education in regional Queensland?

Ms JONES: I thank the honourable member for his question. I know that since being elected as the member for Rockhampton he has been very passionate about growing jobs in his community. At the moment, international education is worth around \$9 million to the Rockhampton economy. Today I am very proud to announce that we are working very closely with the Rockhampton community to establish Study Rockhampton, which will provide opportunities to grow international education numbers in that community, which are of significant benefit not only to the university and TAFEs but also to the growth of the economy at large.

We know that for every international student secured into Queensland, we get about three visits from friends and families to that local community. What better place to visit than Rockhampton, particularly next week, which is Beef Week. I am really looking forward to going to Rocky during Beef Week. In the past 20 years, the beef sector has grown each and every year, even with other things at play. I am looking forward to seeing the honourable member for Rockhampton in Rocky next week.

Ms Palaszczuk: I'm going, too.

Ms JONES: I will see the Premier there. However, a very serious matter was reported in the *Courier-Mail* on 28 February, which was that the \$2.2 billion cuts to the tertiary education sector of this country will have a more detrimental effect on rural and regional communities than anywhere else. It is about time that members opposite started standing up for those communities.

Mrs Frecklington: Are you kidding me?

Ms JONES: I take that interjection from the Leader of the Opposition. It is about time that the honourable member for Nanango stood up against the continuous cuts to regional and remote communities in this state.

Mrs Frecklington: What are you talking about?

Ms JONES: I take that interjection from the Leader of the Opposition. She just said, 'What are you talking about?' I am talking about the honourable member's Canberra colleagues who are cutting \$2.2 billion from our universities and that all of the reports into the consequences of those cuts show that rural and regional universities are going to be hit hardest.

If the Leader of the Opposition does not know about this, maybe she should meet with the vice-chancellor of CQU? Maybe she would like to meet with the vice-chancellor of the Southern Queensland University? Maybe she would like to meet with the vice-chancellor of James Cook University? If she wants to know, I call on the member for Nanango to do her homework and talk to the sector so that she can understand the consequences of those cuts. If she paid attention, she might have noticed that they are cutting funding from our schools, from Queensland hospitals and from Queensland roads. It is about time that the Leader of the Opposition stood up to her mates in Canberra and did her job.

Political Donations

Mr BERKMAN: My question is to the Premier. Putting aside legislative action already finalised or pending and issues at the local government level, will the Premier outline to the House what further actions the government intends to take to prevent the perceived and increased risk of corruption created by political donations at the state level?

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Maiwar, you said 'putting aside legislative action'. The Premier will need to answer carefully, but she may answer the question any way she chooses.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Maiwar for the question. Of course, there is legislation before the House and I am very conscious of not disrupting that. On this side of the House, we have introduced real-time disclosure. We believe that there should be full and public disclosure of political donations that come to political parties. As I said in this House today, we have put reforms in place. We are yet to see details of around \$100,000 of secret donations to the LNP. I understand that that matter is still being considered and future donations are still to be declared. Of course, we want to be as transparent as possible. That is what one gets from this side of the House. Unfortunately, we have not seen it from the other side of the House.

The other thing we did was lower the threshold. When my government was first elected, we introduced disclosure and reduced the threshold so that people can see what is being declared. My understanding is that when the LNP was in government the threshold was \$12,800, so a whole lot of donations under that threshold were secret and hidden from the public. We brought that threshold right down to \$1,000, which is declared in real-time disclosure. In fact, I think that Queensland is leading the way when it comes to this area of reform. I would like to see this at the federal level as well. I firmly believe that the processes we have put in place in Queensland should be a benchmark for the national level.

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, I apologise. I am hearing many questions from my left, yet no-one has risen to their feet to ask those questions during question time. I have given my ruling on that. I caution members to my left.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Maiwar for his interest in such an important area of reform. It is one that my government has taken swift action on.

Seniors

Mrs McMAHON: My question is to the Minister for Communities and Minister for Disability Services and Seniors. Will the minister update the House on what the Palaszczuk government is doing to help our most vulnerable achieve better financial security?

Mrs O'ROURKE: I thank the member for the question. I share her concern with regard to the financial sustainability of some of our most vulnerable constituents. Sadly, there are people across Queensland who are doing it tough—caught up in a vicious debt cycle and, frustratingly, unable to break free. What makes this situation worse though is that some unscrupulous payday lenders are charging our vulnerable Queenslanders up to 800 per cent interest. Needing extra money for car repairs or unfortunately having to repair a broken fridge can be all it takes to send some of these people into a spiralling debt cycle.

I am proud that the Queensland government is offering a viable alternative to payday lenders to Queenslanders struggling to make ends meet. Front and centre of these efforts are our two Good Money stores—one based in Cairns and one based on the Gold Coast. These stores are experiencing strong demand for budgeting advice and zero or low interest loans.

In fact the Good Money stores in Queensland received close to 3,800 inquiries for services from April last year—when they opened their doors—until March this year. In the same time, they have provided more than \$970,000 in no- or low-interest loans to Queenslanders doing it tough. This goes to show how much these stores are needed in their local communities.

I am proud that the Queensland government is providing more than \$1 million this financial year to the two Good Money stores. This is part of our financial literacy and resilience funding totalling \$3.5 million in 2017-18. The financial literacy and resilience program, also known as Better Budgeting, is about building financial reliance amongst Queensland individuals and families and addressing the issue of financial exclusion.

The program includes additional financial resilience workers and counsellors, continued emergency relief and, of course, our two Good Money stores. We do remain committed to helping vulnerable Queenslanders, but the state cannot do it alone. We need the federal government to work with us. Unfortunately, when it comes to supporting vulnerable Queenslanders the Turnbull government has been dragged kicking and screaming to put in place protections.

I understand that there is a bill before the federal House of Representatives to remove the ability for payday lenders to charge monthly fees when a consumer fully repays the loan early, to impose a cap on total payments that can be made under rent-to-buy schemes and to increase penalties. The Turnbull government needs to act quickly because these changes cannot come soon enough.

Toowoomba Second Range Crossing

Mr WATTS: My question without notice is directed to the Minister for Transport and Main Roads. I refer the minister to the contractor he appointed to build the Toowoomba Second Range Crossing. Will the minister assure the House that Toowoomba local subcontractors are not being forced to initiate costly court proceedings against Nexus just to get what they are owed?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the honourable member for his question. The Toowoomba Second Range Crossing project has a very high local content provision to ensure that local businesses benefit from this very large project. I believe it is above 75 per cent. It is a very strong provision. Of course all subcontractors should be compensated and paid appropriately and in a timely fashion. If the member has any specific instances where he is dissatisfied and he wishes to provide them to me, I am happy to follow them up.

Manufacturing Industry

Mr POWER: My question is directed to the Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning. Will the minister please update the House on what the Palaszczuk government is doing to promote investment in manufacturing in Queensland? Is the minister aware of any other approaches?

Mr DICK: I thank the member for Logan for his question and pay tribute to his ongoing support for a vibrant manufacturing industry in Queensland. This week the government released its response to the Queensland Productivity Commission report into manufacturing.

Our government is absolutely committed to driving a reinvigorated policy agenda for manufacturing and jobs in our state. That includes powering on with our key initiatives that drive economic growth in our state, including delivering our commitment to double the Made in Queensland program. A further \$20 million round of funding, as honourable members would know, bringing the total value of that program to \$40 million, has been invested and injected by our government. We are also delivering the highly successful \$65 million Advance Queensland Industry Attraction Fund, with existing allocations expected to generate over a quarter of a billion dollars in capital investment in our state and create over 580 jobs. These programs are delivering great outcomes for our state.

Not everyone is riding on the maroon bus. As soon as she heard about it, what did the Leader of the Opposition say? She said—

The Labor government is happy to give taxpayer funded handouts to interstate and international companies. These companies then compete against Queensland businesses.

I suppose we can rule out Boeing. We do not need them. We do not need those jobs according to the Leader of the Opposition. We do not need Qantas Dreamliners in Queensland. We would not want Qantas Dreamliners serviced here. We do not want Virgin Australia here. They came to Queensland under a Labor government in the year 2000. That investment has generated 3,000 jobs in

Queensland. We do not want Oji Fibre Solutions' new big factory in Yatala with satellite factories in places like Mareeba, which is supported by the member for Cook. If those opposite do not want them in Bowen and they do not want them in Bundaberg—please stand up, member for Bundaberg, and say we do not want—

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, direct your comments through the chair.

Mr DICK: And no Rheinmetall and the jobs that that would bring. I want to know from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the shadow Treasurer, whether this would be the first program they would cut. When they were in government they axed the Queensland industry incentive scheme. They axed the Queensland manufacturing industry solutions for manufacturing fund. He does not say much about the budget. He does not say much about economic policy. In fact, he does not say much at all about his portfolio. Is this the first cut? Is the shadow Treasurer going to back these programs or is he going to axe these programs? We want to know what he will do.

We have had the greatest exposition of collective amnesia today that we have ever seen in Queensland—‘No, we didn’t do anything to the CCC. We didn’t do anything to the PCCC. We did not do anything when we were in government.’ They want to forget their government. Why would they not—how appalling it was. I ask the members opposite, including the shadow Treasurer: will they back them or will they axe them? I will keep asking that question until they answer it.

(Time expired)

Surf Life Saving Queensland, Drones

Mr MILLAR: My question without notice is directed to the Minister for Fire and Emergency Services. I table an article from the *Cairns Post* five days before the last election where both major parties committed to funding a Surf Life Saving Queensland trial to use drones to patrol North Queensland beaches for crocodiles.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Cairns Post*, dated 20 November 2017, titled ‘Major parties consider cash for crocodile spotting program’ [606].

Why has the minister reneged on this promise which is an important public safety initiative for Far North Queensland?

Mr SPEAKER: Member, it is my understanding that the Minister for Fire and Emergency Services has made a commitment in his capacity as a local member and not as part of his portfolio responsibilities. I do not believe that the minister actually has carriage of that particular commitment. If the minister is willing to answer the question, I am happy to allow the question.

Mr CRAWFORD: I thank the member for the question. This is my first question so thank you very much. To clarify, there is obviously some crossover between my portfolio and my capacity as local member. QFES has a partnership with Surf Life Saving Queensland in terms of a number of funding models. There is a bit of a connection there. Leading into the last election Surf Life Saving Queensland came to all sides of government asking for a \$150,000 commitment towards drone trials throughout Queensland, particularly North Queensland. Neither side, that I am aware of, made a commitment to fund that particular trial.

Since coming into this House as Minister for Fire and Emergency Services, I have been engaging with Surf Life Saving Queensland on a regular basis. We have been having those conversations about what we can do in that space. I am very keen to see drones used on the Queensland coastline for a range of items that Surf Life Saving Queensland could use them for, such as looking for crocodiles, looking for sharks, patrolling the beaches and using it as part of their overall beach protection models. I reject any statement that I have reneged on any promises because there were no promises given. What I can say to the member and to the House is that that is something I am very keen to see us do. I am happy to have those conversations further offline with the member.

Kowanyama

Mr HEALY: My question is to the Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services. Will the minister please update the House on his recent trip to Kowanyama following the damage caused during the wet season?

Mr RYAN: I thank the member for Cairns as well as all of the members for Far North Queensland for their support of their communities, particularly the discrete Indigenous communities who have experienced some pretty bad weather over the last month or so. It was a great pleasure to be in

Kowanyama last month with the Police Commissioner and the president of Parole Board Queensland to inspect damage caused by recent Tropical Cyclone Nora. I am happy to report to the House that the community is bouncing back strongly. They have a great council and a great community. They were also very grateful to have a visit from the Premier and the Minister for Fire and Emergency Services in the aftermath of the cyclone.

I am also very proud to be the ministerial champion for Kowanyama. I really enjoy getting up to the community as well as having my regular conversations with the council including the mayor and the CEO. I would particularly like to acknowledge you, Mr Speaker, when you were previously sitting on the treasury bench, for your role in reinstating the government's ministerial champion program for Indigenous communities. It is a great program. It allows our government to not only work more closely with those Indigenous communities but to be real champions and to make sure that we stick up for all Queenslanders irrespective of they live. I am very pleased to see that our government's support for Kowanyama is ongoing and deep. The community are very happy with the recent announcement of a new fire truck—thank you very much, Minister Crawford—a new rural fire appliance for Kowanyama, as well as other support.

Where our government invests in remote and Indigenous communities and supports Queenslanders right across our state, those opposite and their mates in Canberra have failed to deliver. Those opposite and their mates in Canberra continue to ensure that our remote Indigenous communities are not invested in by the federal government and are not supported. I was very disappointed to see that the federal government funding has been cut for a really important program in my portfolio area of corrective services—the Time to Work Employment Service. It is a program offered through the University of Southern Queensland, which has its presence in the member for Toowoomba North's electorate and has a connection with the member for Toowoomba South's electorate, as well as offering programs right across the state. This is a program which helps prisoners breaking the cycle of offending. It helps prisoners gain important skills around literacy and numeracy and to go on to do further study.

This program, which was funded by the federal government, has come to an end. The federal government has not made any further commitment. It is a disappointing development. It is not surprising, because the federal LNP has failed to invest in Indigenous communities in Queensland.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: The time for question time has concluded.

VEGETATION MANAGEMENT AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from 2 May (see p. 942), on motion of Dr Lynham—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Hon. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy) (11.14 am), in reply: I thank the honourable members for their contributions to the debate on the Vegetation Management and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. This bill before the House confirms the Palaszczuk Labor government's commitment to ending broadscale tree clearing in Queensland—again. Queensland Labor governments have led the way on balanced, measured and responsible land-clearing laws. From the introduction of the Vegetation Management Act in 1999 to the ban on broadscale tree clearing in 2006 and protections for high-value regrowth in 2009, it was Labor's reforms that decreased clearing to an all-time low in 2009, when only 53,590 hectares were cleared.

I have listened to those opposite talk about the impact of the bill on the agricultural community. If you were to believe the rhetoric from the member for Burdekin, the member for Gympie, the member for Gregory, the member for Warrego and other members from that side of the chamber, then you would think that in the years between 1999 and 2012, when Labor's vegetation management laws were in place, agricultural industries withered on the vine. In fact, we know that the opposite was the case. Queensland agricultural industries thrived and prospered during this period. Again, if you listened to those opposite—and I particularly point to the nonsensical contribution from the member for Glass House—you would think that, under Labor's laws, Queensland did not produce any bananas, any sugar, any cotton, any wheat, any citrus, any strawberries or any pineapples. Obviously in Labor's time there was not one fruit salad in Glass House.

Madam Deputy Speaker, let me assure you that Queensland always has and always will continue to produce high-quality and high-value agricultural produce not only for domestic consumption but also for export. Labor will always support agriculture in this state. Agriculture is a major contributor to our state's economy and is a major employer. The agricultural community continued to grow and thrive in Queensland under Labor's vegetation management laws. Labor's view, unlike those opposite, is that we can grow our state's agricultural sector and protect our environment at the same time. Labor has always been able to get the balance right because that is what we stand for—measured, balanced and responsible vegetation management laws.

Let me contrast that to what we have seen from the LNP. The Newman government, of which the Leader of the Opposition was assistant minister to the then premier, gutted Labor's laws. As a result of those irresponsible changes, we have seen the re-emergence of broadscale tree clearing in our state and we have seen overall clearing rates rise. That is a fact. We have seen tree-clearing rates, particularly the most important being remnant vegetation, reach 138,000 hectares in 2015-16. This is the highest rate of clearing of remnant vegetation in more than a decade.

At a time when the rest of the world is reducing its emissions, Queensland is driving Australia's emissions up thanks to the LNP's land-clearing laws. Labor has always maintained that the debate about sustainable vegetation management in this state is not about farmers versus conservationists. It is not about taking sides: it is a question of science. Labor accepts the science that proves that unsustainable rates of tree clearing are damaging Queensland's environment and our climate and, ultimately, damaging our economy. It was due to Labor's vegetation management reforms that Australia was able to meet its Kyoto targets for reducing carbon pollution. We acted and we achieved results. That is what responsible governments do. That is what the Palaszczuk government promised to do at the past two state elections.

During debate the member for Nanango lamented the loss of the former member for Hinchinbrook, Mr Andrew Cripps. There are not a lot of things I agree on with the member for Nanango, but I must agree with her that the quality of debate from those opposite has diminished greatly in the former member's absence. I will talk to some of the issues raised by the member for Nanango and Leader of the Opposition and some of her colleagues.

Those opposite raised the issue of consultation. The Leader of the Opposition claimed that Labor's reforms are based on dodgy figures and no consultation and that the very people these laws hit the hardest were not even given a seat at the table when these laws were written. I would like to remind the member for Nanango and those opposite of the explanatory notes to their own vegetation management bill—the one introduced by the same Mr Cripps in 2013. On the issue of consultation they state—

Consultation with external stakeholders and the community has not occurred. Consultation will occur once the bill is introduced to parliament.

It is perfectly acceptable for them to have no consultation! On the issue of consultation, I acknowledge the thoughtful and balanced contribution to this debate by the member for Bancroft as chair of the State Development, Natural Resources and Agricultural Industry Development Committee. He said—

There has never been a better consultation process by a committee in this House.

I sincerely thank the member for Bancroft and his fellow committee members—the members for Ipswich West and Mount Ommaney—for their objective and comprehensive review and for the recommendations they made in response to more than 13,000 submissions and the eight public hearings held across the length and breadth of this state at which they heard from almost 130 witnesses.

The Palaszczuk government presented its detailed commitments on native vegetation management at the 2017 state election. It was the same commitment that successive Queensland Labor governments had taken to the Queensland people election after election. Our plan was not a secret; it was a key plank of our commitment to the people of Queensland—to work hard to do what we could to reverse the decline in the Great Barrier Reef. That was our commitment and we are following through today.

By contrast, in 2012 those opposite signed up to an election policy that there would be no removal of Queensland's tree-clearing laws. What did they do? They did exactly the opposite. Despite their commitment to the Queensland people, they introduced the so-called high-value agricultural permits and irrigated high-value agricultural permits. We now know that these high-value agricultural permits

have been used to clear remnant bushland for pasture and not high-value agriculture. The LNP government, to quote the then minister for natural resources, 'took an axe' to Queensland's responsible and successful vegetation management laws. This has seen important remnant forests being cleared. Labor's commitment to the people of Queensland, made at the past two state elections, was that we would close this down.

Members opposite have piously called for a RIS program and economic modelling for these reforms. Where was the RIS when the Newman government took an axe to Queensland's world-leading vegetation management framework—a stable framework at the time? There was not one. Where was the economic modelling on the impacts of the LNP's reckless laws on Queensland's \$6 billion tourism industry associated with the Great Barrier Reef? There was none. Where was the analysis of the loss of jobs in the tourism industry? There was none.

Mr Millar interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Pugh): Order, members.

Dr LYNHAM: I am trying to explain that when they brought in their own bill there was no data, no RIS, no modelling—no nothing. He is asking me where the data is. I am explaining to him that there was no data to back that. Where was their analysis around the impacts on water quality and loss of essential habitat for endangered wildlife? Again, there was none. What about the economic modelling of the increased agricultural activity they said they would generate? There was not even any on that.

Labor's reforms are about reinstating the responsible vegetation management framework that existed before 2013. If you want to understand the economic outcomes of these reforms, look at what happened to our rural industries under Labor's laws pre 2013. They thrived then and will continue to thrive in the future. It is nonsensical to suggest, as those opposite have, that the reinstatement of the ban on broadscale tree clearing will stop the growth of the Queensland agricultural sector. Preliminary analysis by my department of soil suitability and water availability shows that there is more than one million hectares of Queensland's best agricultural land that can be used for grazing which could be developed for cropping. The land is currently category X on property maps of assessable vegetation, which means that no clearing of regulated vegetation is required to significantly expand cropping in Queensland. The reality is that there are significant opportunities for our agricultural industries to grow and prosper on previously cleared land without the need to destroy remnant vegetation.

Labor's election commitment included measures to protect high-value regrowth vegetation. Once again, we are reinstating responsible controls that were dismantled by the LNP's government changes to the Vegetation Management Act. This high-value regrowth vegetation shows many of the characteristics of remnant vegetation. That is why it is called high-value regrowth.

I now turn to the issue of economic opportunities in the Cape York Peninsula area. Since 2007 there have been statutory provisions supporting economic development in the Cape York Peninsula area through the Cape York Peninsula Heritage Act. This bill changes nothing in relation to that. Labor has always supported and always will support the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people with their aspirations for economic development and their ability to manage traditional lands. We have listened to the concerns that have been raised by leaders of the cape's Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people that the existing processes contained in the Cape York Peninsula Heritage Act are unnecessarily complicated. In response, we have committed to review this act with respect to the provisions supporting economic development opportunities for traditional owners.

Our commitments extend to all landholders, and we retain important mechanisms to support responsible landholders manage native vegetation. We retain the fodder harvesting accepted development code. Harvesting under the code requires notification but not an approval. Harvesting can commence as soon as the notification is made. The revised code is similar to the code that was made in 2013 and approved by former LNP minister Cripps, with some additional checks and balances.

Contrary to what we have heard from those opposite, the government has not banned landholders from managing thickened vegetation. We have listened to the scientists and implemented some controls. It is a justified, responsible response. Our decision is guided by science. Based on the scientific advice received, I have an obligation as the responsible minister to withdraw the managing thickened vegetation accepted development code once this bill has passed and has royal assent. As the responsible minister I understand that there is a legitimate need to manage thickened vegetation. It is for this reason that the practice will remain as a relevant purpose for which application can be made for development approval. At present there is a \$3,130 fee for applications for a development approval—a cost set by the department of state development. These application costs will be reviewed as part of a wider assessment of the efficacy of the approval process.

I would like to address an issue that was raised on a number of occasions that the bill would affect housing affordability. This claim was made on the basis that local governments may, in a future review of their planning schemes, have regard to essential habitat, category C. The claim was that this risk increases uncertainty and in turn affects land prices. I provide the advice that future development areas in faster growing regions of the state are identified through regional plans, which does give long-term certainty to the development industry.

I would now like to address the claims by the member for Bundaberg that the expanded powers of entry that are part of the bill will give my department powers that even police do not have. It is disappointing that the member for Bundaberg has been misleading in his comments. As a former police officer he really should know better. Under section 60 of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act police have powers to enter and search a premises that are far greater and more intrusive than those proposed in this bill.

The new power of entry enables departmental officers to enter land where there is a reasonable belief that a vegetation-clearing offence has been or is occurring. Written notice must be given. The power to enter is limited and they cannot enter residential dwellings. The power does not allow an officer to enter a person's home. This power of entry is necessary to ensure effective and proactive enforcement of vegetation-clearing legislation and to prevent serious and often irreversible impacts on biodiversity. This provision simply brings the Vegetation Management Act in line with powers that already exist in the Water Act and the Land Act.

I now come to the amendments circulated by the member for Maiwar. These amendments to the bill included reinstating high-value agriculture and irrigated high-value agriculture exemptions for land clearing provided the area of remnant vegetation being cleared is less than 1,000 hectares or 10 per cent of the property. These amendments circulated by the member for Maiwar would have meant some 114,000 hectares of remnant vegetation potentially being cleared and opened a loophole one could drive a bulldozer through. However, I understand that common sense has prevailed and the member for Maiwar has withdrawn these amendments. It is a bizarre world in which the environment movement calls on the Greens to withdraw amendments that would weaken environmental protections.

The high-value agriculture exemption proposed by the Greens is the same tool that Campbell Newman used to nobble vegetation management protections in 2013. Go figure! Where did that come from? It is the same exemption that was used to clear 32,000 hectares of vegetation on Olive Vale. Go figure! The Greens would rather remnant vegetation be cleared for HVA and prevent farmers using land already allocated to them. It is nonsensical. It is clear that these amendments were not about the environment but about the Greens' bid to build their political power by expanding their support base. This is about the Greens' election chances just over the border in New South Wales. This is sacrificing vegetation for votes. A huge scythe has just been cut through the Greens' integrity today.

I thank the Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef and Minister for Science, and the Minister for Innovation and Tourism Industry Development for their contributions to this debate. We are at a critical juncture in terms of our stewardship of the Great Barrier Reef. We have sediments, pollutants and nutrients running into the reef. These are issues that are real and scientifically quantifiable, but we can do something about that.

The member for Noosa made a most important point during her excellent speech as part of this debate calling for a balance to end political point-scoring. I agree passionately and have been trying to achieve this. While my LNP predecessor would not consult with the conservation sector, my door has been open to all those who wanted their say on this bill. This legislation is the start of that balance. It is measured and responsible legislation. Two measures often overlooked are the SLATS data and our three-year review. This is our tuning mechanism to achieve that balance between agricultural production and protecting our environment. I want to reach a steady state. We were nearly there in 2012, but 2012 changed everything.

Today we are resetting. I will continue to work with people I greatly respect—Grant Maudsley, Stuart Armitage, Tim Seelig and many others. I will give my all to cease the uncertainty—the fluctuations in policy around this issue. I used to look with envy at New South Wales—no policy shifts, no debate; just a will to care for farmers and the environment. Then came 2017 and they are doing just what Newman did in 2012. The uncertainty will push on in New South Wales. We had a sheep property there in 1980. When the first tranche of New South Wales legislation came through we thought that the sky would fall in. It didn't; that happened when the wool floor price collapsed.

Queensland farmers are fine people. The vast majority do the right thing. They can thrive and prosper under these laws. I want to set the dial to steady. These laws have done that. My door is open. It always has and always will be. I thank all whom I have met and listened to, and I thank all here today for their contributions.

(Time expired)

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Pugh): Order! I acknowledge students in the gallery from Calamvale Community College and Browns Plains State High School in Minister Enoch's electorate of Algester and from Siena Catholic Primary School in Mr Brent Mickelberg's electorate of Buderim. Welcome to the gallery.

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

AYES, 49:

ALP, 47—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Miller, Mullen, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 43:

LNP, 39—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Costigan, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, I note that the member for Maiwar's amendment No. 1 proposes to amend clause 2 and relates to proposed new provisions contained in later amendments. Therefore, consideration of clause 2 and the member for Maiwar's amendment is postponed until all other clauses and amendments have been considered.

Clause 2 postponed.

Clause 3, as read, agreed to.

Clause 4—

 **Mr BERKMAN** (11.42 am): I thank the House for the opportunity to speak to this bill, which we all know is a vitally important piece of legislation. I am very pleased to be able to speak to the amendments that I have proposed to this clause. I move the following amendments—

2 Clause 4 (Amendment of s 19O (Accepted development vegetation clearing code))

Page 6, line 17, before 'Section'—

insert—

(1)

3 Clause 4 (Amendment of s 19O (Accepted development vegetation clearing code))

Page 6, line 21, ' including'—

omit.

4 Clause 4 (Amendment of s 19O (Accepted development vegetation clearing code))

Page 7, after line 7—

insert—

(2) Section 19O(2)—

omit.

I table the explanatory notes to my amendments.

Tabled paper. Vegetation Management and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018, explanatory notes to Mr Michael Berkman's amendments [607].

It is unfortunate that attempts to take a nuanced approach to re-regulating this vitally important area have somehow been represented as me aligning myself with the policies of past governments that have wrought such destruction across the state. That was absolutely not the intent and, as has already been noted in the House, I have taken a change of tack in respect of that.

These amendments I am moving would limit the range of purposes for which an accepted development vegetation code can be made. This is essentially to prevent the provision of exemptions to assessment by stealth. In the government's proposed amendments, the purposes for which an accepted development vegetation code might be made are nonexhaustive. The effect of this is to leave the door open for codes to be developed for unregulated clearing to be allowed without any further legislative amendment. For us to be confident—

An incident having occurred in the chamber—

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Maiwar, can you pause your contribution. Will the member who has their mobile phone turned on please put it on silent and excuse yourself from the chamber. This is a warning to all members to please keep your devices on silent. Apologies to the member for Maiwar.

A further incident having occurred in the chamber—

Mr SPEAKER: Members, I do not want to trivialise this. The House should be orderly. Mobile phones should be switched to silent.

Mr BERKMAN: For us to be confident that these very important amendments that align with the restriction of clearing under codes will not be circumvented by development of additional codes in the future, it is important that the list of purposes be limited strictly. This can be achieved by a very simple amendment by removing the word 'including', and this is the amendment that is proposed in my amendment No. 3. Amendments Nos 2 and 4 are very minor consequential amendments on that first removal of the word 'including'.

The vehemence of the debate in this House on this issue should have made it clear to all of us that these are very important issues to the state and to all of our parties respectively. The prospect of really substantial changes to this regime being made outside the legislation and by the creation of subordinate legislative instruments is one that I think we all should be very concerned about on both sides of the chamber. I would implore the House to think very carefully about adopting this amendment and ensuring that the legislature has control over any really significant changes in this space in the future.

Dr LYNHAM: I thank the member for Maiwar for his contribution. It is important that the minister have access to a full scope of accepted development codes not relying on a specific set of purposes. For instance, it relies on the flexibility of the minister to make the accepted development codes to the way that needs and best achieves the purpose of the act. I will give an example. This would prevent the minister, myself, from making a code for, say, apiary infrastructure or for clearing for solar farms. The amendment would still ironically allow for code for clearing for grazing as a suitable land use. They tend to be rather restrictive and prohibitive. I think the flexibility still needs to be there for the minister to rely on these codes.

Non-government amendments (Mr Berkman) negated.

Clause 4, as read, agreed to.

Clause 5, as read, agreed to.

Clause 6—

 **Dr LYNHAM** (11.47 am): I move the following amendment—

1 **Clause 6 (Insertion of new s 19S)**

Page 7, after line 30—

insert—

(3) However, if the Minister replaces an accepted development vegetation clearing code, subsection (2) does not apply to the extent the replacement code provides otherwise.

I table the explanatory notes to my amendments.

Tabled paper: Vegetation Management and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018, explanatory notes to Hon. Dr Anthony Lynham's amendments [608].

Amendment No. 1 amends clause 6 to insert a new proposed subsection to give the minister discretion to enable previous notifications to remain in effect while ensuring that further clearing must otherwise comply with the new replaced accepted development vegetation clearing code. The purpose

of this proposed amendment is to reduce regulatory burden on notification holders in circumstances where an accepted development vegetation clearing code needs to be replaced but it is not necessary to make previous notifications cease to have effect. In this case, the code can specify that all notifications or certain notifications made under the replaced code continue to have effect so that landholders do not need to notify again should they wish to carry out the activity. Quite simply, within this amendment if the code is changed all notifications to the code do not have to be withdrawn and then reprocessed. The notifications can remain if the code is changed.

Mr LAST: The amendments moved by the minister clearly highlight what we have been saying throughout this debate over the last two days; that is, this bill before the House was rushed and the amendments that are going to be brought forward by the minister—and this is the first of several—clearly highlight the fact that there was not a lot of thought put into this. There are some fundamental errors which should never occur in the drafting of a bill. The fact that the minister now has to stand up here in this place and move amendments to fix a bill—things which should have been done during the drafting stage—highlights the lack of thought and preparation that has gone into this bill.

This particular amendment is going to create uncertainty, and the last thing our farmers need is more uncertainty. As honourable members would appreciate, farmers would have long-term plans in place for their farming operations. What the government is doing with this amendment is saying, 'You can trust us because we will continue with those codes that are in place and those decisions that have been made, but it is at the discretion of the minister.' That creates a big question mark for a lot of our farmers. This government should certainly not be trusted when it comes to discretion.

Mr WATTS: I would like to add my comments regarding uncertainty. Obviously people who are exercising their land management practices over their investment and their property need to be able to do that in the long term. They need to be able to manage various fodder; they need to be able to manage the effects of drought; and they need to be able to manage their investment so they can get a decent return on it and keep the banks at bay. In order to be able to do that the one thing they need is clear certainty. Giving the minister the ability to change things removes that certainty from them and puts at risk their ability to either borrow money and/or invest their own money in their land management practices.

I would urge honourable members to not support this amendment because it shows that it was rushed. The main thing it achieves is a level of investment uncertainty for someone who is looking to manage their property in the long term, and farmers are already facing that now. People have gone out and bought blocks of land with mulga ready to drought proof and now under this legislation they are going to have difficulty in being able to manage those blocks.

This amendment allows the minister to move the goalposts quicker and more regularly at his or her discretion. In the case of banks lending money, chances are they will not do so knowing that that uncertainty might exist. In the case of farmers looking to make an investment, chances are they will hesitate because if someone can move the goalposts around at a whim in terms of how they can make a return on their investment that is going to cause a problem. I urge members not to support the minister's amendment.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Speaker, I thank you for your indulgence for allowing me to speak from this chair in the chamber today. Following on from my colleagues' contributions in relation to the honourable minister's amendment to this clause, I think this is a very concerning one, particularly given the current angst and mistrust in relation to this vegetation management legislation. I would stress to the minister that it would be of concern if the codes could be changed at any time at the minister's discretion. Whilst the minister currently occupies that position, he could be moved at any time.

I do note that it is pretty obvious that Labor ministers have not been able to stand up for our regional families when it comes to these codes. I note also that the Labor agriculture minister signed a pledge to the Wilderness Society before the last election, so I doubt there would be too many graziers or farmers in the state who could trust a minister with that background not to come in and just amend the codes willy-nilly.

My colleague from Toowoomba North said it very well when he talked about the fact that we need certainty. We need to go to the banks to borrow money to improve and to continue the business. This clause that is to be amended through this legislation clearly goes a step too far by just leaving those amended codes in the hands of the minister.

Mr MILLAR: One of the big issues out there is certainty; another is confidence. We are also talking here about property values for primary producers right throughout Queensland, whether they are a cattle producer in the north-west, a cotton producer in Central Queensland or a wheat producer

on the Darling Downs. We have to be reminded that there is an element of distrust out there at the moment. There are also financiers and lenders who are constantly keeping an eye on this sort of legislation and the property values. When we cause a change in the value of a person's property it can have significant implications for equity and their ability to operate. That relates to being able to borrow money and the capacity of the operation to be able to extend loans if they have bad seasons. We have to have certainty around this.

My concern with this clause is that leaving it up to the discretion of the minister of the day does not provide the certainty that the primary producer needs, that the bank lender needs or that the financial institution which has lent money to that operation and property needs. We have to give certainty back to primary producers. There has been a lot of mistrust, and we only have to look at what happened earlier this week for proof of that. We saw all these primary producers travelling here and attending the rally. They did not come here for a holiday; they came here because this legislation will have a massive impact on their operation and on their ability to have certainty from the government and the minister of the day going forward.

Mr HART: This is another indication of how this legislation has been rushed in at the last minute. This Labor government has been talking about making changes to vegetation management for quite a number of years. As they pointed out during the main debate, this was actually an election promise that the Labor Party made and that is why they are following through with this.

Most of our farmers are people of the land obviously. They are out there taking care of their property, taking care of their animals, looking at what they do in terms of clearing, but they are not necessarily watching the paperwork all the time. They know that there are rules in place. However we have a shifting target here when a minister can change codes without any notification, without any consultation with anybody and can change what a farmer can do. The farmer might think they are doing the right thing, but all of a sudden the code changes and the process has to change. That is the problem that I see here. Even if at the end of the day these approvals are in place, a farmer has been notified of it and they can follow through, this will be a moving target. It is far too complicated. While I would not normally agree with much that the Greens say, I have to agree with what the Greens member said in his contribution about changing codes.

Sometimes we place too much power with the minister to change overnight these things around which people have built their whole livelihoods. Sometimes it is just way too hard for some of these people to catch up on exactly what they should be doing and how they should be doing things. Given the time that the minister has had to think about these amendments and this legislation, the government should have got it right the first time. They should not be coming in here now moving amendments—and I understand there are five or six amendments to come yet—which will just fix the problems that the legislation created in the first place. Why did we not get this right? That is the big question we have to ask. They should not demonise our farmers and tell them they are doing things wrong. The government should get it right to start with and not come in here at the 11th hour to try to change things.

Dr LYNHAM: I want to correct a misunderstanding because obviously those opposite do not understand. We are correcting an LNP mistake, not one of ours. Under the LNP, if there was a mistake in a code it would mean that all farmers who applied for that code would have to renotify, so with this amendment we are correcting a mistake in your legislation. I let you go on, but I should have stood sooner to save you the embarrassment. All we are proposing is that, if there is a mistake in a code or if a code is rewritten, all of those farmers who have notified are not taken off the list and do not have to renotify. I trust that I have clarified this issue for those opposite.

Mr PERRETT: If only it were that easy. As a rural producer you need trust and you need certainty around what is going on, and I am not certain we are getting that from this government. There are significant investments that go into rural properties and the management of those properties. I am a rural producer and I am invested heavily in it. I do care for my land, and I care for it meticulously because it is in my interest to do so. I do need certainty around these sorts of things, and I am not always convinced that what is suggested from the other side will give me confidence to invest into the future. In relation to the level of discretion that the minister or future ministers will have, it is all right for you, Minister, to make this suggestion—

Mr SPEAKER: Member, I ask you to direct your comments through the chair in accordance with standing order 247. It is not me having a particular preference: there is a standing order that I would ask you and all other members of the House to adhere to.

Mr PERRETT: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I respect your guidance in this matter. We do need certainty into the future. Minister, with the greatest respect to you and what you are trying to achieve—

Mr SPEAKER: Member, I ask you to direct your comments through the chair.

Mr PERRETT: What the minister is trying to achieve as a result of this amendment will not instil confidence in the rural sector. That has been demonstrated loud and clear, not only outside this parliament but around this state, by representations that have been made to the committee hearings. Whilst some diverse opinion was expressed at those hearings, by and large the opinion that was expressed is that the amendment you are proposing does not provide confidence to the rural sector.

Ms LEAHY: As we have heard earlier in relation to the change of codes, there was really plenty of time to fix it up and make sure that this particular provision in the legislation was correct. A constituent in my electorate rang the department and asked, 'Am I right to go and clear?' The department said yes, but the legislation had changed in the House and that information did not flow through to the department. My constituent was subsequently charged for illegal clearing which he thought was allowed, but the information had not flowed through to the departmental officers on the ground. That is one of the critical problems that we have when continual change happens: it does not flow through to departmental people quickly enough.

There are people out there managing their properties on a day-to-day basis and they find it very difficult. I may now have to advise all of my constituents that, when contacting the department of natural resources in relation to any changes to the vegetation management codes or legislation, they get the confirmation in writing because of that particular case. That landholder had to plead guilty because he could not afford to defend himself. He had been assured by departmental officers that he was able to go ahead and clear, but eventually he unfortunately ended up in court.

We need to be very careful about constant change because people do things on a regular basis. The codes relate to thinning and fodder harvesting, and it is no secret that there is a drought in south-west Queensland. People are fodder harvesting every day. You simply cannot go and stop feeding the cows or the sheep because there has been a change to the legislation and you cannot get an answer from the department. It is critically important when we make changes because the codes relate to thinning and fodder. There is an animal welfare issue here as well, and it is really important to ensure that people get the information quickly. People want to do the right thing; they do not want to do the wrong thing by the legislation.

Mr BOYCE: This amendment seeks to remove the property rights that reside with the registered owner's title and place those rights in the hands of the minister, in my view unlawfully. It is then asserted that the right to the effective use and benefit of the landholder's private property will then be allowed or denied at the sole discretion of the minister. This does not provide for certainty, and this is the problem.

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

AYES, 49:

ALP, 47—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Miller, Mullen, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 43:

LNP, 39—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Costigan, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, for future divisions I intend to ring the bells for one minute only, which has been agreed by the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr BLEIJIE: I rise to a point of order. I have not agreed to that with the Leader of the House and I propose four-minute divisions.

Mr SPEAKER: It needs the agreement of the House. Divisions will be four minutes.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The question is that the clause, as amended, be agreed to. Those of that opinion say 'aye'.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Those against 'no'. I think the ayes have it.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: No, I called 'no'. That was very quick, Mr Speaker. I rise to a point of order. I called 'no' to that and, before even being given the opportunity, you went straight to the noes and then 'the ayes have it'.

Mr SPEAKER: Member, I am happy to hear your contribution.

Mr BLEIJIE: I called 'no', Mr Speaker, and I am waiting for the call—

Mr SPEAKER: The ayes have it.

Mr BLEIJIE: No, a division is required, thank you. Call a division.

Mr SPEAKER: Excuse me, member, but I will not have instructions by a member of the House. You have made your point. A division has been called. Ring the bells for four minutes.

Division: Question put—That clause 6, as amended, be agreed to.

AYES, 49:

ALP, 47—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Miller, Mullen, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 42:

LNP, 38—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Costigan, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, McArdle, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 6, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 7—

 **Mr BERKMAN (12.16 pm):** I move the following amendment—

5 **Clause 7 (Amendment of s 20AH (Deciding to show particular areas as category B areas))**

Page 8, lines 24 to 29—

omit, insert—

- (i) controlling non-native plants or declared pests;
- (ii) ecological restoration; or

This clause raises some concerns for us in terms of the avenues it leaves open for fodder harvesting to be maintained in the ongoing management of thickened vegetation clearing of encroachment under area management plans. These are potentially a really valuable tool for landscape scale management and for encouraging best practice management across larger areas than single properties.

The amendment that I have proposed is intended to allow these plans to remain in place effectively for the purpose of pest management—controlling non-native plants and declared pests—and for ecological restoration. These are obviously really positive environmental outcomes that might be achieved through the existing mechanism within the act as area management plans and I would suggest that we should adopt these amendments to provide those facilities for better pest management and ecological restoration.

Dr LYNHAM: Quite simply, area management plans can be superseded by accepted development codes and they provide a flexible tool that allows for proper property planning and are a more effective regulatory mechanism. I assure the member for Maiwar and those opposite that pest management, ecological restoration and harvesting of fodder under these codes continue under this government.

Mr KATTER: Surprisingly enough, we see some merit in this in that this is a move back towards somewhere where we want to be in reintroducing fodder harvesting in areas. I think that could be something that would ordinarily be welcomed, but it does not go far enough. As part of the overall tranche of changes here, it would not be something that we could support but I do acknowledge that it is a move back at least towards something that is more in favour of the farmers in allowing that but not something that we could ultimately support.

Ms ENOCH: I do not support these amendments either and I think the minister, Dr Lynham, has made it very clear why we will not be. Given the contribution from the member for Traeger, I think we can see what has happened with the Greens in Queensland through the member for Maiwar attempting to broaden their base to create opportunities across the border and federally to be able to make the Greens a little bit more palatable to other voters, and in doing so we saw some of those amendments from last night unfortunately going against their own policies which are online about reinstating Queensland's world-class protections for native forests and vegetation.

We will always stand by our commitments to ensure that we have world-class protections for native forest and vegetation and we do not step away from that. Unlike what we have seen from the member for Maiwar on behalf of the Greens in this state, we have been clear on our convictions. We can see from the contribution of the member for Traeger that that is exactly what the member for Maiwar was trying to do—to extend the reach of the Greens and, in doing so, undermine their own convictions, their own policies. We will not be supporting this amendment.

Ms LEAHY: This is a particularly concerning amendment for local government, because local government has a lot of pest management plans that they are responsible for. Local government does a lot of work in controlling non-native plants and declared pests. I think there are some problems with this amendment, because there has been absolutely no consultation at all with anyone in the local government area. There is also no indication in this amendment of the cost implications to local government. Would any cost shifting occur in relation to this amendment? I think we should look at this amendment very carefully, because it has not been thought through and it has not been looked at properly.

Non-government amendment (Mr Berkman) negative.

Clause 7, as read, agreed to.

Clause 8—

 **Mr BERKMAN** (12.22 pm): I move the following amendment—

6 **Clause 8 (Amendment of s 20AI (Deciding to show particular areas as category C areas))**

Page 9, lines 21 to 26—

omit, insert—

- (i) controlling non-native plants or declared pests;
- (ii) ecological restoration.

This amendment relates to the area management plans, which I spoke to a moment ago. Given the contributions to this point, I do not see a great need to say more on this amendment.

Non-government amendment (Mr Berkman) negative.

Clause 8, as read, agreed to.

Clause 9, as read, agreed to.

Clause 10, as read, agreed to.

Clause 11, as read, agreed to.

Clause 12—

Mr BERKMAN (12.23 pm): I move the following amendment—

7 **Clause 12 (Amendment of s 20CA (Process before making PMAV))**

Page 11, lines 15 to 20—

omit, insert—

- (i) controlling non-native plants or declared pests; or
- (ii) ecological restoration; or

Once again, this amendment effectively deals with the same issues that I discussed before around area management plans. It is a consequential amendment; it is not the substantive proposal. I will leave it at that.

Non-government amendment (Mr Berkman) negated.

Clause 12, as read, agreed to.

Clause 13, as read, agreed to.

Clause 14—

Mr BERKMAN (12.24 pm): I move the following amendment—

8 **Clause 14 (Replacement of pt 2, div 5B (Area management plans))**

Page 13, lines 7 to 27, page 14, lines 1 to 31, page 15, lines 1 to 28 and page 16, lines 1 to 7—

omit, insert—

14 Amendment of s 20I (Definitions for div 5B)

Section 20I, definition *restricted (fodder harvesting) land*—

omit.

I have no further contribution to make on this amendment.

Non-government amendment (Mr Berkman) negated.

Clause 14, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clauses—

Mr SPEAKER: Please note that Mr Berkman's amendment proposes new clauses 14A to 14F.

Mr BERKMAN (12.24 pm): I move the following amendment—

9 **After clause 14**

Page 16, after line 7—

insert—

14A Omission of s 20L (What is *restricted (fodder harvesting) land*)

Section 20L—

omit.

14B Amendment of s 20P (Criteria for approving draft plan or accrediting planning document)

Section 20P(d)—

omit, insert—

- (d) the plan or document provides for, or allows, clearing of vegetation only for either of the following purposes—

- (i) controlling non-native plants or declared pests;
- (ii) ecological restoration; and

14C Omission of s 20Q (Mandatory condition on approval of draft plan or accreditation of planning document)

Section 20Q—

omit.

14D Omission of s 20UC (Mandatory conditions for area management plan)

Section 20UC—

omit.

14E Amendment of s 20V (Register of area management plans)

Section 20V—

insert—

(3) Also, the register must state, for each area management plan, details of the plan area and the environmental outcomes the plan achieves.

14F Amendment of s 20ZC (Amendment application for particular plans)

Section 20ZC(6), '20Q,'—

omit.

Once again, this is another amendment that deals with the potential that we could make of area management plans if they were to be used for pest management and ecological processes rather than being a tool for ongoing fodder harvesting and some of the sorts of practices that we have seen that have been damaging over the years. These are the same issues that I have canvassed previously. Given the views that have been expressed, I do not see the need to take up any more time of the House.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: In relation to the Greens' proposed amendments for the past couple of clauses, but particularly this one, if I have it right the member for Maiwar is also suggesting the shortening of the transitional period for the proposed phase-out of the area management plans. I want to highlight this matter to the House. While the feeling of the House is pretty obvious that the amendments may not be agreed to, I think it is important to note in this House that, through his amendment, the member for Maiwar is attempting to shorten that period from two years—and I do not agree with the phase-out period—to 8 March 2018.

It needs to be highlighted to the House that that was an intention of the amendment moved by the honourable member for Maiwar—to shorten the transitional period for the proposed phase-out of those area management plans. It is very disturbing that the member's amendment proposed that date of 8 March 2018. As part of my contribution, I would like to highlight for the House that that phase-out date was going to be moved back to 8 March 2018. Given that today's date is 3 May 2018, I think that is a draconian amendment and it will not be supported.

Dr LYNHAM: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for identifying that. It is true that we have a two-year phase-out of the area management plans to be replaced by accepted development codes. I also wish to point out another issue with the amendments moved by the member for Maiwar in relation to the area management plans. Under his proposed amendments, if there is any future correction on a PMAV to category B or category C areas—that is remnant or regrowth—they would be forced to be category X. Through the member's proposed amendments, he is also moving remnant and regrowth into category X. That is another amendment that certainly goes against the policy that I have discussed with members of the environmental movement.

Mr WATTS: I want to make a comment about certainty. The member proposed an amendment that will change the two-year phase-out. Although a two-year phase-out is a longish time, people take out 15-year, 20-year, 25-year and maybe 30-year loans to manage their properties.

The amendment to change this to 8 March would be both draconian and cause a great deal of angst in the rural community. Two years, whilst giving people an opportunity to readjust their affairs, talk to their financiers and look at other commercial returns that they may be able to get as the goal posts shift underneath their investment, is certainly not a long period of time for an investment cycle in a land management practice.

As we would all be aware, whether it be mulga or another kind of regrowth—whether it in fact be woody weeds, and it would be nice if SLATS could tell the difference but they do not always—they do not necessarily show up in a two-year time cycle. I am concerned that a two-year transition to these codes that will be at the discretion of the minister—with the ability to move the goal posts in a way that will affect people's financing, affect their investment but also affect their ability to prepare for drought, flood and other naturally occurring events that they have to manage—is not going to be the best practice going forward.

I accept that the two-year transition is a lot better than the 8 March transition, which would have been completely draconian and very unfair. I would encourage people to not support the amendment with that 8 March time line on it, if for nothing else than the mental health of people who have massive investments. The implication of being able to adjust your life in such a short time frame—in fact, a negative time frame—is impossible for landowners.

Mr HART: I am a little bit confused about the member's contribution.

Government members interjected.

Mr HART: I take the interjections from those opposite. I can see they are confused about it as well. We have a number of amendments that appear to support local area management plans and say that they are a good thing and we need to stick with them, and now we have an amendment that phases them out six weeks ago. It beggars belief that the Greens can come in here and say one thing but when that fails they completely reverse their position.

How can our farmers follow what is going on here? I wonder, if the member for Maiwar went out and spoke to the farmers the day before yesterday and suggested to them what he was going to amend, if they may have been able to follow it. I am struggling to follow the logic that the member for Maiwar is bringing to this House: supporting local area plans in one lot of amendments and then phasing them out six weeks ago in another amendment. I would not mind hearing back from the member for Maiwar as to what his logic is.

Ms LEAHY: The member for Burleigh has pointed out how these amendments have not been thought through by the member for Maiwar. To say you support the area management plans and then to move amendments that actually phase them out six weeks ago is quite bizarre. There are many people who are watching this broadcast, many from my electorate, and they will be absolutely horrified by what they are seeing. This has impacts on their livelihood and future investment, as we heard earlier from the member for Toowoomba North.

We are hearing about phasing these things out, but supporting them and changing transitional arrangements. It is not great when the people who are watching have to go to their bank and say unfortunately the legislation is moving left, right and centre. They have no idea what to advise their financial institution, which they are looking to obtain a loan from to keep their primary production going for the next 20 to 30 years. It is absolutely bizarre. I do not think I have seen that consequence of amendments for quite some time in this House. I think it is very disappointing.

I think it is also very disappointing that the explanatory notes were not provided early so we could scrutinise these things to make sure that the amendments were sensible and not what we are seeing now, where on the one hand we have support yet on the other hand there is a proposed amendment to phase that out and stating that it should be retrospective phasing out. I think that is very disappointing. I would like to hear an explanation from the member for Maiwar in relation to why they have chosen to do that.

Non-government amendment (Mr Berkman) negated.

Clause 15, as read, agreed to.

Clause 16—

 **Mr LAST** (12.36 pm): I move the following amendment—

1 **Clause 16 (Amendment of s 22A (Particular vegetation clearing applications may be assessed))**

Page 17, lines 4 and 5—

omit, insert—

(6) Section 22A(2)(k) and (l)—

omit, insert—

(k) for high value agriculture; or

(l) for irrigated high value agriculture.

I table the explanatory notes to my amendments.

Tabled paper: Vegetation Management and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018, explanatory notes to Mr Dale Last's amendments [609].

Amendment No. 1 expands the scope of development applications that can be assessed to include high-value agriculture and irrigated high-value agriculture. HVA and IHVA are critical to our food and our fibre. Farmers need an ability to apply for clearing applications for these purposes. HVA and IHVA are at the very heart of what this is about today and certainly are of critical importance for those on this side of the House who truly appreciate the contribution that irrigated high-value agriculture and high-value agriculture play in this state in terms of supplying the food, whether it be sugar cane, mangoes, macadamias, or fibre such as cotton out in the Central Highlands, or grains. It is absolutely crucial. I have a number of farmers in my electorate who are desirous of expanding their farming

operations, of creating employment, of generating money that will flow through those local communities, particularly those rural communities that so desperately need that, and those local businesses that rely on it.

Unfortunately, the Labor government's bill removes the current exemption for high-value agriculture and irrigated high-value agriculture. If we want to eat locally grown produce, if we want to continue to access the fibre that we need that puts the clothes on our backs in this state then we need to cater for that growth. We need to understand that farmers who are desirous of improving and developing their blocks have an opportunity to do so.

On Tuesday morning we saw a number of kids protesting outside parliament who want to become farmers. They were wearing placards around their necks and holding corflutes. These are bush kids who would like nothing more than a future on the land. This bill that is before the House puts that in jeopardy. The LNP is committed to expanding food and fibre production because a growing state, a growing nation and a growing world needs more food and fibre. Without a clear pathway for development approvals we cannot capitalise on that.

Mr SPEAKER: Before calling the Leader of the Opposition, members, I appreciate that you need to stretch your legs, but it is not appropriate for members to be standing around the chamber unless they are actively moving or doing other things. Feel free to take a short walk outside if you like, but otherwise I encourage you to please resume your seats.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I thank the shadow minister for his contribution and for trying to find some form of amendment to make this horrendous piece of legislation slightly better for landholders. In speaking to this clause, I want to highlight issues that have been raised with the opposition over many years.

Yesterday I stood beside Mr Richie Ah Mat, the Chair of the Cape York Land Council, as he said, 'We've only just got our land back and they are now taking it away'. The Labor members of this House should hang their heads in shame, because they are taking away the rights of our Indigenous people to look after and manage their lands. I can see members opposite shaking their heads, but I beg them to have a chat to Richie and listen to what he has says. Yesterday, with the Hon. Matt Canavan, he stood in front of the media and is now on the record talking about how abhorrent this piece of legislation is to his community. It is a shameful piece of legislation.

The LNP amendment will go a small way towards enabling high-value agriculture to take place not only on the Cape but also across Queensland. As the shadow minister said, it is an essential part of agriculture, but it is something that the Labor party seems to have missed. I am looking forward to the minister's contribution and his support for the LNP's sensible amendment to the legislation. For those who do not understand high-value agriculture, it is actually where you have intensive agriculture. For example, say you need to grow a patch of bananas—

Mr Millar: Figs in Emerald.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON:—figs in Emerald, tomatoes in Bundy or Bowen—

Ms Leahy: Blueberries in St George.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON:—blueberries in St George, Crows Nest or Mundubbera, that is high-value agriculture. It is what we want to produce to send to the rest of the world and eat ourselves. I plead with the Labor members opposite to listen to Elder Richie Ah Mat. Listen when he says, 'We have just been given our land back; why lock it up?' I look forward to the minister's contribution and his acceptance of the LNP's amendment.

Ms TRAD: I could not let that contribution go past without responding. Firstly, I reflect upon the fact that those opposite tend to stand up to echo and represent the views of our first nations people only when it aligns with their own point of view.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I find those comments offensive and I ask the member to withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: The member has found those comments offensive. Deputy Premier, will you withdraw?

Ms TRAD: I withdraw. Where was the member for Nanango when Richie Ah Mat cried out about the fact that former deputy premier Jeff Seeney awarded a mining contract to Glencore instead of an organisation that he would have preferred it to go through, again in the dead of the night, two minutes before Christmas? I think she was a bit mute then.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. My point of order goes to relevance. Where is the relevance of the Deputy Premier's contribution? I know that she is desperate—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member, you have raised the issue of relevance and I do not need a full explanation. The Deputy Premier has three minutes to make her contribution. I will listen carefully in terms of relevance.

Ms TRAD: It is entirely relevant for me to talk about Richie Ah Mat, considering that the member for Nanango raised Mr Richie Ah Mat in this place. Let me talk about the fact that in the Cape York Heritage Act we have a specific capacity and provision for Indigenous Aboriginal economic development in Cape York. That provision has not been used for a number of years. We have committed to reviewing that and to find out exactly what it is. From the outset I say that land tenure has more to do with the enactment of that provision than native trees.

I find the contribution from the member for Nanango on this topic absolutely abhorrent. It is absolutely shameful and abhorrent. While I still have time on the clock I want to say, in relation to the specific amendment being proposed by the LNP, that this is about the loophole that Andrew Cripps, when a member of this House—after declaring that he would take the axe to tree-clearing laws—put into the Vegetation Management Act, that is, specific provisions for clearing for high-value and irrigated high-value agriculture. Farming happened before these provisions were in the act. For many years we have had an agricultural industry and we did not need these provisions for an agricultural industry.

Today, my deepest disappointment is in the fact that the member for Maiwar introduced into this House exactly the same provisions but then withdrew them. I thank the member for Maiwar for withdrawing his amendments. However, we must reflect on the fact that they very much mirrored what we are currently debating from the LNP.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, you need to seek the call and not only rise to your feet.

Dr MILES: As the Deputy Premier has just outlined, this issue goes to the very heart of the conflict in the chamber today: do you support the clearing of remnant vegetation, as the LNP does, as the Katter party does and as the Greens party does, or do you support protecting remnant vegetation as Labor does?

This amendment to retain the clearing right for high-value agriculture and irrigated high-value agriculture is effectively the same amendment introduced and withdrawn by the member for Maiwar. The member for Maiwar wanted to make history. Today, he has made history. In the history of this place, no member has so quickly turned their back on the principles on which they were elected as he has in debate on the first major conservation bill to come before this parliament.

The Greens party walks in and sides with the LNP to support the ongoing clearing of remnant vegetation. It is an insult to Greens voters and it is an insult to Maiwar voters. Frankly, it is an insult to the conservation organisations and their leaders who have fought so hard for these laws over decades. I understand that Queensland's Environmental Defenders Office had something to do with the drafting of these and that is deeply concerning to me. Labor will oppose this amendment and, in doing so, will be the only party that has stood for forests over political expediency.

Mr MILLAR: I support the shadow minister's amendment to clause 16. As many would know, I come from an area that has high-value agriculture and irrigated high-value agriculture. It is very important to the economy of the Central Highlands, where more and more of this land needs to be made available if we are going to meet the export opportunities for Queensland.

What the Labor Party is doing is locking up Queensland's agricultural potential. I remember a letter written by a lady in the Central Highlands to AgForce this week. The Premier was visiting the Central Highlands and she called upon a farm around Capella. She asked the owners of this farm, who are generation after generation farmers, 'We need to grow some more chickpea. How do we grow more chickpea?' They said, 'That is easy. We have the land, we just need to clear some more land to be able to bring it into high-value agricultural land to grow more chickpea.'

Mr Krause: What did she say?

Mr MILLAR: The Premier quickly shut that conversation down and moved on. We need to get the best potential out of agriculture. High-value agriculture and irrigated high-value agriculture is imperative.

In Emerald at the moment we have moved into the citrus industry and the growing of watermelons and figs. This offers major potential for the Central Highlands. There is also potential with the proposed Rookwood Weir. I know that the Minister for Natural Resources has been going around saying that there is plenty of land available under the PMAVs and category X for Rookwood Weir. There are also areas on everybody's PMAVs which are coloured differently—that is, different categories.

The last thing we want to do is restrict any opportunity when it comes to Rookwood Weir. Rookwood Weir would provide a billion dollars worth of agricultural production for Central Queensland and 1,500 real full-time jobs in agriculture. I am sure the minister is going to get up and say, 'We have plenty of land there that is under category X.' There is also land there that is not category X.

There is an opportunity for high-value agriculture and irrigated high-value agriculture right across Queensland. There is a great opportunity to expand in the cape. We need to make sure that we continue to see high-value agriculture and irrigated high-value agriculture and that we give something back to agriculture and give some confidence back to agriculture and put something in this bad legislation which may do a little to grow agriculture in Queensland.

Mr DICK: I want to endorse the position expressed by the Deputy Premier and the Minister for Health on this amendment. It should rightly be opposed by all members of the House. It is bad public policy. Can I say how deeply disappointing it is to have witnessed over the last couple of days the approach taken to this very important piece of legislation by the member for Maiwar.

As I said in the debate yesterday, the only thing that surprises us about the LNP is their capacity to take to an even lower point of public policy debate in this House. Under the leadership of the member for Clayfield we had the worst opposition in Queensland history. It has been taken to even lower depths by the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

This is bad public policy and should not be supported. We know the history of environmental protection in this nation and the consistent approach that members of this government have taken. There is one party that has been absolutely rock solid and consistent on this sort of legislation, and that has been the Australian Labor Party.

We know what happened nationally. No-one will ever forget the massive setback delivered to sensible action on climate change when the Greens sided with the coalition to vote down Kevin Rudd's attempt to put a price on carbon. Australia would have had a price on carbon if it had not been for the position of the Australian Greens—a policy objective that they publicly supported, that they campaigned on, that they said was crucial to the survival of the planet and then voted down.

The point I want to make, as so well articulated by the Deputy Premier and the Minister for Health, is that there is consistency constantly by the Australian Labor Party on this issue because it matters to us and because it matters to Queensland. We see the hypocrisy that comes from the members opposite on the issue of the value of agriculture. It has gone from \$8.6 billion to \$13.2 billion in the last 10 years. That is not just an increase in commodity prices, in the value of agriculture; that is more agricultural production when this sort of legislation applied.

To take the cloak of Indigenous rights and to carry that speaks so much for the Leader of the Opposition. I heard the member for Chatsworth yelling out. He is the person in the election campaign who said that minority groups were destroying our country. That is a shameful attack on minority groups in Australia that I will never forget, member for Chatsworth, given that I represent one of the most multicultural electorates in Australia. I will never forget what you said in the election campaign. The amendment should be opposed.

Mr KNUTH: I support the amendment moved by the shadow minister for agriculture. I want to express the importance and need for the clearing of land for high-value agriculture and irrigated high-value agriculture. I support the members of the opposition on this. At the present moment Cape York is 98 per cent remnant. Likewise, the gulf plains are 98 per cent remnant. The Einasleigh Uplands are 96 per cent remnant. Most of that runs into the Great Barrier Reef. How does this affect the Great Barrier Reef?

I was at the public hearings and heard members of the Indigenous community express great concern about this legislation because they are finally ready to go with development. I totally agree. With two per cent of that area cleared, why is the government picking on Indigenous communities?

The SLATS reports of 2012 and 2014 indicate that 290,000 hectares have been cleared but there are 470,000 hectares of regrowth. The government has another figure, but it is not using it. The figure shows that regrowth has outstripped clearing. This is basically a myth. It is a big myth. This is going to impact not only rural and regional Queensland but Queensland in general. I support the amendment.

Mr HART: I think the member for Hill was backing our amendment, but I am not 100 per cent sure. I back the very sensible amendment moved by the shadow minister because I like food and I like fibre, as many members in this place do. Unlike members opposite, I realise that this food comes from our high-value agricultural areas and our irrigated high-value agricultural areas. It does not just come from Coles; it comes from a farm.

While the LNP opposes this radical change that the Labor Party wants to bring in once again—this merry-go-round of vegetation management that we keep having—we think that the very sensible amendment moved by the shadow minister—and there will be a few more amendments—will make this bad legislation at least palatable for some of our farmers. It is important that those opposite take note that, while we oppose the legislation, if we can at least get some of these amendments across the line it will give farmers something that they can at least live with. This is a very sensible amendment.

High-value agriculture means something to our farmers. It means that our farmers can look to expand their production on land that they possibly already own. They will have to clear it, but it is land that can be very productive. These are very sensible amendments that we brought in when we were in government. We brought them in because the farmers were telling us that they needed these amendments. That is why we did it. We did not do it for any ideological reason. We did it because our farmers asked us to put in place those amendments so that they could grow food and provide us with the sustenance we need. This is a very sensible amendment. I urge all members to support it.

Ms JONES: I rise to speak against the amendment moved by the opposition. I am also deeply disappointed to see that there was an amendment put by the Greens and then removed with regard to the clearing of remnant vegetation for high-value agriculture. I think a lot of people in my local community would be very disappointed that an amendment put by the Greens, and sensibly withdrawn however, would be the same amendment that the LNP has just moved.

What we are talking about is the clearing of native forests that have never been cleared. We know how important this is for the biodiversity of Queensland. During the sabbatical that people very kindly gave me, I went and finished my masters in environmental law. I know as a legislator in this House that it is important that we make the right decisions for the long-term security not only of our biodiversity in this state but also of our agricultural sector.

Debate, on motion of Ms Jones, adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 pm to 2.00 pm.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Sunshine Coast Rail Duplication

 **Ms SIMPSON** (Maroochydore—LNP) (2.00 pm): It is time for Premier Palaszczuk to be a premier for all of Queensland, as she claims she is, by getting on board with state funding to duplicate the Sunshine Coast rail line. The federal government's announcement today to help fund the upgrade of this state owned rail line is great news. Now we are calling on the state Labor government to fund its share of the infrastructure—no more excuses: get on board. It is also a way for the Premier to make good on her government's broken election promise to build this rail in 2009, when she was transport minister under Anna Bligh. If this Premier is truly sorry for her government's broken promise then she has a chance to make good today.

Sadly, this morning, instead of welcoming the federal government's funding towards a state owned project—it is very exciting news—the Premier said she was only 'watching' the process. The Deputy Premier churlishly criticised the 50 per cent funding contribution from the federal government towards state owned infrastructure and then she offered no state contribution. When will Labor stop victimising Sunshine Coast residents, start building public transport to our region and grab this opportunity of federal funding for a state rail project and infrastructure? When will Labor become an infrastructure government that builds our great state for all Queenslanders rather than spinning its wheels and underspending on its infrastructure budget by billions of dollars?

Sunshine Coast residents are stuck with an 1890s rail alignment where trains cannot do more than 50 kilometres an hour in some sections. There have been about three business cases and they have all said that this upgrade needs to go ahead. I want to quote from Rail Back on Track advocate Robert Dow, who clearly outlined why this project can happen ahead of the Cross River Rail—a fact, I understand, that is confirmed by the business cases. He stated—

Upgrading the next section of the Sunshine Coast Line from Beerburum to Landsborough North will actually provide more local train paths and improve reliability on the present over tasked single line. This is analogous to the recent duplication of the Gold Coast Line from Helensvale to Coomera. The Gold Coast Line track amplification was not immediately dependent on Cross River Rail, and in the same way neither is the Sunshine Coast Line track amplification.

The only party to break its promise on rail duplication to the Sunshine Coast is Labor.

(Time expired)

Schy, Mrs B

 **Ms HOWARD** (Ipswich—ALP) (2.04 pm): I rise today to praise an unsung hero in the Ipswich community: Mrs Beryl Schy, an amazing 90-year-old woman who announced last month that she will be stepping down as president of the Ipswich branch of the War Widows' Guild after 23 years of service. Beryl Schy is a quiet achiever with a generous community spirit who said she wanted to give something back to the War Widows' Guild in appreciation of all the support and help she received from them herself. Beryl turned to the Ipswich War Widows' after her husband, Frank Schy, a former Rat of Tobruk, died in 1983. She has been an active member since 1985 and took up the role of president in 1995, serving in the role for 23 years.

We should never forget the important role the War Widows' Guild of Australia played in helping to end the hardship and poverty many war widows and their families faced in this country after World War II. Soon after it was formed in 1945, the War Widows' Guild fought hard for decent pensions and better housing for war widows so that they would not have to struggle to keep a roof over their heads or feed their kids after their husbands died. They have also been there to provide essential support, counselling and companionship for war widows, and they were there for Beryl after her husband passed away in 1983.

The Ipswich War Widows' offered Beryl the opportunity to form lifelong friendships with other women in the group whose husbands had served in World War II, Korea and Vietnam. The friendships are an important source of strength for the War Widows' organisation, and Beryl has expressed that it has been marvellous to feel that she is not alone and that she has an organisation behind her that is continually fighting for benefits for war widows.

Like many people who devote their lives to community service, Beryl has also been involved in numerous other community groups doing voluntary work for the Scouts, Legacy, Red Cross, Ipswich Hospice and Palliative Care Australia. She also worked in the Red Cross shop once a month at the St Andrew's hospital in Ipswich. She was involved in the Uniting Church's Friendship Circle every fortnight, participating in the Sunshine Fellowship's entertainment and activities for aged homes. In 2004 she was awarded three Centenary of Ipswich Medallions for her community service and, in the same year, was nominated for Citizen of the Year in the Australia Day Awards.

There are many women like Beryl in towns right across Queensland who are a driving force behind our community organisations—who put hours of dedication and commitment into organisations to keep them alive so that they can continue delivering vital support services to people in need. I am constantly amazed at the hard work and long hours that volunteers put in every day behind the scenes in order to keep these organisations running. In Beryl's own words, 'The strength of any organisation is in the number of its loyal members.'

Without dedicated members like Beryl Schy, organisations like War Widows' would not exist and many people in our communities would be all the poorer for it. I would like to thank Beryl for her 23 years of service as president of the Ipswich War Widows' and for her volunteer services to the Ipswich community, and I wish her the very best. I want to acknowledge Jenny Gregory, the Queensland state secretary of the War Widows' Guild, who is continuing that tradition.

Inland Rail

 **Mr LISTER** (Southern Downs—LNP) (2.07 pm): I rise to speak on the topic of inland rail and the route that it is going to take in my electorate of Southern Downs in the region between the New South Wales-Queensland border not far from Inglewood and Gowrie. This particular passage of proposed track is very controversial because it crosses the Condamine flood plain in my electorate. The landowners there are very concerned about the impacts that this rail line might have on flooding levels and on the velocity of the water flows through the Condamine flood plain which may result in erosion.

There are other landholders further south in my electorate between Inglewood and Millmerran where the current favoured route would dissect their properties. They have feedlots and broadacre farming there. It is prime agricultural land. Having the rail line there is going to cause a great deal of difficulty for those farmers, particularly those who have feedlots and need more than just one crossing of a railway line every kilometre.

This is a matter of great importance to the people in that part of my electorate of Southern Downs. There is a broad feeling that they are not being listened to. I have to admit that the current Base Case Modified, as it is called, which stretches from the border to Gowrie, is being examined and assessed as to how the crossing of the Condamine flood plain would be done. I thank the federal government for

doing that. My constituents tell me that they are not too sure that merely showing that the case will not work without spending a vast amount of money to cross the flood plain will mean that they will go somewhere else. They are very concerned that they will be presented with an outcome as a fait accompli and they will just have to live with the consequences.

I would like to state for the record that there are other ways this railway line could go—perhaps through Karara and Leyburn or, to avoid at least the prime agricultural land south of Millmerran, the railway line could be moved further to the west and go through a state forest. My understanding is that that is pretty poor country, so that seems a better solution to me.

Whatever happens, I commit myself to working very closely with locals such as Bud Kelly and Wes Judd, who are on the flood plain, or Jed Cameron and Russell Stevens, who are in that area south of Millmerran whose properties stand to be dissected. I will be working closely with them, the Deputy Prime Minister and the federal member for Maranoa, David Littleproud—I have met them in the past week—to ensure an optimal outcome for those landholders. I do not want to see them disadvantaged in any way.

Vaisakhi Mela

 **Mr MELLISH** (Aspley—ALP) (2.10 pm): Last Sunday I had the pleasure of attending the Vaisakhi Mela at Taigum in the electorate of Sandgate. Joining me were the members for Sandgate and Nudgee and the councillor for Deagon ward, Jared Cassidy. The event was put on by Singh Sabha Brisbane, the Sikh temple in Taigum which welcomes a large number of families and members from all over Brisbane including many from the Aspley electorate. Singh Sabha is one of only two Sikh temples in Brisbane, the other being in Eight Mile Plains. Prior to Singh Sabha opening, many of its current members, many families from the north side, travelled to Eight Mile Plains for worship.

Vaisakhi Mela is an annual event which celebrates the birth of the Sikh faith community. It is one of the most important dates in the Sikh calendar. The Khalsa was founded as an order in 1699 to protect the freedom of conscience and religion for all. That is what they are celebrating. Vaisakhi also celebrates the spring harvest and is a traditional festival for those from the Punjab region. What a great Vaisakhi Mela it was on the north side. There was sunshine, a huge crowd, a fantastic inclusive atmosphere and a great family event for all who came. I am also now an even bigger fan of kabadi, a sport which would make many a Rugby League front rower weep in terms of the toughness and endurance needed.

Ms Pease: A great game.

Mr MELLISH: Absolutely. The festival was also for the first time combined with a citizenship ceremony. What a terrific way to not only celebrate our growing local Sikh community but also have 18 new citizens from a variety of countries at the ceremony integrated into the festival. All in all, it was a wonderful celebration promoting cultural traditions and goodwill towards our neighbours and friends, something I am always very happy to support.

I also acknowledge the federal candidate for Lilley, Anika Wells, and the federal candidate for Petrie, Corinne Mulholland, for coming along to the day. Anika and Corinne are both already well known in their communities as hardworking locals who can get things done. Already I have seen them getting some great local wins on the north side and I look forward to seeing more of this in the coming months.

I would also like to acknowledge a few recent grant recipients in the electorate of Aspley from the Gambling Community Benefit Fund. It was very pleasing to see the Aspley Little Athletics Centre get over \$21,000 for a new long jump track; Guide Dogs Queensland receive \$33,000 for air conditioning; and the Aspley Orchid Society, which has a show on 12 May, get over \$8,500 for the purchase of equipment.

Youth Crime

 **Mr KATTER** (Traeger—KAP) (2.12 pm): I rise to speak about a burning issue in my electorate, particularly in Mount Isa—I believe it is also a burning issue in Townsville and Cairns—that is, youth crime and some of the proposed solutions. There has been much publicity around the problems and statistics in Townsville and Cairns, but I am aware that they are much more acute in Mount Isa. Upwards of 100 new permanent police officers went to Townsville and Cairns, yet none have come to the Mount Isa region. That is very disappointing. That is not the only part of the problem and is not what I want to speak about.

The problems go much deeper than just the kids themselves. You have to follow the problems back to their heart. That is where the solutions lie. One of the solutions is the relocation sentencing policy, which we believe in very strongly. We think there is a third option for kids coming out of Mount Isa. It is not back onto the streets and it is not straight into Cleveland Youth Detention Centre. Those kids could go to a centre in a very remote area. The security requirements in a remote area are much lower. My experience on the ground, particularly with Indigenous kids, is that when you get them out in those remote areas, whether it be in very remote communities or towns or on cattle stations, they are much easier to deal with and you have a real chance of starting to get them back into the system and becoming valuable members of society. It is a good idea if that sort of institution can start re-engaging kids. We have had some meaningful discussion with the minister in that respect.

What are the other things that should happen? That leads me to the issue of blue cards. In Doomadgee and Mornington, where a lot of these problems may stem from, kids are displaced from their homes because mum and dad do not have a job. Why do mum and dad not have a job? In many cases it is because they cannot access a blue card. Some 90 per cent of the jobs in Doomadgee and Mornington require a blue card, so many of them have problems. They are screaming out for a system that is not one-size-fits-all across Queensland, as it is at the moment. This is not lowering the bar; it is giving people a bit of autonomy to decide who should be working with their kids and who should not. A change would be welcomed and is desperately needed. It is not the only answer, but it is a practical solution that does not require any money and can be done right now to help those people to access the jobs. Getting people into meaningful employment, stabilising the family, is the way to start keeping those kids in the house and not on the streets, where they are vulnerable to practices not tolerated by society. We need relocation sentencing to address the acute problem of kids on the streets and re-engaging them, and we need the issue of blue cards to be addressed to help parents get back into work.

(Time expired)

Centenary Learning Alliance of State Schools

 **Ms PUGH** (Mount Ommaney—ALP) (2.16 pm): Mr Deputy Speaker Stewart, you would know more than most that state schools are great schools. In my electorate we are blessed with many of them. Today I want to inform the House about a truly wonderful and innovative program that my local state primary and high schools are operating in the Centenary suburbs, which comprise a major part of my electorate.

CLASS is the Centenary Learning Alliance of State Schools. It is chaired by the principal of Centenary State High School, Mr John Brew, and its junior members are the principals and senior staff of our Centenary primary schools including Jamboree Heights, Jindalee, Middle Park and Darra and the Mount Ommaney Special School. It is worth noting that some of these schools are independent and some are not, but all of them work side by side for the betterment of our kids' education.

CLASS meets regularly throughout the year to discuss trends, information and shared learnings that can improve all of their schools for the betterment of all of their students. They even organise shared training days, pooling their resources in order to get all of our local state schools on the same page about issues such as STEM and technology. In doing this they are able to access the highest quality training and resources for their staff and students. Although, like many schools, they have a friendly rivalry about the results their students achieve, and each of them has much to be proud of, they come together to discuss issues regularly. I am awaiting advice from the education minister's office as to whether theirs is the only program like it in the state. Whether it is unique or not, it is one I am immensely proud of. It is a truly wonderful initiative. As I can see from the wonderful outcomes our local students are getting, it is yielding results.

As the electorate has over 900 teachers, many of the parents at our local state schools are teachers themselves, so they place a very high premium on quality education for their kids. Last month I was thrilled to attend a meeting of CLASS. Normally it is not ideal to be invited to meet with the principal, let alone a room full of them, but it was wonderful to have the opportunity to hear firsthand all about the wonderful work they are doing in their schools.

From the student welfare fund operating at Jamboree Heights and Centenary State High or the amazing Middle Park performing arts program that feeds their talented students through to their local high school, our kids benefit when our local schools work together to ensure the best possible knowledge sharing and resourcing across our state school network. At a time when more and more parents are turning to state schools for their education needs, it is wonderful to know that my local schools are doing such a great job educating local kids, including my two.

M1

 **Mr CRISAFULLI** (Broadwater—LNP) (2.18 pm): I want to talk about something which is time critical in nature. It is important that we do not just place this on the record but also get a result before the end of this month. Currently the Department of Transport and Main Roads is conducting a review of what is now called the trial of a speed reduction—that is, the reduction in the speed limit on the M1 from 110 kilometres an hour to 100 kilometres an hour from the Logan Motorway interchange to Gaven and 100 kilometres an hour to 90 kilometres an hour between Eight Mile Plains and the Logan Motorway.

Why I would like to urgently put this on the record is that I do not want to see us rush into a decision to make this a permanent move because I do not believe it has been adequately trialled. Let me explain why. I have a group of about 100 residents whom I met while doorknocking during the election. They are everyday people. They live in all of the suburbs I represent. I asked them their view of the reduction in these speed limits. Some of them are vehemently opposed. Some of them believe it is a good solution, but there is one common theme amongst almost all of them and that is we do not really know if it was effective because it was trialled during a period when the volume of traffic was not what it normally was.

There was a traffic awareness campaign—call it a scare campaign; call it whatever you like—and one thing is for certain: during the period of the Commonwealth Games when the speed reductions were in place there was not the volume of traffic to make an assessment of whether this works or not. We were told to work from home. We saw a reduction in government services. There were ads of tradesmen on bicycles. We all remember those. Only essential traffic is what we were told. The people of the Gold Coast listened and they responded.

To suggest that the trial was adequate to know whether it was effective is, quite frankly, wrong. During the games I left Brisbane on one Friday afternoon. That is normally bedlam, as anyone who heads to the coast would know, and I got a clear run. It was like that all the way through. At one stage there was more chance of being hit by a tumbleweed than a truck: it was clear. Let us not pretend that this is a barometer, because it is not. I would urge the department, if it is going to consider making this permanent, to do a trial during a proper period, otherwise it was not a trial at all and people will be very cranky based on the feedback I have.

While I am on my feet, I want to acknowledge the member for Coomera on another issue local to the Gold Coast. We have seen another violent armed robbery in Ormeau, this time at Zaraffa's Coffee. The member for Coomera has been fighting tooth and nail for more police for that area. He is calling for 50, and he is right. We are not going to lie down on this issue. There is more in this space, but the northern Gold Coast needs more officers.

(Time expired)

Lytton Electorate, Health Services

 **Ms PEASE** (Lytton—ALP) (2.22 pm): I have spoken often in this place about the Newman government's disregard for the bayside and the shameful slashing of services that occurred during their term. During 2012-13 our community protested against the closure of the Moreton Bay Nursing Care Unit and the reduction of our bayside front-line health services. Our community fought so hard and campaigned. So many of us stood up to fight against these terrible, shameful cuts. These protests fell on deaf ears.

In the 2015 election, baysiders made it clear that they were really unhappy with the LNP's disregard for our community and their very loud message was that we deserved better—in fact, all of Queensland deserved better. I am delighted to say that in October 2017 Gundu Pa, our \$13 million public health service, opened, reinstating all of the services that the LNP government tore out of our community. We have seen 24-hour primary care and other sustainable health services which are so important to the health of our community reinstated. Subacute and palliative care beds which were previously at the old Lota site are now fully operational and are providing outstanding care to baysiders. I recently had a chance to visit.

Pandanus ward has eight general in-facility subacute beds and there are an additional six beds which are available to people in their own homes through Metro South Health's Hospital in the Home, a service new to the area. Camelia, the new palliative care unit at Blue Care Wynnum Aged Care Facility on Sibley Road, has been opened with specialist care being provided by Metro South Health clinicians. In-home services are also available and are being delivered by St Vincent's.

I recently had the opportunity to chat to Robert Smith, who is benefiting from a sunny room in Pandanus, and Elsie, who is enjoying Camelia, which is the new palliative care service. Both my parents were cared for beautifully by our local palliative care services so I know how important these services are to a community. I am so excited about Gundu Pa, Pandanus and Camelia as well as the many health services now available locally. This will ensure our community's health needs are met now and into the future. This is another great example of the Palaszczuk government delivering important infrastructure services to not only my community but all communities across Queensland.

Disability Parking Permits

 **Mr BATT** (Bundaberg—LNP) (2.25 pm): I rise to speak about the Disability Parking Scheme and the fact that visually-impaired people are currently unable to obtain disability parking permits in Queensland. Mrs Cheryl Callaghan and her husband and carer, Mr Kevin Callaghan, recently visited me to discuss their concerns with the Australian Disability Parking Scheme. Mrs Callaghan is legally blind, which is a permanent and incurable impairment. As such, Mrs Callaghan has been unable to drive for a number of years, relying on her husband to drive her wherever she needs or would like to go.

Mr and Mrs Callaghan recently went to their GP to have an application form signed for the ADPS permit, and they were shocked and confused when the doctor would not sign it as Mrs Callaghan did not meet the criteria. I was shocked and confused myself when they came to see me, because I assumed someone who was blind would be able to get a disability permit. Since speaking to many people in my community, they are all of the same opinion that someone who is legally blind would be able to get a disability permit. I do not know whether or not others in the House are aware of this, but I was not.

Mrs Callaghan has had a number of accidents as a result of her blindness, falling over objects such as uneven ground, car park wheel stops, gutters and stairs. Her blindness stops her from walking without the assistance of a white cane. She says she does not feel safe in a public place without a carer. In 2010 a national review was undertaken, and as a direct result a nationally recognised disability parking permit was introduced with minimum standards for disability parking concessions. National eligibility criteria for the permit was also implemented. Eligibility exclusively focuses on the applicant's ability to walk. As such, people with intellectual, psychiatric, cognitive or sensory impairments are not recognised as having a disability. However, under this scheme states and territories have the flexibility to provide additional concessions to meet the needs of local permit holders.

Given this, I wrote to the transport minister a few weeks ago to consider changing Queensland's criteria to allow the visually impaired to obtain disability parking permits. This would align Queensland with the Australian Capital Territory and New South Wales where people who are legally blind are able to apply for and obtain an ADPS permit. Being able to park in wider designated parking spaces with closer proximity to their location would make an element of life so much easier for people like Mr and Mrs Callaghan and those with guide dogs.

I received a response from the minister saying that the eligibility for Queensland's scheme remains exclusively on the applicant's ability to walk and to change the scheme to do so would expand the numbers considerably and may surge public pressure for other impairments as well. I do not think that is good enough for people with any type of disability to say that we cannot do this because there are not going to be enough car parks for them. I will continue to fight to make sure that we change this scheme for Queensland so that people who are blind can access it.

Gold Coast Commonwealth Games

 **Mr HEALY** (Cairns—ALP) (2.28 pm): The 2018 Commonwealth Games broadcasted not just the Gold Coast but also Queensland to the world. The games will leave a lasting legacy, and I am proud of the Palaszczuk government's commitment to ensuring Queensland's regional cities, including my city of Cairns, played an important part in this significant event—one of the largest events to take place in Australia in the last decade.

There are a couple of really important areas to note: firstly, Trade 2018, which was a commercial component of the Commonwealth Games raft of initiatives. Between 8 and 10 April we hosted a Cairns priority site program to highlight to Commonwealth Games delegates the rich experiences afforded to international students as part of their higher education in our region. For example, James Cook University's marine biology program is renowned for being at the cutting edge of marine research in the

world. This program is aimed at fostering relationships that will continue long into the future, benefiting our regional economy. Already there are more than 2,600 international students experiencing Cairns as part of their higher education. This represents a \$39 million contribution to the Cairns regional economy supporting just under 300 jobs directly and indirectly.

Cairns also played host to the basketball for the Commonwealth Games, and I am pleased to note that more than 17,000 tickets were sold, with the majority of those going to locals. Festival 2018—which was once again another initiative of the government—showcased Queensland's talent for the world to enjoy on the Cairns Esplanade, and it looked absolutely fantastic. In our city, more than 80,000 people took part and enjoyed the celebrations and the culture of Festival 2018. The place was absolutely alive. We had 12 days of fun and entertainment from 10 am to 10 pm on the Cairns Esplanade. This coincided with the school holidays, so the attendance was strong. Artworks were displayed, including Big Design, which was an outdoor gallery of public artworks designed by students aged 15 to 17. There were performances both day and night by world-class performers like Kate Miller-Heidke, Archie Roach and The Cat Empire.

The Esplanade was closed off between Aplin Street and Shields Street which allowed for al fresco dining which catered to a wide range of culinary delights. A musical story of Cairns called *Beginnings* was played at Munro Martin Parklands, and I enjoyed seeing this with the Governor-General. We hosted six days of Commonwealth Games basketball for both men and women. I want to say a big and special thanks to the 160 volunteers who made the rich cultural and sporting programs of the games possible. Our volunteers in Cairns, like those in other areas throughout Queensland, made the games. We can all agree that they were the best part of the event. Well done and congratulations to each and every one of them.

Mirani Electorate

 **Mr ANDREW** (Mirani—PHON) (2.31 pm): As I said in my maiden speech, the electorate of Mirani runs deep in my roots and I will always advocate for the best possible opportunities and prospects for the people and the Mirani electorate as a whole. As most members sitting in the House would be aware, the electorate spans 63,290 square kilometres. It covers much of the Queensland coast between the cities of Rockhampton and Mackay, as well as the hinterland west of Mackay and the sugar field plantations throughout towns including Sarina, Marian, Eton, Walkerston and Eungella, just to name a few. It is a regional electorate with many possibilities for growth and diversity by showcasing the best the electorate has to offer, from our pristine reefs to our rainforests.

Yesterday my office was sent a media release announcing that the Premier and the cabinet would be governing from the regions in Mackay. It is fair to say that Mackay and Mirani are neighbours as electorates. The constituents that entwine them are all but one. The constituents and community groups of both Mirani and Mackay work, live and play alongside each other.

Having said all of this, I would like to take the opportunity to extend an invitation on behalf of the Mirani electorate and my constituency to the Premier and the cabinet ministers to visit the Mirani electorate. As they govern from the regions in Mackay this month, they should visit the residents from the Sarina Range, whose main access road was decimated in ex-Tropical Cyclone Debbie and who travel to Mackay for work on a dirt road that is precarious from the Koumala Range on the Koumala Bolingbroke Road; visit Sarina State High School, where \$10 million was promised as an election commitment for the school's P&C to use as they see fit for the redevelopment and refurbishment of classrooms and see the students who have to travel to Mackay for major sporting events; visit the Sarina Hospital, where \$16 million was promised as an election commitment for the remodelling and refurbishment and possible additions to essential services; visit the Pioneer Valley and places like Eungella and Finch Hatton Gorge to see the tourism expansion possibilities in the area; and visit several sugarcane and farming families in the region and take a tour of a sugarcane mill to see where and how our sugar is actually made. It would be fantastic for the Premier and the cabinet to visit these parts of the electorate to witness the sheer possibilities for growth in the regions.

Casey, Hon. ED

 **Mrs GILBERT** (Mackay—ALP) (2.34 pm): I rise to speak about the legacy of Edmund Casey—a legacy I am proud to carry in this place. The record of Edmund Casey needs no recounting. He was a giant amongst those who stood here in this House and a giant of the Mackay community. Mackay Labor politics over the decades has been rooted in its community and has been a force for consensus and not division. Nobody exemplified this more than Edmund Casey.

Edmund always carried his arguments by persuading people not by berating them. Edmund knew that in public life the loudest voice in the room made the weakest argument. It was a skill that Edmund needed during his party's dark days in the 1970s and 1980s when division threatened to fatally split the Labor Party. It was a skill that earned the respect of the parliamentary Labor Party, which sought Edmund to rejoin in 1977 and made him leader only a year later. Edmund could not just convince the person next to him; he could carry the whole party room with him.

During his four-year leadership, he faced off against the Bjelke-Petersen machine at its full might. It was a battle that he did not win. Even if at that time his voice was not heard outside the Labor party room, it was well and truly heard within it. The respect of Edmund's colleagues propelled him into cabinet once Labor returned to office in 1989.

Edmund's skill for bringing people together did not take from his strongly held political beliefs. Edmund was famously quoted in the *Courier-Mail* as stating that he was neither a right winger nor a left winger; he was a Labor man. He was a man of convictions who did not seek to convict his opponents. In his political life, Edmund used argument, reason and history, not abuse, derision and ignorance. Edmund Casey was in every sense of the phrase a gentleman and a scholar. The former member for Southern Downs, during the condolence motion for Edmund Casey, recounted the comments Edmund made upon his retirement to *Courier-Mail* journalist Peter Morley, namely—

I have only had one political ambition—that is that the day when I die—when they lower my body into the grave—there will be somebody at the grave who is able to say that something I had done for them had helped them. Everyone who has come through my office door, or who has contacted me, I have tried to treat as perhaps being that person.

Those who seek to praise Edmund should be wise to heed these words, lest their praise be hollow. I would like to say to the member for Mirani that the Palaszczuk government has visited his electorate many times previously, and the Premier has a lot of knowledge of his electorate.

(Time expired)

Burnett Electorate

 **Mr BENNETT** (Burnett—LNP) (2.37 pm): Recently I ran a Facebook survey for the people of Burnett to give them a real voice and tell me exactly what they want me to raise in this House. I thank those who took the time to respond to the survey for the invaluable feedback we got from most people. The top concern that people in my electorate clearly wanted me to raise was local crime, followed closely by increasing hospital wait times. This does not surprise me when we look at the statistics on crime.

According to the QPS Annual Statistical Review for 2016-17 which was released late last year, the overall crime rate across the Wide Bay-Burnett district is increasing when compared to the previous financial year—fraud offences increased by 88.4 per cent; unlawful use of motor vehicles was up 26 per cent; unlawful entry into houses was up 19 per cent; and the rate of offences against property was up 16 per cent. Given this disturbing rise in crime, forgive me for being somewhat confused as to why the Labor government thinks it is appropriate to cut resources from vital community based services, including our Neighbourhood Watch groups. Labor is gutting 85 per cent of funding from this vital community group, slashing it from \$500,000 a year to just \$75,000. We should be backing community spirited volunteers who play a major role in crime prevention and detection, not giving them a kick in the shins.

Further feedback through the online survey indicated that the people of Burnett are extremely concerned about increasing drug dependency in our community, which naturally contributes to rising crime. Insidious drugs like ice are taking a grip on the nation, and sadly our home town is not immune to the issue. Every week I hear stories about what this terrifying drug is doing to our young people—stories of families being torn apart, crime rates increasing and our police and hospital services struggling to cope. Ice does not discriminate; it is affecting families right across the spectrum. Those on the front line of the ice epidemic are crying out for more support to tackle the issue head-on.

The LNP is listening to these concerns and took a comprehensive ice strategy to the last election, but we do not pretend to know it all. That is why we hosted a series of regional forums across the state, including in Bundaberg, to hear directly from addicts, their families, community experts and everyday Queenslanders about what they think needs to be done to stamp out the ice issue. Unlike Labor, which sat on a draft ice plan for a year, the LNP is out talking to the community and taking action to take ice off our streets and provide safer communities.

Part of our comprehensive \$52 million action plan is to establish a dedicated multibed drug and alcohol treatment centre in the Wide Bay region to help people kick their drug and alcohol addiction and provide them with ongoing support. As the shadow minister for child safety and member for Burnett, I will continue to fight against the scourge of ice to protect our kids and our families.

I regret that I am running out of time to give the local health system the attention it deserves. However, I give the people of Burnett a commitment to highlight this important issue in the House at the next available opportunity. The people of Bundaberg and the Burnett region are clearly being let down by a government which continues to mismanage critical front-line services. Rest assured, I will continue to fight for the vital front-line resources our community expects and deserves.

Anzac Day

 **Mr KING** (Kurwongbah—ALP) (2.39 pm): The Anzac spirit is growing every year in my area. I am pleased to say that in the new electorate of Kurwongbah the community and schools are proudly involved. The participation this year of school students in particular was amazing. As I am sure all of us in this place would agree, we would love to be able to attend every one of our schools' Anzac services. However, time and the concurrent scheduling of these services sadly stops this from being possible.

This year I was personally able to get along to Burpengary State Secondary College for a full school service where we heard from Jeff Korn, a Vietnam veteran, who read a moving poem that his father had written. Some students then performed a heartwarming version of John Schumann's *I Was Only 19*. It was a touching tribute that moved Jeff in particular as the song was written through the experience of a Vietnam veteran.

I also got along to Narangba State School's Anzac service where once again deputy principal Kerry Lofgren's song *Why Do You Cry on Anzac Day*, sung by the school choir with a moving video as a backdrop, left no dry eyes in the hall. The guest speaker was Ms Alex Growden from Legacy, who gave us an overview of the great work that Legacy does for our veterans' families.

This year for the first time as the new member for Kurwongbah I was able to attend the dawn service at Burpengary. The memorial there is spectacular and the new lighting gave great effect to a moving service. I had heard about the lighting and the significance of the memorial posts and plaques, but seeing it in the predawn light with a huge crowd sure does the hard work of the Burpengary War Memorial Committee justice.

I attended the main parade and service back at Kallangur and I was once again amazed at the number of schools that marched. Standing on the dais with my colleague Steven Miles and representatives of Chris Whiting as well as my neighbour Nikki Boyd, who had the amazing Ali France as a representative, were local councillors Denise Sims and Julie Greer as well as the always present Yvonne Chapman, we thought the procession would never end. As I said earlier, the participation of school students just gets better every year. It must warm the hearts of veterans to know their legacy is being remembered with such pride by our youth. I was pleased to see the catafalque party this year was RAEME, which was my corps when I was in the Army Reserve many years ago with 104 Field Workshop at Bulimba.

Once the service was over, as always I was pleased to be able to buy a cold one or two for some of the veterans at our local sub-branch behind Norths Leagues & Services Club. I was joined this year by my new neighbour Steven Miles, and together we listened to a few stories. It certainly is amazing to consider the experience that some of these soldiers went through and the respect I have for them grows each time I talk to them.

As I have said before, Anzac Day is always special to me and I know that the respect and commemorations will continue to grow as time passes. Lest we forget.

Ridgewood Road and Caloundra Road Intersection

 **Mr McARDLE** (Caloundra—LNP) (2.42 pm): I rise today to talk about the issue of the Ridgewood Road and Caloundra Road intersection, a subject I have spoken about in this House on many occasions in the past. The issue of putting in lights at that intersection has moved well forward and is coming to a conclusion. I think it is important to acknowledge the great work done by Greg and Joselyn Walker and Gwen Puszta, who fought for the last 10 years to ensure that the intersection did get the lights that are so critical to control the traffic in and out of Ridgewood Road onto Caloundra Road. They are, indeed, fighters for their community and they deserve the accolades of all who are involved in that battle.

I can recall about two years ago there was a meeting held at a park in the estate where about 150 people attended. They were passionate about what they wanted to have happen. That then flowed through to a committee being formed. After several meetings, there was a public meeting held in Caloundra to which the department was invited to attend. I have to say that the departmental officers attended and took great note of the concerns of the public—the residents and users of that intersection. They were committed to ensuring that feedback was given via me to the public. I have to also acknowledge the work of the minister in this matter because he took a deliberate hand in the outcome. I congratulate him and say thank you on behalf of the community.

In May of 2017 a second public meeting was held. A lot more information was put forward to the department who took copious notes and committed to coming back to me with what they saw as a potential solution. The public always wanted traffic lights at the intersection because they could see that the location of the intersection posed a major threat to people entering and exiting Caloundra Road from Ridgewood Road. The intersection is also used by many schoolchildren who access two school stops in the proximity.

The traffic population in that area is going to increase as time goes by and the department foresaw that. In 2017 they advised a study would be undertaken to see whether or not lights could be put in place. That has now been ticked off by the department and the minister. One more thing now has to happen, and that is funding to ensure those lights are put in place to make certain of the safety of those using the intersection, either pedestrians or in their vehicles, for time to come.

Whilst congratulating the minister on the work he has done in this regard—and I mean that sincerely—I urge him to look at this application via his departmental officers to ensure that we do get the outcome that is so badly needed and has been so hard fought for over many years.

Mount Lindesay Highway

 **Mr POWER** (Logan—ALP) (2.45 pm): I rise to speak today in Road Safety Week to inform the House of an announcement made on Tuesday with the Minister for Main Roads to make the Mount Lindesay Highway safer. This is a \$14 million further investment in saving lives and reducing car crashes. This project enhances safety on the Mount Lindesay Highway by upgrading the intersection of Stockleigh Road and building a service road to connect Casuarina Road and the houses on Wharf Street, eliminating that really dangerous intersection near the temple.

Before I tell the House more about this safety project, I would like to outline the other investments made by the Palaszczuk Labor government and also the failure to invest of the Newman LNP government. A lack of investment was signed off by the current member for Nanango when that member, now the LNP leader, was on the CBRC committee.

When I was elected in 2015 there was no forward investment in the roads budget for the Mount Lindesay Highway north of Jimboomba for the forward four years. There was nothing—zero. The LNP while in government added a paltry \$1 million to build new turn lanes that will soon be unused and they had planned no further investment at all. On being elected in 2015 I knew my job was to turn around this lack of investment and fight for a safer Mount Lindesay Highway. To do this, along with TMR we began consulting through the Mount Lindesay Highway Safety Review in 2015. Off the back of that consultation, Transport and Main Roads identified key areas to improve safety. In addition to this, as part of the Palaszczuk Labor government I voted to support the legislation to facilitate the Logan Motorway Enhancement Project, which is currently under construction and is projected to reduce accidents by 80 per cent at the intersection of the Logan Motorway and the Mount Lindesay Highway.

A government member interjected.

Mr POWER: It is good news. I notice the member for Stretton, who is also a great advocate for the improvements we have made to that intersection and also its connection to the Gateway Motorway. Further, we have made other investments. Honourable members should remember this is from a standing start, from zero. There was \$20 million to duplicate to four lanes the highway at Park Ridge South between Rosia Road and the Stoney Camp-Granger Road intersection. This is only a short section but it makes it much safer because 20 per cent of traffic exits there. There has also been \$20 million in funding for a service road between north of St Aldwyn Road through to Greenbank Road as well as an upgrade to the Greenbank Road intersection. There is also the Camp Cable Road intersection upgrade that has already been completed and uplifting between Camp Cable Road and Jimboomba.

Lastly, I have not had time to speak about it properly in the three minutes available to me, but the design is underway and the survey has already been completed. We will be putting in \$14 million to make the Stockleigh Road intersection safer to ensure this dangerous intersection, where sadly we recently had a facility, is getting the investment it deserves under the Palaszczuk Labor government, and I will continue to fight for more.

(Time expired)

Electricity Prices

 **Mr HART** (Burleigh—LNP) (2.49 pm): If last night's debate told us anything, it is that this Labor government—which claims to be open, transparent and accountable—is anything but. Something else they have been keeping secret from the people of Queensland is the hidden tax in their electricity bills. Respected author Hugh Grant's latest paper, 'The winners and losers of the monopoly game', talks about how the Queensland government profits from Queensland's excessive electricity prices, and I table that.

Tabled paper. Document, dated April 2018, by Mr Hugh Grant, Executive Director, ResponseAbility, titled 'The Winners and Losers of the Monopoly Game: How the Queensland Government profits from Queensland's excessive electricity prices' [610].

Mr Power interjected.

Mr HART: For the member's benefit, the report shows that the Queensland government is ripping out 47 per cent from everybody's electricity bill in the form of a hidden tax. For every \$1,000 in network costs the Queensland government benefits by \$470. When we add to that the fact that 65 per cent of the generation in this state is owned by this government and that at any one time more than that may be put into the Queensland grid and consumed by the people of Queensland, this government is making a lot of money from generation.

In the last budget of this government they made \$405 million more than they had budgeted for—not \$405 million in total but \$405 million more than the budgeted figure in their own budget. That tells us that they are profiting to the extreme on the generation side of it. They are profiting by 47 per cent on the network costs, and when we add in the fact that in South-East Queensland they have to deal with CS Energy and Alinta, they are profiting there. In the regions, Ergon is the only supplier of retail electricity to most of the people, so they are profiting there.

This government is profiting about 50 per cent from everybody's electricity bill. My challenge to the minister is that if I am wrong, come in here and tell us what the real figures are and I will apologise. If not, the people of Queensland deserve to know what this hidden tax is all about. They deserve to know how much this government is ripping them off, so I issue the challenge today. The minister needs to come into this room and tell the people of Queensland exactly how much this government is ripping them off in tax on electricity.

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance

 **Mr WHITING** (Bancroft—ALP) (2.52 pm): On Monday we celebrate Labour Day. There are many reasons to celebrate Labour Day in Queensland, and that is because many workers are now finding jobs under the Palaszczuk government because we are marshalling one of the best economic performances in Australia. The economic performance of the Palaszczuk government is powering business confidence and business investment in Queensland.

The NAB Monthly Business Survey showed that business conditions in Queensland in February were the highest of any state. The first quarter of this year was the strongest quarter for consumer confidence in Queensland since 2010, and the December quarter economic data showed an 11.8 per cent increase in business investment for Queensland last year. There is more business confidence and more investment, and that means more jobs. Nearly 160,000 jobs have been created since the Palaszczuk government came into office. Ninety per cent of those are in the private sector. That means that 4,000 jobs have been created each month, and that includes the more than 75,000 full-time jobs that were created in 2017 alone.

More Queenslanders are looking for jobs than are getting them, and one of the Queensland workers reaping the benefits of this increased confidence and investment is Trudy. I first met Trudy at the North Lakes Sports Club last year. That club is a \$25 million investment in our local community. It was the first greenfield club built in Queensland in 20 years and it has created over 120 local jobs.

Last weekend I met Trudy at the brand-new North Lakes Hotel. That is a development by local developer KeyMax. It is a Great Western hotel with 46 rooms overlooking Lake Eden. It has conference facilities and 11 different combinations of rooms to cater for all kinds of functions, meetings and events.

Trudy, a local worker, was able to move into an even better job in the hotel as a restaurant manager. Trudy's story shows what can happen through increased investment by business in Queensland, and her story shows that Queensland workers have a lot to celebrate on Labour Day.

Queensland workers do not have a lot to celebrate if they look at the performance of the Turnbull government. It is clear that the LNP are an economic drag on Queensland. Their performance federally is letting us down here in Queensland. Let us look at one economic metric. Jim Chalmers MP pointed out that federal debt has hit \$523.9 billion under the federal LNP. Debt is accumulating \$1.23 billion faster in these rosier economic times than under federal Labor. It is very clear that the LNP are not better economic managers. They left that behind years ago. While we in Queensland forge ahead in our economy and economic growth, the performance of the LNP is a drag on the Queensland economy and Queensland workers.

Sunshine Coast Rail Duplication

 **Mr POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (2.55 pm): It is a great day for the residents of the Sunshine Coast. It is one of those days that I wish I was back on the coast sharing in the celebrations, but by being here in parliament I have an opportunity to tell members and all of Queensland why it is such a great day. The north coast rail duplication is a project that is very near and dear to me. It is a project that I needed when I did the two-hour-each-way-each-day commute from my home on the Sunshine Coast to Brisbane as a public servant; a project that as a resident of a railway town on the Sunshine Coast I know is desperately needed; a project that as a local member I know will bring certainty, improvements and better transport around the Sunshine Coast and into Brisbane and beyond; a project that as a former transport shadow minister, and now as the infrastructure shadow minister, I know is desperately needed; and a project that is about to become a reality.

Sadly, this project was canned by those opposite in 2009. Despite promising the money, despite having the money in the budget and despite having work crews do preliminary works between Beerburum and Landsborough, it went missing. My Sunshine Coast colleagues and I have been fighting ever since to get this project back on the books. We were joined in this fight by our federal colleagues, Andrew Wallace, the member for Fisher, Ted O'Brien, the member for Fairfax and 'Team Queensland'. I thank them for what they have been able to achieve.

This is a project that the LNP put back on track. In our term in government we got all the approvals and all the works done so the project was shovel ready. We gave a commitment in the 2015 and 2017 election campaigns to make this project a reality. Now it can be, because our federal colleagues, the Turnbull government, have committed \$390 million. We will see that in next week's federal budget. It is a wonderful contribution that will lead to 150 extra weekly services on the north coast rail line. It will improve freight. What that means for everyone who does not use rail is fewer cars and trucks on the Bruce Highway. What a fantastic outcome for everyone who commutes or travels to and from the Sunshine Coast for work or enjoyment.

This duplication is a necessary precursor for fast rail. Many of my constituents on the coast have heard me talk about that, and I am excited that it is still potentially on track. We need this duplication, particularly through to Landsborough, to make fast rail through to Nambour and Maroochydore a reality. There are no more excuses. The federal government has put \$390 million on the table. Our residents do not want to hear quibbles over whether that is 50 per cent, 80 per cent, 20 per cent, 30 per cent or 60 per cent. We need a commitment from the Annastacia Palaszczuk Labor government in June's budget to match that funding so this project finally becomes a reality.

Premier's Reading Challenge

 **Ms LINARD** (Nudgee—ALP) (2.58 pm): I was very proud to have the Premier and the Minister for Education, Grace Grace, visit my electorate last week to officially launch the 2018 Premier's Reading Challenge at Nundah State School. This program, now in its 13th year, aims to improve literacy and encourage children to read widely for pleasure and learning. Open to early childhood centres, state and non-state schools and home educated students up to year 9, this annual statewide program is all about getting young people motivated to read or read more in a fun way. Last year a total of 156,000 children and students participated in the challenge from 850 schools and 410 early childhood centres. Over 2.19 million books were read as part of the challenge, and I know that Queensland children can do even better in 2018.

To successfully complete the challenge, children must read or experience an allocated number of books during the reading period. These targets are age appropriate, with prep to year 2 needing to read or experience 20 books, year 3 and 4 students to read 20 books and year 5 to 9 to read 15 chapter

books. Importantly, this challenge is open equally to all students in those year levels, with suggested book titles for the first time being available in Chinese, French, German and Japanese as well as English. For learners with special needs, they will also be able to engage with books that support their needs whether in large print, braille or audio.

As part of the launch last week at Nundah State School, the Premier and education minister read a book to year 2 students in the library and took the time to have a quick tour around the gorgeous new quadrangle—the heart of the school—and principal Deb Cox proudly showed off the new STEM space. At the launch the Premier also confirmed that the Queensland Ready Reading program will recommence this year after being cut by the previous LNP government in 2012. The program will see up to 3,000 reading volunteers trained by Volunteering Queensland to go into schools across the state to share the love of reading with students.

I am passionate about literacy and developing a lifelong love of learning in our young Queenslanders. Books have the capacity to transport us to faraway places, to allow us to be anyone or anything we want to be, to learn from history, to make history and to be challenged by other's expression. I have taken great pleasure in donating hundreds of books to early learners across my electorate over the past three years in celebration of the culmination of the Premier's Reading Challenge and Book Week celebrations each year in August. This year will be no exception and I encourage all young readers across my electorate and all electorates to pick up a book and take up the challenge, with registrations now open and reading to commence on 14 May. My two young boys have their first books already picked and ready to go for when the challenge kicks off in a few weeks, with my four-year-old Ollie showing particularly good judgement and choosing a book called *Just Like My Mum*.

DEPUTY SPEAKER'S RULING

Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by a Minister

 **Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Stewart): Honourable members, on 6 March 2018 the Leader of the Opposition and member for Nanango wrote to Mr Speaker alleging that the then minister for transport and main roads and member for Miller deliberately misled the House in making three statements about two separate issues whilst answering questions without notice. These statements occurred in the 55th Parliament, but the Leader of the Opposition advises that the cause of delay in referring these matters was due to the recent release of evidence under the Right to Information Act 2009.

On 7 March 2018 the Speaker wrote to Minister Bailey seeking a response to the allegations. Minister Bailey responded on 19 March 2018. On 22 March 2018 the Speaker decided that whilst these matters raised do not directly relate to his previous duties as the treasurer he had decided out of an abundance of caution approach to delegate the functions of Speaker in relation to the matter under standing order 269(6) to me as Deputy Speaker.

On the evidence before me I considered that the minister has made adequate explanation for the basis of his three statements, which, on the face of the material before me, do not appear to be factually incorrect or misleading. Therefore, I have decided that this matter does not warrant the further attention of the House via the Ethics Committee and I will not be referring the matter. I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 6 March 2018, and enclosures, from Leader of the Opposition, Mrs Deb Frecklington MP, to Mr Speaker, Hon. Curtis Pitt, regarding an alleged misleading of the House by the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, Hon. Mark Bailey [\[611\]](#).

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 22 March 2018, from Mr Speaker, Hon. Curtis Pitt, to the Deputy Speaker, Mr Scott Stewart MP, in relation to an alleged misleading of the House by the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, Hon. Mark Bailey [\[612\]](#).

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 19 March 2018, from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, Hon. Mark Bailey, to Mr Speaker, Hon. Curtis Pitt, regarding an alleged misleading of the House [\[613\]](#).

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

Leave granted.

SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED DELIBERATELY MISLEADING THE HOUSE

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER: Honourable Members,

On 6 March 2018, the Leader of the Opposition and Member for Nanango wrote to me alleging that the then Minister for Transport and Main Roads and Member for Miller deliberately misled the House in making three statements about two separate issues whilst answering Questions Without Notice around the subject of his private email account.

These statements occurred in the 55th Parliament but the Leader of the Opposition advises that the cause of the delay in referring these matters to me was due to the release of evidence under the Right to Information Act 2009.

The first allegation concerned two statements made by the minister, on different dates.

The minister's first statement, made on 28 February 2017, was in response to a Question Without Notice: '... when deleting his accounts, what efforts did the minister make to comply with the Public Records Act 2002?'

In his answer, the minister stated:

... It was a private email account, I treated it as a private email account and I deleted it as a private email account ...

The minister's second statement, made on 1 March 2017, was in response to a Question Without Notice: '... will the Minister inform the House exactly how many emails were in his Yahoo! account in relation to official government business such as matters subject to cabinet consideration?'

In his answer, the minister stated:

... In relation to that private email account, I have made it very clear that it was a private email account that I used for private purposes. That is very clear ...

The second allegation concerned the minister's answer to another Question Without Notice.

This third statement, made on 28 February 2017 was in response to a further Question Without Notice: '... will the Minister now reactivate his account and provide official records as he is required to do under the Official Records Act?'

In his answer, the minister stated:

... Regarding the issue which Mr Peter Simpson raised with me, I was not a decision-maker in that merger process and I made no representations whatsoever with anybody.

With regard to the first allegation, in her letter to the Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition alleged that the minister mislead the House by implying that the account was exclusively for private use.

In his response, the minister argued that the Leader of the Opposition has erroneously sought to characterise his statements as implying that his personal email account was used exclusively for private use.

The minister explains that when the full questions and answers are read in context, there is no suggestion of exclusive private use. I note on the plain reading of the minister's full statements that there is no indication in the actual words used that the email account was exclusively used for private matters.

Whilst an argument could be made that the minister's statements could have been misleading by omission, when the statements are assessed in the context of the full questions asked and answers given, I accept the minister's explanation that the statements were not factually or apparently incorrect or misleading.

In regard to the second allegation, the Leader of the Opposition alleges that the minister made representations about the merger by forwarding an email to his Chief of Staff for action. In his response, the minister explained that his statement was factually correct, in that he was not a part of the merger process and nor was his Chief of Staff. He stated that he did not believe that simply forwarding an email to his Chief of Staff from his personal account could be viewed as a 'representation'.

I note that the email in question of 15 January 2017 to the minister's Chief of Staff does not include any instructions or request any action. Accordingly, I accept the minister's explanation that merely sending an email to his Chief of Staff does not amount to a representation and therefore, there is no evidence to suggest that the statement was factually or apparently incorrect or misleading or that the minister intended to mislead the House.

Standing Order 269(4) requires:

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

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

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

I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Portfolio Committees, Referral of Auditor-General's Reports and Reporting Date

 Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (3.03 pm): I seek to 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 135A that the date for the Transport and Public Works Committee to report on the Heavy Vehicle National Law Amendment Bill 2018 be 28 June 2018.

The committee has resolved pursuant to standing order 194B that Auditor-General report No. 2 for 2016-17 titled *Forecasting long-term sustainability of local government* and report No. 13 of 2016-17 titled *Local government entities: 2015-16 results of financial audits* be referred to the Economics and Governance Committee; Auditor-General report No. 16 of 2015-16 titled *Flood resilience of river catchments* and report No. 19 of 2016-17 titled *Security of critical water infrastructure* be referred to the State Development, Natural Resources and Agricultural Industry Development Committee; Auditor-General report No. 2 of 2017-18 titled *Managing the mental health of Queensland police employees* be referred to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee; Auditor-General report No. 1 of 2017-18 titled *Follow-up of report 15: 2013-14 environmental regulation of the resources and waste industries* be referred to the Innovation, Tourism Development and Environment Committee; and Auditor-General report No. 20 of 2016-17 titled *Education and employment outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people* be referred to the Education, Employment and Small Business Committee.

These reports were referred to portfolio committees of the 55th Parliament but not reported on before the dissolution of that parliament. In addition, the committee has resolved pursuant to standing order 194B that Auditor-General's report No. 14 for 2017-18 titled the *National Disability Insurance Scheme* be referred to the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee.

MOTION

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

 Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (3.05 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee inquire into and report to the Legislative Assembly by 30 September 2018 on:

- a) the establishment of a pharmacy council, and
- b) all transfers of pharmacy ownership in Queensland over the past two years to ensure compliance with existing legislation.

That, in undertaking this inquiry, the committee should consider:

- a) the effectiveness of the current systems and processes in Queensland to regulate pharmacy business ownership in Queensland and protect Queensland consumers;
- b) the possible role and scope of responsibility of a pharmacy council, including any powers of enforcement and/or ability to impose penalties; pharmacists' and pharmacy assistants' roles and scope of practice; and interactions with other agencies or individuals involved in regulating pharmacy businesses and practice;
- c) models of regulation of pharmacy business ownership in other jurisdictions;
- d) a cost-benefit analysis of establishing a pharmacy council;
- e) any changes to legislation that would be required to establish a pharmacy council, including, but not limited to, changes to the Pharmacy Business Ownership Act 2001 (Qld), the Health Act 1937 (Qld) and subordinate legislation, namely the Health (Drugs and Poisons) Regulation 1996 and the Health Regulation 1996; and
- f) all transfers of pharmacy ownership in Queensland over the past two years.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

MOTION

Amendments to Sessional Orders

 Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (3.07 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That the days, hours of sitting and order of business for the sitting week 12 to 15 June 2018 (budget week) contained in the temporary sessional orders circulated in my name be agreed to, effective from 12 June.

BUDGET WEEK—TEMPORARY SESSIONAL ORDERS

(1) The days, hours of sitting and order of business for the sitting week 12 to 15 June 2018 (budget week) be as follows:

Tuesday

*9.30am—10.15am—Preliminary Business **

Prayers

Messages from the Governor

Matters concerning privilege

Speaker's Statements

Appointments

Petitions

Citizen's Right of Reply

Notification and tabling of papers by the Clerk

Ministerial Papers

Ministerial Notices of Motion

Ministerial Statements

Any other Government Business

Personal Explanations

Tabling of Reports

Notice of motion for disallowance of statutory instrument

10.15 am—11.15 am—

Question Time

11.15 am—1.00pm—

Government Business

1.00pm—2.00pm—

Lunch break

2.00pm—until adjournment moved

Government Business

Wednesday

*9.30am—10.15am—Preliminary Business **

Prayers

Messages from the Governor

Matters concerning privilege

Speaker's Statements

Appointments

Petitions

Citizen's Right of Reply

Notification and tabling of papers by the Clerk

Ministerial Papers

Ministerial Notices of Motion

Ministerial Statements

Any other Government Business

Personal Explanations

Tabling of Reports

Notice of motion for disallowance of statutory instrument

Notice of motion for debate during Private Members' Motion (5.00pm—6.00pm) (Notice may be stated in the House and delivered to the Clerk)

10.15am—11.15am—

Question Time

11.15am—12.00pm—

Introduction of Private Members' Bills #

12.00pm—2.00pm—

Lunch break

2.00pm—3.00pm—

Private Members' Statements (Total time 60 minutes, 20 members x 3 minutes each)

3.00pm—5.00pm

Government Business

5.00pm—6.00pm—

Private Members' Motion (motion for which notice was given immediately prior to 10.15am to take precedence)

6.00pm—7.00pm

Government Business

7.00pm—7.30pm—

Automatic Adjournment

** (If completed before 10.15am, Question Time will commence earlier and continue for 1 hour with starting times for all other items, except lunch breaks, in the Order of Business adjusting accordingly.)*

(If there are no Private Members' Bills to introduce, or any introduction to complete, the next item of business to commence with starting times for all other items, except lunch breaks, in the Order of Business adjusted accordingly.)

Thursday

*9.30am—10.15am—Preliminary Business **

Prayers

Messages from the Governor

Matters concerning privilege

Speaker's Statements

Appointments

Petitions

Citizen's Right of Reply

Notification and tabling of papers by the Clerk

Ministerial Papers

Ministerial Notices of Motion

Ministerial Statements

Any other Government Business

Personal Explanations

Tabling of Reports

Notice of motion for disallowance of statutory instrument

10.15am—11.15am—

Question Time

11.15am—1.00pm—

Government Business

1.00pm—2.00pm—

Lunch break

2.00pm—6.30pm

Government Business

6.30pm—7.30pm—

Dinner break

7.30pm—until adjournment moved

Government Business

Friday

From 9.30 am—10.00 am—

Prayers

Messages from the Governor

Matters concerning privilege

Speaker's Statements
Appointments
Petitions
Citizen's Right of Reply
Notification and tabling of papers by the Clerk
Ministerial Papers
Ministerial Notices of Motion
Ministerial Statements
Any other Government Business
Personal Explanations
Tabling of Reports
Notice of motion for disallowance of statutory instrument

10.00am—10.30am—
Question Time

10.30am—1.00pm—
Government Business

1.00pm—2.00pm—
Lunch break

2.00pm—until adjournment moved—
Government Business

(2) Speaking times for items of business will be as per the Sessional Orders for the 56th Parliament as amended on 1 May 2018.

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (3.07 pm): I thank the Leader of the House for briefing me on this matter prior to the introduction of the motion today. I have to say though that, having reviewed the amendments now, it is groundhog day or 'we told you so', because already the government has to extend the sitting hours of parliament to deal with parliamentary business because family friendly hours have not worked so well, have they?

In the past we did not have to move sessional and temporary standing orders for the budget. If we look at each day, it says that it is government business until the adjournment is moved. That used to be the case on every sitting night. We now have our seven o'clock automatic adjournments on Tuesdays and Wednesdays and the automatic adjournment at six o'clock on Thursdays. For budget week the Leader of the House says that we need to extend those hours because otherwise we will not get through the budget speeches.

The Leader of the House and the government ought to have a look at the number of bills that have been reported on by committees, the number of bills currently before committees and the fact that we have only been able to debate one piece of legislation this week and we are still not finished that piece of legislation, yet we are less than three hours away from the automatic adjournment. This is just the start of an extension of time, time and time again for the sessional and standing orders.

As has been the practice for years and years, the opposition will not stand in the way of a government's budget. That is why we will be supporting the allocation of time for speeches because we know that, if we do not, the government is going to guillotine the debate anyway. We want to make sure that our members get the opportunity to speak to the budget.

The election was in November last year. Other than for those new members who have made their maiden speeches, we have not really made inroads into the address-in-reply. We are going to go into a budget sitting week and have the budget debate as well as the address-in-reply. Members will be giving their address-in-reply to the Governor's speech and also delivering their reply to the budget speech given by the Treasurer. In the 10 years that I have been in this place, that has not occurred. This is because the government has curtailed the hours of debate under the guise of family friendly sitting hours. We are now seeing that the government members are not able to get their agenda through this House because they are lazy. That is why this amendment has been moved to the sessional orders for budget week to keep members here after seven o'clock at night. Effectively, the amendment says, 'Don't go home at seven. We need you here. We will go back to what it was like in the old days of the last parliament and sit after 7.30 pm on Tuesday and Wednesday nights and 6.30 pm on Thursday night.'

I am speaking to this motion because this is just the start. As more bills are introduced, as the committees get more burdened with the government's legislation—and this week we have not even had one bill completed in a three-day sitting—we will see that the government cannot manage the business of this House.

 **Mr WATTS** (Toowoomba North—LNP) (3.11 pm): I would like to talk briefly to this motion. I remember debating the sessional orders in this House and highlighting some of the difficulties that they would cause for regional members, such as not holding committee meetings on Wednesdays and regional members being unable to get home to their families at night and still being in Brisbane with no business being done in the House.

I travel down to Brisbane. I am here every evening. I want to make sure that, when we are here, we are getting the business of the state done. I will be supporting this motion, because it means that, finally, we will get the opportunity to speak to bills and get some work done without having an adjournment forced on us. Those members who live in Brisbane pop home to their families while the other members are stuck here unable to travel.

I find it curious that only just a few sitting days ago we were debating the sessional orders and how, in the brave new world under this incompetent administration, we would be able to get all the business of the House done in the time that it has decided would be allocated. Here we are, just a few short sitting days later, finding out that the government members are asleep at the wheel. They cannot manage the business in the chamber. Even with an early bedtime on a sitting day, they cannot manage the business of the House in the time they have allocated.

I think we should seriously consider going back to operating under the sessional orders as they existed in the previous parliament, which would allow not only debate—

Ms Jones interjected.

Mr WATTS: I am being told that I do not stand for family values. I cannot get home to see my family because I live in a regional town. Does the minister not understand where regional Queensland is? Some members who live in Brisbane should go home via Toowoomba after a sitting day. That way they might understand the concept of being unable to see their family under these family friendly sitting hours. Obviously, it would not be safe for me to drive for five hours from my home to Brisbane and back again each night during a sitting week.

When I come to parliament, it is my intention to get some work done to make sure that the voice of the people of the Toowoomba North electorate is heard in this place and heard loudly so that the people of my electorate get the resources and the things they want, and to make sure that their representation on legislation is put forward. We cannot do that if the government constantly keeps chopping short the sessional orders.

I cannot attend committee meetings on a Monday because I have shadow cabinet responsibilities. I want to go to some of those committee meetings, but I cannot do two things at the same time. This motion that we are debating is a clear consequence of government members in the south-east corner changing the sessional orders to suit themselves and to make sure that some members of the opposition cannot attend committee meetings on very important bills. Those committee meetings provide very important opportunities for members to listen to witnesses who come forward to address the committee.

The original sessional orders were bipartisan. We held committee meetings on a Wednesday morning. That was a bipartisan decision. That sessional order was made for the good of the parliament. When I look at some of the legislation that is before us and when I consider some of the things that happen on a Monday morning, I would dearly like to be able to represent the people of the electorate of Toowoomba North by attending those meetings and listening to the witnesses as they put their evidence. I cannot, because the hours allocated for committee meetings have been moved. I cannot remember exactly how many short sitting days ago it was that that happened, but it was not many. Now, here we are making an adjustment.

I have not made my address-in-reply. I do not imagine that I will make my address-in-reply today. I am not even sure that I will make my address-in-reply before I have to talk about the budget, which is a bizarre situation. I think the Leader of the House needs to look at the sessional orders of the previous parliament in order to understand the concept of parliament, which is that people who have been duly elected to represent their electorates get the opportunity to come to this place and talk about the issues that are affecting their electorates.

Those members who are members of committees, and who, when considering bills, have travelled throughout the state, have only 20 minutes to speak to those bills. We have all heard the debate that we have had on vegetation management. Some of the members of the committee that considered that bill had a mere 10 minutes to talk about all of the evidence they heard about this bill as they travelled throughout the state. If we consider all the locations that committee went to and all the witnesses—

Mrs D'ATH: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. This motion is about budget week. It is not about changing the sessional orders for the usual sitting weeks.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. In answer to the point of order, you cannot amend the sessional orders for the budget—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): You cannot—

Mr BLEIJIE: My point of order is that, in terms of the debate, you cannot have a debate about the new sessional orders without the sessional orders that will not now apply on the same evening.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Toowoomba North, we continue to hear the same argument. Under standing order 236, I ask you to come back to your point and make it relevant. Otherwise, I will ask you to resume your seat.

Mr WATTS: I appreciate the opportunity to make my point in relation to these temporary sessional orders that have been proposed for budget week. Certainly, for me, one of the points is to make sure that I can represent the people of Toowoomba North during budget week. I would also very much like to represent—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Toowoomba North, I have guided you and now advise you under standing order 236(1) that your argument is becoming tedious repetition. I would advise you now to make your point and make sure you do not continue to repeat yourself; otherwise I will ask you to resume your seat.

Mr WATTS: I appreciate it may be tedious repetition. The job I have is to come here and represent the people of Toowoomba North. I cannot represent the people of Toowoomba North if I am not allowed to make the point. The point is that I cannot make the point.

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Members to my right, I encourage you not to shout out your objections across the chamber. I have made my ruling. I have given guidance to the member. Allow me to do my job.

Mr WATTS: My point is it that if I cannot go to committee meetings then I cannot represent the people. This may be, in fact, the only opportunity I get to discuss the fact that I have been completely gagged in terms of my ability to attend committee meetings by the sessional orders that now guide this parliament.

I am very pleased today to see a new set of sessional orders be proposed for the budget week. The simple facts are that these are superior sessional orders to the ones that guide the parliament on a regular basis. I would ask that the Leader of the House consider that these sessional orders be adopted going forward so that we have the opportunity to speak on bills on a regular basis and that the work of this House can happen when people come down to Brisbane to represent the people that they were elected to represent. With that I will cut myself short, even though I have a couple of minutes left.

Government members interjected.

Mr WATTS: I do not have to cut myself short. If people would like me to continue on I am happy to do that.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Through the chair.

Mr WATTS: I hear many people who would like me to continue for the additional minutes. I was quite prepared to sit down because I understand that there is a lot of business before the House that we need to get through because, of course, we have the automatic adjournment during the normal sessional hours. Even though I hear the Labor members who would like me to continue, I will finish up with a little bit of time on the clock even though the people of Toowoomba North would very much like to make sure their voice is heard in this place on a regular basis.

Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (3.22 pm): I rise to speak to the motion before the House in relation to the change to the sessional orders for the budget week. We have just received notice of these matters. It is a culmination of what I warned this House about when the new sessional orders were coming into the parliament. As the architect, I am proud to say, of family friendly hours in this House in the 55th Parliament, I am pleased that the foreboding that I expressed in parliament in my speech on the original sessional orders has come to fruition through this motion we have before the House today.

As the Manager of Opposition Business mentioned, the reality is that we have a backlog of speeches in this House to clear, we have a backlog of bills before the House to clear and we have a lot of work to get through in budget week because of the changes to the previous sessional orders that bring the House to a close at 7.30 pm. Whilst it does not relate to this motion, in terms of the portfolio committees meeting on a Monday morning, it does transgress the intent of family friendly hours by the very fact that members have to move in from a Sunday—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Mermaid Beach, can I bring you back to relevance and back to what the motion is.

Mr STEVENS: I am giving the background to why we have this motion before the House. The reality is that this is a direct result of the family friendly changes to the sessional orders that were put forward in this House that pulled the House up at 7.30 every night. At this stage we have still to get through one bill in this week. I have been in this place for 11 years and there is not one week that I can remember where we have done one bill for the week. Over those years we have had some pretty contentious bills, as members would know, where debate has gone into the early hours of the next day. That is the very reason why I see this motion that the Leader of the House has put forward here today for parliamentary consideration as being inappropriate for the House and unfortunately leading to changes again to the sessional orders. If we had not had those changes to sessional orders, if we had worked through what I suggested—without going into matters of the CLA at the time—in terms of a 9.30 pm pull-up, which was a suggestion that I have made consistently in public—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I understand that this could be committee work that you are now discussing. I encourage you to tread cautiously with the rest of your comments.

Mr STEVENS: Thank you for that advice. I do take on board directions in these matters. I have said personally for a long time in the media, recommending family friendly hours for the parliament to sit, that on a personal basis I thought 9.30 pm was the appropriate time for the House to operate to. That personally suited me. Whatever considerations there may have been by other committee members is a matter, of course, we have to keep confidential.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think you are continuing to be tedious. Please move on.

Mr STEVENS: That is what my wife says. It has not worked with her either. This is a culmination of what I predicted would happen. We are having to change sessional orders for budget week. This motion landed on our laps after lunch on a Thursday in a very tedious week, as you mentioned, Mr Deputy Speaker. This would have been a very appropriate time for me to move an amendment that we incorporate family friendly hours that move to a 9.30 pm finish as opposed to our normal sessional orders rather than just debate this specific motion about the budget week. That amendment would be cause for further debate and deliberation. There are many people from regional areas who are here at night after 7.30 pm raring to go for parliament the next day.

Mr Lister: All those electorates, name them!

Mr STEVENS: There are many regional areas that have excellent representation from our side of the House. The reality is that sitting until 9.30 pm, as I suggested, would have meant getting through bills so that we did not have to extend budget week to take in speeches on the address-in-reply et cetera. Those matters could have been dealt with through the normal processes and it would have eased the burden on the week that we now have to change the sessional orders for.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order! One moment, member for Mermaid Beach. I am continuing to hear tedious repetition in your speech. Under standing order 236, I need to advise you that if you do not add anything new to your speech you will be asked to resume your seat.

Mr STEVENS: I am just about out of new things to tell you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I have not got to the repetition. The reality is that, unfortunately, the motion before the House puts into reality what I predicted previously. Even though we will agree to the motion, the motion is unfortunate for the effective operation of the House.

 **Mr CRANDON** (Coomera—LNP) (3.30 pm): Mr Deputy Speaker, thank you for recognising me. I know there was a lot of enthusiasm from members on my right who want to speak to this motion. I will refer to the actual words of the motion, before addressing some other matters. In relation to the timing, I see that on the Tuesday we are meant to sit until whatever time. It says '2.00 pm—until adjournment moved' and then 'Government Business'. I do not see any dinner break, so we will take potluck there.

Mr Hinchliffe interjected.

Mr CRANDON: I am sorry, but the words are '2.00 pm—until adjournment moved' and then 'Government Business'—but wait, it gets better—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Coomera, I instruct you to direct your conversation and your speech through the chair, please.

Mr CRANDON: My apologies, Mr Deputy Speaker. I was taking an interjection from the minister, who has no idea what is coming, which is the next day. The minister must have something on on Wednesday night, because interestingly we see that we pull up stumps at 7.30 pm.

Mrs D'Ath: When does the debate of the budget bills start? Thursday!

Mr CRANDON: I take the interjection from the Attorney-General. I still make the point that we have other bills to debate in this place and on Wednesday night we are back to those so-called 'family friendly' hours, which do not benefit me in the least. I cannot go home, because I cannot risk coming up the M1 the following morning. I cannot leave Kingsholme and arrive here at a reasonable time, unless I am prepared to leave at 4.30 in the morning. If I leave after five o'clock in the morning, from as far north as my home in the Ormeau area, which by the way is where heaven meets earth in the electorate of Coomera—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Coomera, I ask you to come back to the motion. If you cannot come back to the motion, under standing order 236 I will ask you to resume your seat.

Mr CRANDON: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I will come back to the motion. I am specifically talking about the Wednesday evening, when we will finish at 7.30. I note that on Thursday we will commence at 9.30 am and from 7.30 pm we will go through till the adjournment. I imagine on Friday it will be some godforsaken hour of the morning by the time we finish. Some of the points that have been already raised here that need to be considered for members who are as close—

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Cooper—ALP) (Minister for Innovation and Tourism Industry Development and Minister for the Commonwealth Games) (3.33 pm): In accordance with standing order 88, I move—

That the question be now put.

Mr BLEIJIE: I rise to a point of order. Mr Deputy Speaker, under the standing orders I realise that it is for you to ascertain whether enough debate has been had. The member has moved that motion in the middle of a member's contribution, which I think is a disgusting abuse of due process. I put it to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that sufficient time has not been given to debate fully this motion.

Ms JONES: I rise to a point of order. I note that in the half an hour that we have debated this, Mr Deputy Speaker, you have had to call relevance, I think, probably 40 times. In actual fact, you have called relevance more than they have contributed.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: There has been sufficient debate on this topic. The question is that the question be now put.

Mr NICHOLLS: I rise to a point of order. Mr Deputy Speaker, in relation to your actions under standing order 88, you have formed an opinion that sufficient debate has been taken. My point of order relates to your decision that in your opinion sufficient debate on the motion before the House has been undertaken under standing order 88.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Clayfield, we are not debating my decision. I made it very clear—

Mr NICHOLLS: I am not asking for that. I am saying that it is your opinion that that has occurred—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Thank you, member for Clayfield.

Mr McARDLE: I rise to a point of order. Continuing with the point raised by my colleague, I think it is in the province of the House to ask you as the Deputy Speaker to state that you believe in your opinion that sufficient debate has been had.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not going to debate this through the chair. My opinion is that sufficient time has been given to this topic. Therefore, we will put the question.

Division: Question put—That the question be now put.

AYES, 50:

ALP, 47—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Miller, Mullen, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 42:

LNP, 39—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Costigan, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Notice of Motion, Dissent from Deputy Speaker's Ruling

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Respecting the ruling of the Deputy Speaker in the chair before, I rise on a point of order in relation to standing order 250—dissent from the rulings of the Speaker. I give notice that I will move dissent from the Deputy Speaker's ruling with respect to standing order 88 because I am of the opinion that, although the Deputy Speaker felt that, in his opinion, there was sufficient debate, the standing orders also say and 'is not an abuse of the rules of the House or an infringement of members' rights'. I believe the member for Coomera, who was on his feet, has had his rights abused in the parliament this afternoon.

Mr SPEAKER: Duly noted.

MOTION

Suspension of Standing Orders

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (3.42 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That, notwithstanding anything contained in standing orders, for all further divisions on the Vegetation Management and Other Legislation Amendment Bill the division bells shall be rung for one minute.

The normal process of this House is that where there are multiple divisions in relation to a bill during consideration in detail subsequent division bells are rung for one minute. Why? It is about efficiency of this House. We have just listened to a debate about getting work done and wanting to debate bills. We heard those opposite talk about the farmers who have come to town this week and yet they want those people in the gallery and everywhere here to sit and listen to bells being rung for four minutes for every single division that they intend to call for possibly every amendment to the bill for the rest of the afternoon. That is not an efficient way to run this parliament.

The fact is that we have already had an hour and a half of consideration in detail on this bill. The majority of members have been sitting in this chamber. It is an efficient use of time to simply have the division bells rung for one minute for all divisions to come. There are plenty of clauses to still be considered.

There are multiple amendments from both government and non-government members still to be considered. It would be an absolute abuse of the processes of this House to suggest that we should sit here while the division bells are rung for four minutes for divisions on those matters. If those opposite are serious about having genuine debate during consideration in detail on this bill then they should support this motion and allow, as is normal practice in this House, the division bells to be rung for one minute for the remainder of the divisions during consideration in detail.

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (3.44 pm): Again we have another example of the Leader of the House and the government not being able to manage the agenda of the House and the legislation before it. I take the Leader of the House's point that it is normal practice to have one-minute bells for divisions.

I will give a practical example of what happened before our lunch suspension to highlight the issues around one-minute bells for divisions. There was a division and then debate on an amendment went for 25 to 30 minutes. If we had adopted one-minute bells for divisions that would have meant that for 30 minutes members would not have been able to attend meetings with constituents in the parliament or stakeholder meetings or attend to other matters.

If an amendment to a particular clause is moved and then there is subdebate on that particular clause, then that is generally—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members on both sides will cease interjecting. I am listening to the Manager of Opposition Business.

Mr BLEIJIE: In that situation it would generally be one-minute bells for the divisions when they follow one after the other. They do not here. These are different subjects. The shadow minister responsible for the vegetation management laws has moved one amendment out of a series of four or five amendments. They are all dealing with different issues. If this House—opposition, crossbench and government members—were to debate each individual clause dealing with different specific matters then that is not how the House usually operates. In fact, that is certainly not how the House operates.

With respect to the example I gave before of one particular provision and the amendment that was moved by the shadow minister, the member for Burdekin, I point out that we are still in the midst of debating that particular amendment. There will be other amendments that will follow that amendment. This motion has been moved because the Leader of the House cannot manage the time of this House. We have one bill before the House and we have only 2½ hours left of the day.

I would suggest that if they did not do this then they would do one of two things later. They would either guillotine the debate on the vegetation management laws or—

Government members interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: We do not want to go home. We are happy to stay all night. They would either guillotine the debate on the vegetation management laws or move a motion to extend the sitting hours—a motion just like the one we have just debated in relation to the budget sittings. When they looked at the sitting time frames and government business they should have heeded the warnings of the opposition that they are not going to get through the business of government in the time they have allocated.

The one bill that has been debated this week is a contentious bill. All members have had an opportunity to speak on the bill. They now want to curtail the time and force members to be here, there or wherever. The debate should operate as it does at the moment. Members should have the opportunity to continue to have meetings or do whatever business they have on the parliamentary precinct without this time being curtailed by the Labor Party.

They cannot hide from the fact that this is sloppy management of the House. That is all it is. Stirling Hinchliffe would never have done this. The former leader of the House would never have allowed this rubbish, debacle, chaos, rabble and this curtailing of members' speeches.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Members on both sides will cease interjecting.

Mr BLEIJIE: All honourable members should have the opportunity, the appropriate time, to get back to this chamber to vote. The government are hoping that by having one-minute bells for divisions between now and the six o'clock automatic adjournment a few members will miss the vote. For the people in the gallery and the rest of the world watching today, it is okay for the ministers who are all out in their ministerial offices just out there—

Ms Jones: It hurts, doesn't it?

Mr BLEIJIE: It is going to hurt you a lot more when you are in opposition. I will tell you that.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Kawana, you will put your remarks through the chair.

Mr BLEIJIE: The member for Cooper, like the member for Woodridge, never served a day in opposition. She had a holiday, a sabbatical. Just like I said about the member for Woodridge, the member for Cooper would not be able to handle a day in opposition.

The ministers are all just out there. They can rush back in here within a minute. For other members of parliament who have to go throughout the precinct—maybe having meetings with parliamentary staff in their offices about parliamentary business—that is wrong. Members of the parliament should have the appropriate time to be able to come to this chamber. If the answer to this is to not speak on clauses, to not speak on motions and to not speak on amendments being moved then that is curtailing members' right to speak on those particular provisions. I would strongly urge everybody in this House to oppose this because it is abusing the process and it is abusing the rights and immunities of members of this House.

 **Mr LANGBROEK** (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (3.50 pm): Mr Speaker—

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order, members to my right!

Mr LANGBROEK: I also rise to oppose the motion based on the content of the motion in the sense that the Leader of the House was saying that we should just have one-minute bells for divisions when clearly we are up to clause 16 in the vegetation management bill at the moment. The principle can apply, as I understand it, when particular clauses are debated with amendments that may have been moved to those clauses and there are consequential votes because of amendments that have been moved.

I want to take the point of the Manager of Opposition Business. When we have a number of clauses that may pass through unremarked and then we have a significant debate on one clause, it may mean that members will sometimes go to other places within the precinct. As I understand it, in all the time I have been here, to have as a natural consequence that we are only going to have one-minute bells for divisions is not the way we have done it. We have done it usually through agreement because there were going to be a large number of divisions and they were going to be consequential in the clauses. That is not what we are seeing here.

As the Manager of Opposition Business has pointed out, there are a number of clauses to get through in this vegetation management bill but debate on some clauses could go for half an hour with no divisions and then we could have some clauses with subsequent divisions. That is why one-minute bells for divisions is not enough for members of the parliament both to express their views in terms of the debate of the clauses and to give them adequate time to come back if they are in the annex, with the issues we have with the lifts and things like that. I strongly urge members and members on the crossbench to at least consider that curtailing debate and having one-minute bells for divisions is not adequate and should not be supported.

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (3.52 pm): In accordance with standing order 88, I move—

That the question be now put.

Mr NICHOLLS: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. With respect to the closure motion under standing order 88, that standing order requires you to form an opinion based on the fact that the 'question has been sufficiently debated' and the motion is 'not an abuse of the rules of the House or an infringement of members' rights'. Mr Speaker, in my submission to you on the point of order, it is an infringement on the rights of members who have clearly identified a desire to speak on a motion that is of importance to the rights and liberties of members of this parliament, and that is to express a view on both the process of this parliament and the passage of legislation. In my submission, you are not yet in a position to be able to form that opinion having only heard from two speakers.

Mr SPEAKER: Having a close look at standing order 88, this is not a debate on a substantive motion; it is a procedural motion. I have always had a view on motions that are of a substantive nature versus those that are about procedure and the workings of the House. My view would be that there has been sufficient debate on what is, quite simply, a procedural motion related to the timing of the ringing of bells. I would suggest that the motion be put. Thank you, member, for your point of order.

Division: Question put—That the question be now put.

AYES, 48:

ALP, 47—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Miller, Mullen, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

NOES, 43:

LNP, 39—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Costigan, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

KAP, 2—Dametto, Katter.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Mr SPEAKER: The question now is that the motion be agreed to. A division has been called. I declare that the bells will ring for one minute.

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

In division—

Mrs D'ATH: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member for Currumbin is not in her seat.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Currumbin has now taken her seat. All members are reminded that when the bars are closed they must be in their allocated seat.

AYES, 50:

ALP, 47—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Miller, Mullen, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 40:

LNP, 38—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Costigan, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

KAP, 2—Dametto, Katter.

Resolved in the affirmative.

VEGETATION MANAGEMENT AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Detail

Resumed from p. 986.

Resumed on clause 16, to which Mr Last had moved an amendment—

 **Ms JONES** (4.03 pm): It is wonderful to get back to debating the bill. Funnily enough, I got elected to debate legislation, not to sit around listening to bells ring for four minutes. Let us get back to the bill that we are debating and the amendment moved by the LNP.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. I do not intend during consideration in detail revisiting the procedural motions we have just debated. Minister, you will remain relevant to the clause and members will cease interjections, particularly those trying to carry on the previous debate.

Mr CRANDON: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I would like a clarification. Is the next division going to be a four-minute division or a one-minute division?

Mr SPEAKER: Member, did you vote on the previous motion?

Mr CRANDON: Mr Speaker, I did but that was not in relation to this.

Mr SPEAKER: We have just held two divisions. I am asking you: did you vote on the previous motions before the House?

Mr CRANDON: Yes, correct.

Mr SPEAKER: You are aware of what you were voting for or against?

Mr CRANDON: Yes, correct.

Mr SPEAKER: Please resume your seat.

Ms JONES: As I was saying, I am very pleased to have the last two-minute contribution on this amendment moved by the opposition. I do not support the amendment. This amendment allows for remnant vegetation to be cleared. In an act of neighbourly kindness I am giving the member for Maiwar, who has withdrawn the amendments he originally sought to put, the benefit of the doubt that he does not support the clearing of remnant vegetation. However, when we see very similar amendments being put by the Greens and the LNP, this reminded me of history in Queensland when in 1995 the Greens did lock up preferences with the National Party in Queensland.

In debating this amendment we are hearing criticism of the Wilderness Society and other conservation movements. I think it is a timely reminder when we see what has transpired with amendments to the bill over the last 24 hours that this is not the first time we have seen the green party machine—I am not accusing the member for Maiwar—using this piece of legislation in the parliament to have two bob each way, trying to appeal to the farmers to the detriment of conservationists and the environment in this state.

(Time expired)

Mr PERRETT: I rise to support the amendment moved by the shadow minister. On a pure cost-benefit basis it makes economic sense to support our amendments. That smashed avocado on toast, mango salsa or macadamia encrusted dish comes from HVA or IHVA sectors. The Premier loves to talk about chickpeas. Those chickpeas also come from the HVA sector. Constraints on expansion would aggravate the extensive pressures the industry currently faces—pressures from creeping urban development and alternative land uses such as manufacturing, industrial services, utilities and mining.

If farmers are not given a pathway to manage their land and grow their business, it will be all downhill. All Queensland food promotional events will be for nothing if farmers are not given a pathway to manage their land and grow their business. The HVA and IHVA sectors are responsible for a very small amount of clearing proportionally for industries that deliver very high value. Canegrowers CEO Mr Dan Galligan said—

The way this bill is drafted, it completely codifies the size of our industry. It constrains our ability to diversify and expand. Therefore, our ability to deliver on what are multiple outcomes that this government already has in using cane in Queensland as a feedstock for biofuels and generally biofuture industries is completely limited.

QFF CEO Travis Tobin said—

In terms of irrigated high-value agriculture, which is what we were talking about before, across all agriculture only 5,608 hectares has been approved to be cleared since that was brought in. To put that in context, as a percentage of the total land used for agriculture, that is .0039 of one per cent ... Surely, there is no justification for getting rid of IHVA when it is already the most controlled. You have the opportunity to strengthen things if you want to and it is certainly not being abused.

The economic benefit, the social benefit, the jobs—all the things that you get from it—are incredible.

Rachel Mackenzie from Growcom said—

Like cane, we have had 19 applications, or permits, approved since 2013. In fact, one of the largest ones was for the Queensland Department of Agriculture and Fisheries for mangoes and maize. The rest of them were all under 30 hectares. I note in the explanatory notes that there is a comment saying that it is anticipated that this amendment to irrigated high-value agriculture and high-value agriculture will 'reduce clearing rates and subsequent carbon emissions in Queensland'.

I would be very interested to know what the carbon emissions are from 56 hectares per annum and whether that is enough to justify completely stifling an industry that the Farm Index has just said has had a \$1.1 billion appreciation 'after strong demand for both developed assets and suitable greenfield planting sites in the horticultural sector'.

I encourage this House to support the amendment moved by the shadow minister.

Mr WEIR: I rise to speak to this amendment, which I support very strongly. As a member of the committee which held hearings around Queensland on this, I can say that HVA and IHVA were raised constantly. No matter where we went, this was an issue that was raised. We have heard people talk about the Indigenous communities in North Queensland. There is no doubt that they were very, very

strong in their opinion of this. They think it is vital for the future development of their communities. It will help them forward, it will give their communities some work opportunities and it will further develop their country. There is a program which was mentioned earlier by the minister, but I believe no applications have gone through that process.

As it stands now, HVA and IHVA are the most regulated part of this whole legislation and this will just make it harder. We heard of different areas that had tried to apply to get through this process and had given up—it was too hard. It is already heavily regulated and it does not need to be any more.

There seems to be a strange idea of what HVA is. We hear that there is all this land out there that is category X that can be used for HVA. Well, they are not going to grow bananas at Quilpie. Most of the areas where we are looking to get this done are new areas for new developments and there will be some remnant trees in it because most of that country is near the rivers or streams and the flood-out country where it builds up with silt, where you get your high-grade soils and your moisture-retaining soils. That is why this is so important. There are not great swathes of country out there that can immediately be turned into high-value agriculture country, so this is vitally important.

We have seen schemes over the years, like out at St George and at Emerald at Fairbairn Dam where they put water in place. The growers at Fairbairn Dam pay more in tax every year. Under this legislation, those days are over. We heard from landowners who want to develop a little bit of high-value agriculture to grow some corn for silage to help them through the drought periods. This removes that opportunity or makes it so difficult that it is unachievable. It is already too difficult now. This was one of the most highly discussed items as the committee went around. I support the amendment very strongly.

Ms LEAHY: I rise to support the amendment moved by the shadow minister for natural resources. It is not just farmers who actually need to have access to these high-value agriculture permits. I want to read some information that has been sent to me by the shire of Flinders. They have a high-value agriculture project in their shire of some 300 hectares which the council have expended some \$1.5 million on. It would enable table grapes, vegetables, tree crops and some grains to be grown and it would provide approximately 300 jobs which would be particularly valuable for the community of Hughenden. The mayor said in her correspondence to me—

Under the proposed Vegetation Management legislation as presented for debate this would mean that the years of planning, work and expenses would have been for nothing as this project would need to commence from the beginning again. This has been brought about with the removal of High Value Agriculture from the proposed legislation.

The council has been very, very diligent in making representations to the state government. I might read a piece of correspondence from the Hon. Cameron Dick, the Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning. He said—

The delivery of a project such as the 15 Mile Irrigated Agricultural Development which proposes to encourage private sector investment, as well as deliver long-term sustainable employment opportunities, aligns well with EDQ's objectives.

That is very interesting. That is actual support for high-value agriculture. This is correspondence back to the mayor supporting a high-value agriculture project. The minister went on to say—

... I have asked Mr Sly to meet with you and relevant council officers to progress discussions about the project, and particularly how the project might drive economic and employment growth for the region.

Thank you again for your letter and for identifying this important project. I look forward to hearing about your discussions with EDQ.

We can see that it is not just members on this side of the House who actually support high-value agriculture. We have the Flinders Shire Council which are working really hard to get that project going and they have expended a lot of time and effort to do that. This amendment would enable that council to actually have those 300 jobs in that community of Hughenden. This is so critically important for those regional communities. We see that the government does support high-value agriculture. For that reason, I urge members opposite to support those jobs.

Mr NICHOLLS: I am sorry to cut across the minister who is very keen to wrap up debate on this portion of the bill—displaying all of the appetite and desire of the Labor Party to actually have a fulsome debate in relation to what is a very significant piece of legislation. This is a party that seems to think you cannot have agriculture and responsible vegetation management and look after the environment at the same time. I can tell the House that we in the LNP believe you can do exactly that. I am proud to announce that we are about protecting the environment with our—

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Clayfield, you are displaying a prop. What is your intention?

Mr NICHOLLS: I am happy to table that prop, Mr Speaker—

Mr SPEAKER: Well, given my previous—

Mr NICHOLLS:—because it is such a big part of it.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Clayfield—

Mr NICHOLLS: I am happy to table it, Mr Speaker, because—

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Clayfield, resume your seat. That may be able to be tabled, and you are within your rights to try to table that. However, I caution you and other members, given my rulings on props only two sittings ago, that these items are to be kept forever. I do think that members should start showing some common sense when it comes to these things.

Tabled paper: Bag tabled by the member for Clayfield, Mr Tim Nicholls MP [614].

Mr NICHOLLS: Good policy does allow you to both protect the environment and also have a productive and worthwhile agricultural sector, but that is not what we are seeing out of this government. I heard the member for Woodridge talk about bad public policy. Bad public policy is something that the member for Woodridge is an expert in—having been a member of a government that between 2009 and 2012 removed the fuel subsidy levy, removed the stamp duty concession for first home owners, introduced a waste levy—

Dr LYNHAM: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I raise the matter of relevance.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, Minister. I mention to all members here that we are in consideration in detail. We have had a couple of days of debate on the broader issues related to this bill. This is about clause 16 and the amendment moved by the member for Burdekin. I caution all members that relevance should be strictly adhered to, and I will be paying very close attention to that throughout the contributions during the consideration in detail stage.

Mr NICHOLLS: Mr Speaker, as always I accept your guidance on that. When I was talking about policy I was responding to the debate in relation to the amendment that was moved by the member for Woodridge. This is a policy that will effectively sterilise large parts of productive high-value and irrigated high-value agricultural land, and that is not good policy. It comes from a government that cannot but from week to week walk in here and boast about exports of agricultural products, about how well the legumes and the beef exports are going and all of those sorts of things but wants to introduce a policy that will actually affect the very thing it claims to be a supporter of and boasts about. That is bad policy. It is bad policy to pass that legislation with only six weeks notice and limited consultation. That is why this amendment, which seeks to preserve some aspects of the value of agriculture, should be supported.

(Time expired)

Mr WATTS: I rise to contribute to the debate on high-value agricultural land and irrigated high-value agricultural land. I want to take a point that was mentioned before lunch particularly in relation to our first nations people up in Cape York. As many members here would be aware, Queensland was developed by opening up land. Honourable members need only to look at our coat of arms to see that agriculture has played an enormous role in the development and prosperity of Queensland. High-value agricultural land has actually been key to that.

To turn around to the first nations people of Cape York, where there are many, many opportunities for high-value agricultural land to be developed, and to lock it up and deny them the opportunity that was given to all of our first and early Queenslanders as they came here to develop our agricultural industry I think is a mistake. It is certainly bad public policy. I think we know that there is high unemployment in the north. We know that there is a high crime rate in the north. We know that there are many people who are seeking jobs—

Mr SPEAKER: Member, I want to pause you there. We have debated the clause which related to First Australians and Indigenous landholders as related to the Land Act. Now you are straying into other territory. I caution you. I ask you to come back to the clause or resume your seat.

Mr WATTS: For me it is about the high-value agricultural land and their opportunity to be able to develop that land. However, I will move on to a couple of other points in relation to high-value agricultural land.

I look around this chamber and I see many people wearing cotton or wool. Food and fibre, particularly in regions of Queensland where there is an opportunity to develop high-value agriculture, is crucial to our development and to our supply. I do not want to see everybody sitting in this chamber in nylon suits made from petrochemicals. I would much rather see people here wearing wool suits that

are from merino on land that has been developed here in Queensland and has provided jobs to outback Queensland. We know that youth unemployment in outback Queensland is massively high. These are areas where there are high-value agricultural opportunities that should be allowed to be developed to help with their unemployment, provide the food and fibre we need for the future as well as the extra income—

(Time expired)

Mr BOYCE: I feel I must remind those on the other side of the House of exactly what high-value agriculture is and what the land is. It produces food. The lunch that we ate today came from high-value agricultural land. The cotton in the clothes that we wear came from high-value agricultural land. Any further stifling of the expansion of high-value agriculture would be to the detriment of the Queensland economy and people in general.

In my electorate of Callide there is a proposal, as honourable members would be well aware, to build the Nathan Gorge dam, a water storage facility that is approximately three times the volume of Sydney Harbour. It has huge ramifications for the agricultural industry as far as expansion and greater production goes. If we are to limit the further expansion of high-value agriculture, people will not be able to put up a business case for such projects to move them forward.

I will further expand on what the member for Gregory said earlier about the Rookwood Weir. It is of the same ilk. Downstream of the Rookwood Weir are large areas of high-value agricultural land that can be developed. If this is not allowed to happen, what then becomes of the Rookwood Weir? Will it just become a giant fish pond? Is that what we are doing?

Mr Millar: A ski park.

Mr BOYCE: A ski park. I suppose we will get some—

Mr Costigan: Rockhampton Water Ski Club gets a new home.

Mr BOYCE: Absolutely. I take that interjection. There are also other projects in the electorate of Callide, for example, the Kirar weir at Mundubbera. Mundubbera supports a \$100 million berry and fruit industry. They are looking for water infrastructure projects such as these to continue so that they can expand their high-value agriculture and add to the economy of Queensland. It is most important that this amendment be upheld, and I urge the government to support the amendment. Anything less will see the economy of Queensland suffer and all of these small communities out in rural and regional Queensland suffer when we are already suffering now. Any further hindrance will not be a good thing for rural and regional Queensland. What we have is a government of Brisbane instead of a government of Queensland.

Mr KATTER: I rise to speak to these clauses on high-value agriculture and irrigated high-value agriculture because they are very relevant to my electorate. I would like to make a very important point to the House. Predominantly my electorate is made up of primary producers and the cattle-grazing industry. There is often an appetite—but not a large appetite—for farming. Most of these people are cattle graziers and they do not have a strong desire to become a full farming operation, which is an important point to make.

Johnny Brownson, for instance, in Charters Towers is on 30,000 acres and has 30 acres under a centre pivot, which he would not be allowed to do once these laws pass. He has 30 acres under a centre pivot. No-one would pick that from a plane; it looks like the house yard. That is 0.1 per cent of his property. That makes the difference in him getting through a dry season on the hay he gets from that paddock. Just that tiny little bit of area can make a huge difference. Johnny Brownson does not want to go and broadscale clear the whole place, nor do many people up there. A lot of times it is not cost-effective to do so, but that little bit of irrigation or that little bit of clearing makes all the difference.

I was talking to Alister McClymont up in the gulf. I said, ‘What difference would it make—one or two per cent—if you could do that on a big grazing parcel?’ He said, ‘An amazing difference. Unbelievable! One per cent on a hundred thousand acres, you would get a thousand acres out of that. That is an amazing difference.’ Honourable members or I would hardly pick it from a plane, but the hay they could get from that would mean they would not have to be carting in hay from other regions of the state and importing weeds. They would be growing hay and getting through the protein drought. They would be feeding their weaners and they would then be employing one or two more people because they have a more stable operation. It is very much a part of us being able to sustain ourselves.

High-value agriculture does not mean they go out and bulldoze 24/7 and take out the whole lot. A lot of people just want that little bit of a hay paddock to get them through. Honourable members need to understand that a lot of these people are graziers primarily who would not mind trying their hand at

a little bit of farming. We have never developed up there or had any opportunity for that. Just being able to use that tiny proportion of land for high-value agriculture and irrigated high-value agriculture would mean so much for the resilience and sustainability of the towns and industries in our area. I use that word ‘town’, because taking those clauses out really takes us backwards. It does not give us the ability to sustainably go in there and perform those activities that keep us alive and give us something to work on to even out the bumps in the seasons so we can get through that protein drought and feed our weaners. That little bit—that 0.1 per cent for Johnny Brownson and the one per cent for Alister McClymont in the cape—would be a wonderful thing we could do for people. We would never know the difference and the environment would be no worse off. Unfortunately, the government is removing that opportunity.

(Time expired)

Mr JANETZKI: I rise to support the amendment that has been proposed by the shadow minister. This amendment seeks to expand the scope of development applications that can be assessed to include high-value agriculture and irrigated high-value agriculture. We know that this afternoon Queensland farmers are watching. I can tell you that, from the text messages coming through on the member for Warrego’s phone, her constituents are watching. Queensland is watching. The Queensland Farmers’ Federation is watching, and I want to reflect briefly on what they had to say in their submission to the committee. They said that in terms of irrigated high-value agriculture, only 5,608 hectares has been approved to be cleared since that was brought in. To put that in perspective, as a percentage of the total land used by agriculture that is 0.0039 of one per cent. Surely that is no justification for getting rid of IHVA when it is already the most controlled.

Mr Speaker, I can tell you that from Toowoomba and the Darling Downs’ perspective this is exactly the kind of productive agriculture that we are encouraging. What this government is proposing to do will hurt that, and this is why we need to support the amendment of the shadow minister. I look in particular to avocado farmers on the north side of Toowoomba near Cabarlah. I have had a number of conversations now with avocado orchard operators there.

I think of Bill Mair, who runs Balmoral Avocados. He transports avocados all over Australia to Brisbane, Sydney and Melbourne to service markets that continue to grow. With the passing of these laws if those opposite choose not to support these amendments his business will be severely curtailed. The opportunity to grow his business will be severely diminished, and that will cost jobs in Toowoomba and the Darling Downs. It will cost Balmoral Avocados six full-time jobs and up to 40 part-time jobs. Far greater than that, the Darling Downs through the Toowoomba and Surat Basin Enterprise and Food Leaders Australia has been working hard.

We have a brand-new Toowoomba Wellcamp Airport that the Wagner family built. They run a Cathay Pacific plane to Asia that we are seeking to fill with high-value agricultural production right now. At a time when Toowoomba and the Darling Downs seek to invest ever more into high-value agriculture—whether it be blueberries from St George or lettuce from the Lockyer Valley—we have an extraordinary economic opportunity. We have the infrastructure in Toowoomba and the Darling Downs. Unless this amendment is supported, that growth and that production from Queensland will be put at risk.

(Time expired)

Mr LISTER: This is a very important amendment. It is vital that we recognise and protect the exemption for irrigated high-value agriculture and high-value agriculture. In my electorate of Southern Downs we could be looking at crops of olives or fruit from around Inglewood or on the Granite Belt. As I said in a speech yesterday, I was met here by farmer Howard Poole, who grows leafy green vegetables with little baby leaves and so forth.

An opposition member: Rocket?

Mr LISTER: Rocket and that sort of thing. Yes, I take your interjection.

Mrs Stuckey: Spinach?

Mr LISTER: Spinach and all those sorts of things. A small area of vegetation cleared can reap astonishing rewards. Obviously there is a great deal of employment because growing vegetables is a labour-intensive industry. To put this in context, if you have cattle and you are struggling to feed them and you can clear a couple of acres to grow lucerne, that means the difference between you making ends meet that year or not. It can mean the difference between a farmer and his family staying on the land or not. We need to look at this in context.

If you have an exponential increase in output from a small reduction in vegetation, then I think in the balance of public interest that should be allowed to happen, because without it we would not have the industries that we have now. More importantly, we are not going to have the industries that we will need in the future to clothe and feed ourselves and, increasingly, to clothe and feed the rest of the world.

I know that the Palaszczuk government likes to talk about chickpeas. Chickpeas are intensive agriculture and a high-value product. I listened with interest today when I heard the story of the Premier inquiring, 'What can we do to help you grow more chickpeas?' When the answer was, 'Let us clear more land'—

An opposition member interjected.

Mr LISTER: The member for Gregory, my good friend, said that.

Mrs Frecklington: They are not easy to grow.

Mr LISTER: I take the interjection from the Leader of the Opposition. Yes, they are not easy to grow and you do need land to do it. It was instructive that that inquiry was quickly curtailed when the answer contained an unpalatable truth. We are crazy if we go to the extent of eliminating the ability of farmers to clear land for high-value agriculture. This is what our state is based on. There is a huge amount of productivity in the high-value agricultural industries we want to promote which is at risk. You cannot stand still; you have to grow. How are we going to do that if we are not able to clear the land we need?

An opposition member interjected.

Mr LISTER: That is right, yes. I urge everyone in the House to support this amendment. I certainly will. I know that the world is watching. It is a greater stage than just inside this room.

Mr COSTIGAN: Mr Chairman—

Mr SPEAKER: 'Mr Speaker' is fine. We will keep it informal. I call the member for Whitsunday.

Mr COSTIGAN: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. Mr Chairman, I rise to support—

Mr SPEAKER: Is that disrespect to the chair?

Mr COSTIGAN: I hope not.

Mr SPEAKER: The title is Mr Speaker. The chairman of committees is no longer in existence. Anyone sitting here is to be referred to as Mr Speaker. I call the member for Whitsunday.

Mr COSTIGAN: Mr Speaker, I want to back up my great mate from Central Queensland, the member for Callide, and his contribution earlier because he has put it out there in very simple terms. For anyone watching the broadcast of what is happening here in the chamber this evening during this debate it really does spell it out, doesn't it? If we did not have high-value agriculture, as the member for Macalister said, we would not have had any tucker for lunch, no smoko and no clobber to wear. It is a scary thought for some of us in this place.

I went to a funeral recently for the former mayor of Bowen, the late Col Leather, who came to Bowen as a railway worker and then cleared the land around the delta to grow food. What an amazing concept. If we had not done that years ago, Bowen would not be the successful town that it is today in terms of growing food. The town of Bowen is represented by the member for Burdekin whose amendment, needless to say, I will be supporting. The member for Callide touched on the great project that has been talked about for decades: the Nathan Dam on the mighty Dawson River, one of the great tributaries of the Fitzroy River, the second-largest basin behind the Murray-Darling.

A government member: Home to Taroom too.

Mr COSTIGAN: Not too far from the Taroom turf club but, more importantly, not far from a great dam site. What would the business case be if we rip away the scope for irrigated high-value agriculture and high-value agriculture? As the member for Burdekin knows, in what is now his electorate—which I gifted to him, so to speak—with the great project that is the Urannah Dam there are 30,000 hectares of irrigated farmland in the offing to grow food and fibre. What a great opportunity it is. The thing about Queensland is that it has been the land of opportunity for so many decades for so many generations. We would be a poorer community, a poorer region and a poorer state without people like the late Col Leather, who came to Bowen and gave it a red hot go. With the Urannah Dam project, the mind boggles in terms of what could be used in terms of cropping there. There are 30,000 hectares of irrigated farmland. There is a business case that is being undertaken right now in relation to that.

One wonders about the shifting sands of government and the unpredictability of government today where no-one can plan properly. We look what happened at the Fairbairn Dam and how that transformed the great town of Emerald. I tell you what, Mr Speaker, that chickpea story is spreading like lantana. The Premier is becoming as popular as lantana, because in 100 years at the Capella Road Runners reunion they will talk about the chickpea story and how she switched off and did not want to know about increasing production and growing agriculture in our state.

Mr BATT: I also rise to speak in favour of this amendment. I was one of the six members on this committee and want to talk about some of the submissions in relation to the HVA and IHVA, high-value agriculture and irrigated high-value agriculture, sectors. The submissions advised that this is responsible for a very small amount of clearing proportionally for industries that deliver very high value and that the strategy encompassed in the amendments may not be the best way of achieving the bill's policy objectives on a cost-benefit basis.

As the member for Toowoomba South said earlier, QFF's CEO Mr Travis Tobin testified that, in terms of irrigated high-value agriculture, 5,608 hectares have been approved to be cleared since it was brought in. As we have heard, that equates to 0.0039 of one per cent that was cleared during that three years. He also went on to say—

Surely, there is no justification for getting rid of IHVA when it is already the most controlled. You have the opportunity to strengthen things if you want to and it is certainly not being abused.

The economic benefit, the social benefit, the jobs—all the things that you get from it—are incredible.

In relation to the horticultural sector, Ms MacKenzie said—

Like cane, we have had 19 applications, or permits, approved since 2013. In fact, one of the largest ones was for the Queensland Department of Agriculture and Fisheries—

under this legislation—

for mangoes and maize. The rest of them were all under 30 hectares. I note in the explanatory notes that there is a comment saying that it is anticipated that this amendment to irrigated high-value agriculture and high-value agriculture will 'reduce clearing rates and subsequent carbon emissions in Queensland'.

I would be very interested to know what the carbon emissions are from 56 hectares per annum and whether that is enough to justify completely stifling an industry that the Farm Index has just said has had a \$1.1 billion appreciation 'after strong demand for both developed assets and suitable greenfield planting sites in the horticultural sector'.

Further, we heard locally from Bundaberg canegrowers and the Bundaberg Fruit & Vegetable Growers in my patch—the salad bowl of Queensland—who are very concerned in relation to getting rid of irrigated high-value agriculture. Therefore, I will be voting for this amendment.

Dr LYNHAM: I want to take the opportunity to clarify a few of these points. Firstly, this might be my only chance to say this after this morning's debate, but obviously those opposite are pandering for inner-city green votes given that they are supporting irrigated HVA and HVA. I also remind those opposite that there are a million hectares of category X already cleared available for irrigated high-value agriculture and high-value agriculture, and those opposite are delusional if they do not think there is enough category X already cleared in coastal areas to grow those types of fruits and vegetables as they think should be growing in that way. I also remind those opposite that this is not a small amount that we are talking about—some fictitious small amount—but rather we are talking about in their time 114,000 hectares of approved irrigated HVA and HVA.

Those opposite also talked about Cape York and locking up economic opportunities in Cape York. Some 300,000 hectares have already been cleared on Cape York. Also, a review of the Cape York Peninsula Heritage Act will be underway to make it easier for traditional owners to participate in agricultural production. They also talked about the Flinders project. We had meetings with the Flinders project and we are working with the Flinders Shire Council to facilitate its project. They also talked about Rookwood. Some 90 per cent of that land for Rookwood in agriculture is category X available for high-value agriculture and irrigated high-value agriculture. Earlier today they also talked about all of these amendments that we are moving. There are five amendments, and one of them is clearing up one of their mistakes from the previous legislation. When those opposite introduced the legislation there were 34 amendments across-the-board.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order relating to relevance to this clause.

Mr SPEAKER: Please resume your seat, Leader of the Opposition. I have been listening carefully to the minister's contribution, and it is as relevant as most of the other contributions I have heard during consideration in detail on this clause.

Dr LYNHAM: There is no doubt that with the land available it is already cleared and it is already category X. We will still be allowing high-value agriculture and irrigated high-value agriculture to occur in the state of Queensland so that we can have agricultural prosperity in the state of Queensland. If we were to listen to those opposite there would be no apricots, there would be no stone fruits, there would be no watermelon and there would be no cherries. Given the contribution from the member for Whitsunday in that same vein, obviously under Labor there was no fruit salad in the Whitsundays!

Dr ROWAN: I rise to speak in support of the amendment moved by the shadow minister and member for Burdekin. I wish we could take on face value the minister's assurances, but as we have seen through this entire process of the bill—the submissions to the committee, the entire process and the lack of consultation—it is very hard to take this on face value given the lack of trust that people have in this Labor government and particularly our farmers and those from rural and regional Queensland. As we have heard from speakers before in relation to this bill, the Palaszczuk Labor government's proposed bill currently removes the exemption for high-value agriculture and irrigated high-value agricultural land. We need to protect high-value agricultural and irrigated high-value agricultural land because it is very important to Queensland's food security. It is also very important for farming families right across rural and regional Queensland.

We need to develop our land in Queensland. We need to ensure that we have a robust and vibrant agricultural sector not only for our domestic economy but also for exports. We all know that we want to enjoy mangoes and the fruits that are here in Queensland—the rich tapestry that we have—and high-value agriculture is needed for intensive agricultural purposes to ensure good food and fibre production not only in Queensland but also to export that, because Queensland can also be a rich source of providing clothing internationally. Queensland needs its own security. We live in a complex world, and ensuring that we are able to not only produce food and fibre for people who live in Queensland but also contribute that to other state jurisdictions around Australia and South-East Asia and other parts of the world is very important as well.

If we look at the various submissions to the committee—and if the Labor government and the Labor members would read those submissions—and the committee report, it is very clear that we need to ensure that we maintain the status quo. The Labor government's bill will jeopardise high-value agriculture and irrigated high-value agricultural land. Being able to have land for intensive agricultural purposes is also very important for biofuels, medicines, textiles and other things as well. The LNP is the only side of this House that is committed to expanding our food and fibre production here in Queensland. That is why as a growing state—which we continue to be as part of a growing nation and our contribution not only to the domestic economy but also to exports—we need to ensure that we maintain our high-value agriculture and irrigated high-value agricultural lands. Queensland can capitalise on these opportunities into the future, and that is certainly what we need to do. That is why I support the amendment as moved by the shadow minister and member for Burdekin.

Mr DAMETTO: I rise to speak in support of the amendment. We really need to ensure that high-value agriculture and irrigated high-value agriculture are included in this. I had the pleasure of being invited to sit on the committee during the committee's hearings in Townsville to listen to the farmers who came to give submissions. There are young families out there who want to get into farming. They cannot afford to walk onto a farm that has been developed, so rather they want to buy a farm that has been run down. The only way they can buy a farm that has been run down and get it back up and running is to get out there and clear that land for high-value agriculture.

This family who gave evidence told me that the only way they could do this was by irrigating their land and bringing it back up a standard where they could run a decent number of cattle on it so that it could become a viable operation. The idea of using fire for clearing land for irrigation was not something that they were willing to do because they were down to three native grasses on this land. Those three native grasses were all they had and it was bare in some parts and patchy in others. That family had to get in and clear the land. Once they had cleared the land and started irrigating it, 20 native grasses came back to this farm. That is biodiversity at its best.

Mr Katter: Hear, hear.

Mr DAMETTO: Yes. That is right. I do not believe that the sugar industry will be able to continue in my patch without land being cleared for high-value agriculture. I think people forget that when land is cleared it does not become a barren wasteland; it becomes a beautiful farming community. As these crops grow, they absorb carbon from the atmosphere. People can then make some money from those crops and support other people who live in these rural communities.

Mr McDONALD: I congratulate the shadow minister and member for Burdekin, Dale Last, on the effort that he has put into formulating these amendments in consulting with the industry. Although we do not approve of this bill, I ask for some common sense to prevail and for the government to listen to what the industry has to say.

New sections 22A and 22B with regard to high-value agriculture land and irrigated high-value agriculture will have a big impact on the Lockyer community. Obviously those opposite have decided that Queensland's agricultural sector has grown enough. High-value agriculture and irrigated high-value agriculture are critical to the continued growth of this state's great economy. As I have made clear on a number of occasions, the farmers of the Lockyer provide much of the fruit and vegetables that we enjoy. How are our farmers supposed to continue to provide for our growing population if they are not given reasonable opportunity to access the high-value agricultural land that they need to grow the food that we love?

Through discussions with farmers in my local area, one thing is certain: these people need certainty and assurance that their livelihoods are going to be protected. As the government would know if they listened to the hundreds of farmers who have recently protested outside this chamber, these laws provide little certainty to anyone. It may not be something that those opposite or many other people understand, but our farmers work within tight schedules. The success of their endeavours often depend on forces that are outside their control. That is why they need not only the ability to apply for permits but also the certainty that those permits will be processed in a reasonable time frame. A farmer in my electorate tells me that often he has less than a week's window to plant crops for the coming season. He cannot afford to spend thousands of dollars and months waiting to know if he will be able to plant on a particular section of land.

This amendment is more than just a convenience. Providing clearly defined approval procedures with detailed response deadlines could be the difference between farmers seeing their businesses grow and prosper or watching them fail and seeing their families struggle to make ends meet. As representatives of our communities, it is our duty to get the balance right. The laws contained in this bill fail to do that and our farmers will feel the pain.

Mr ANDREW: During my maiden speech I spoke about the \$44 million that was put into the cane rail that joins Mackay to Carmila. Over the range from Carmila are five rural properties that were bought and are waiting for the Connors River Dam.

I have been talking to Kevin Borg from Canegrowers. He likens the area from Carmila down to St Lawrence in my electorate to another Burdekin. I am sure the member for Burdekin will tell members that, if that area is developed, it would generate billions of dollars for Queensland.

Mr Costigan interjected.

Mr ANDREW: Plane Creek Mill is in my electorate. I think that this legislation is an extreme thing to do at the moment. When the government changes or something happens down the track, the laws will swing back the other way. We have to have a sensible way of being able to deal with this issue so that everyone gets the best out of the situation and that, as a Queensland parliament, we do not disadvantage anyone.

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

AYES, 44:

LNP, 39—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Costigan, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 48:

ALP, 47—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Miller, Mullen, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Mr Last) negatived.

Clause 16, as read, agreed to.

Clause 17—

 **Mr LAST** (4.57 pm): I move the following amendments—

2 Clause 17 (Insertion of new s 22B)

Page 18, line 1—

omit, insert—

17 Insertion of new ss 22AA–22B

3 Clause 17 (Insertion of new s 22B)

Page 18, after line 3—

insert—

22AA Vegetation clearing applications for high value agriculture or irrigated high value agriculture

- (1) This section applies if a vegetation clearing application is for high value agriculture or irrigated high value agriculture.
- (2) The application must include the following—
 - (a) the location and extent of the proposed clearing;
 - (b) particulars of the clearing, including when it is expected the clearing will be completed;
 - (c) details of the proposed high value agriculture or irrigated high value agriculture;
 - (d) evidence that the owner of the land on which the clearing is proposed has access to an adequate water supply to support the high value agriculture or irrigated high value agriculture.
- (3) The chief executive may be satisfied the vegetation clearing application is for high value agriculture or irrigated high value agriculture only if—
 - (a) the clearing is likely to be economically viable; and
 - (b) the clearing to be undertaken is limited to that required for the proposed high value agriculture or irrigated high value agriculture; and
 - (c) the land the subject of the clearing is suitable for the proposed high value agriculture or irrigated high value agriculture; and
 - (d) the owner of the land on which the clearing is proposed has access to an adequate water supply to support the proposed high value agriculture or irrigated high value agriculture.

22AB Deemed approval of vegetation clearing application

- (1) A development approval is taken to have been given for a vegetation clearing application if the application has not been decided by the assessment manager for the application or a decision notice for the application has not been given to the applicant—
 - (a) if the planning chief executive is the assessment manager for the application—within 20 business days after the planning chief executive receives the application; or
 - (b) if a local government is the assessment manager for the application and there is no referral agency for the application—within 20 business days after the local government receives the application; or
 - (c) if a local government is the assessment manager for the application and there is a referral agency for the application—within 30 business days after the local government receives the application.
- (2) If subsection (1)(c) applies to the application, the local government must give the application to the referral agency within 15 business days after the local government receives it.
- (3) If subsection (1)(c) applies to the application and the referral agency has directed the local government to refuse the application or impose conditions on the development approval for the application, the local government must give the applicant a decision notice for the application within 30 business days after receiving it.
- (4) This section applies despite the Planning Act.
- (5) In this section—

decision notice, for a vegetation clearing application, means a decision notice under the Planning Act for the application.

22AC Assessment manager must consider guideline made by Minister

- (1) The Minister may make a guideline about dealing with a vegetation clearing application for high value agriculture or irrigated high value agriculture.
- (2) In deciding a vegetation clearing application for high value agriculture or irrigated high value agriculture, the assessment manager for the application must have regard to a guideline made under subsection (1).

These amendments relate to the approval process for vegetation clearing applications for high-value agriculture or irrigated high-value agriculture. This application process has been developed in consultation with the industry, AgForce, the QFF and, more importantly, with farmers across the state. We have had long and lengthy discussions in coming up with this approval process.

I want to read into *Hansard* that process, because I want the people of Queensland to know that what I am proposing is practical, common sense and environmentally responsible. The process states—

The application must include the following—

- (a) the location and extent of the proposed clearing;
- (b) particulars of the clearing, including when it is expected the clearing will be completed;
- (c) details of the proposed high value agriculture or irrigated high value agriculture;
- (d) evidence that the owner of the land on which the clearing is proposed has access to an adequate water supply to support the high value agriculture or irrigated high value agriculture.

(3) The chief executive may be satisfied the vegetation clearing application is for high value agriculture or irrigated high value agriculture only if—

- (a) the clearing is likely to be economically viable; and
- (b) the clearing to be undertaken is limited to that required for the proposed high value agriculture or irrigated high value agriculture; and
- (c) the land the subject of the clearing is suitable for the proposed high value agriculture or irrigated high value agriculture; and
- (d) the owner of the land on which the clearing is proposed has access to an adequate water supply to support the proposed high value agriculture or irrigated high value agriculture.

The development approval process that I have just outlined is defined and it is certain. It is far and away removed from that which we are hearing the minister on the other side talk about in terms of wide-scale clearing that is unregulated. This approval process is legitimate. More importantly, unlike with those opposite, it has been developed in consultation with farmers right across Queensland. This approval process will mean that farmers do not have months or years to go through Labor's long and drawn-out development assessment process.

In addition, we say that the development approval process should be approved within a maximum of 30 business days. If it is not, the application is taken to have been approved. Time is money on the land. To put it very clearly when it comes to this application process, the assessor gets the information back to the farmer who has made the application or it will be deemed approved after 30 business days. I think that is reasonable in anyone's language. The final amendment is the ministerial guideline which will be developed in consultation with all stakeholders, farmers, environmentalists and members of the community.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I would like to congratulate the shadow minister on his common-sense amendments. I also thank our industry bodies such as AgForce and the Queensland Farmers' Federation for not only lending their support to these amendments but also their policy advisers and coming to the point where we can say, 'This legislation is rot and it will not work but how can we make it better?' Industry groups sat down with the shadow minister to make it better. That is what these amendments are all about. That is different to the process that the Palaszczuk government undertook when it was preparing this bill. It has been clearly enunciated through the debate that there has been a sheer lack of consultation. Industry groups and the people this is going to affect were not at the table.

This common-sense amendment provides that an application is deemed to be approved if it has been sitting on a desk for 30 days. Landholders are telling us they want certainty and confirmation that their application is not going to be stuck on the desk of someone for months or years on end. After 30 days it is done and dusted. If the assessor cannot make their mind up in 30 days the application is taken to be approved. That is common sense. That is certainty.

The shadow minister clearly pointed out in relation to this common-sense amendment that the application must be economically viable, suitable for high-value agriculture, suitable for—if not high-value agriculture—irrigated high-value agriculture and it has to have a water supply. We are suggesting a common-sense amendment, as ridiculous as this bill is, by saying a person cannot apply for something unless they have everything ticked off. These amendments, that have been worked through utilising the brains of our industry as well as the shadow minister and the members of the LNP who were on the committee, are common-sense amendments in an attempt to make this legislation a little bit easier for our landholders to do what it is they do best and get on and feed and clothe this nation.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Gregory, please do not take to your feet until the previous speaker has finished.

Mr MILLAR: Thank you. A lot of people here are keen to talk on this, but I certainly understand what you are saying. These vegetation management laws that the Labor Party are bringing in are not good. We have seen protest after protest at the committee meetings and here on Tuesday morning.

There is something that those opposite can do to make sure that we keep high-value agriculture and high-value irrigated agriculture in these laws. I do not like these laws that you are putting in. I could never vote for these laws that you are putting in.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Through the chair, please.

Mr MILLAR: Here is an opportunity for those opposite to do something right to save face out there in agriculture.

Mrs Frecklington: If you want to go to Beef Week you might like to.

Mr MILLAR: Absolutely. The amendment provides for the new heading of 'Vegetation clearing applications for high-value agriculture or irrigated high-value agriculture.' If we are going to have high-value agriculture and irrigated high-value agriculture we must have the infrastructure in place and it must be economically viable, it must stack up. It has to provide an opportunity to be a part of the economy in Queensland. It has to provide jobs, export dollars or a domestic market. Whether it is in Clare or further north in Hinchinbrook or Cook there is an opportunity to create high-value agriculture so that we can increase our production. I think there is an opportunity here. It has the most stringent controls around it.

Farmers who want to get involved in high-value agriculture have to jump through hoops. They cannot come in and say, 'This is what I want to do.' They have to be serious about it. There is an opportunity for the minister to say, 'Yes, we do need high-value agriculture.' Here is the opportunity to make sure that we have stringent controls on developing it. We do need to increase our food and fibre production. We have a growing population here in Queensland. There is a growing population in South-East Asia. We need to be able to improve and increase agricultural production.

I think it is important that those on the other side at least support this amendment. These amendments are important. The reason we put these amendments forward is because it does happen under a Labor government where the approval process continues to drag on. People are waiting more than 30 business days; they are waiting up to six months. I have primary producers in the electorate of Gregory who are waiting for an opportunity for a water allocation. Last year the government announced in a big song and dance that there is a new water allocation they would like people to apply for. They have not heard back for six months to 12 months. I ask those opposite to support this amendment.

Mr WEIR: I fully support these amendments. I find it very hard to see that the other side would have any grounds to oppose it. This legislation repairs those instances that the minister addressed. He talked about areas that were cleared that were not for high-value agricultural land. This addresses that issue. If you go through this process you are in the correct location, for a start. That takes me back to category X country that is scattered all around Queensland. If it is not close to water, if it is not fit for purpose, it cannot be used for high-value agriculture. It cannot. This amendment fixes that access to water. If it is going to be irrigated high-value agriculture it has to be close to a water source.

The member for Gregory and I often talk about the expenses involved in pumping water. One needs to be very close to water. That is where your better soil is. This amendment states that the application has to prove that it is a viable case. It is not something that anybody will take on willy-nilly; they have to sit down, make a business case and prove that the project is going to work.

Earlier, the member for Hinchinbrook talked about sugar-growing areas and biofuels. This is a serious issue for those areas, because the sugar mill owners have to put so much sugar through their mills to be viable. All along that coastal belt, we are losing land to urban sprawl, to infrastructure—

Mr Costigan: To solar farms.

Mr WEIR: We are losing it to solar farms in my area. They are going to build a train line across it. We continue to lose prime high-value agricultural areas. When you lose that it has a long flow-on effect. It has a knock-on effect. You cannot just put a fence around high-value agriculture and say that that is all you are going to have for eternity.

The approval process will take 30 business days. We constantly heard from those who have tried to go through a DA process how it had been held up and dragged on for months. They were disheartened. Some of them abandoned the process because it was all too hard. Those are busy people who do not have time to run backwards and forwards to departmental officers because they forgot to put a dot here or a tick there. This gives a realistic time frame for going through a very meticulous process and it will work. I strongly support the amendment moved by the member for Burdekin.

Mr HART: This has to be one of the most sensible amendments I have seen in my time in this House. We are suggesting that we provide our farmers with a checklist so that they know that the land is high-value agricultural land or irrigated high-value agricultural land. They know that it is in the correct location—tick. They know they have the correct water supply for it—tick. They know that it is suitable as high-value agricultural land—tick. Most importantly, they know they have the water available to grow the produce. Our farmers need to be aware of those things and that they are in the right location. They need packing sheds nearby so that their produce can be packed for market. They need to be close to transport routes so that trucks or trains can take away their food. They need to be in the right location. Those are important things to be considered.

In 2012-13, I was a member of the natural resources and infrastructure committee. We toured regional Queensland and went to many farming locations. Over and over again we heard about clearing laws. We heard about farmers putting in applications that dragged on for months and months, if not for years, before the application was finally approved and they could get on with the business of clearing their land so that they could plant that high-value agricultural product—whatever it may be—which, once grown, could be picked and shipped off. We fixed that problem. We solved that particular issue.

If we offer our farmers a checklist that is very clear, in black and white—tick, tick, tick—there should be absolutely no reason why an approval could not be ticked off within 30 days. That is plenty of time for someone to look at an application and say, 'They've complied with everything here, it is all good and we should give them the necessary approval to get on with their farming activities'. Very sensibly, that application would then be deemed approved. That gives our farmers the certainty that they need to go to the bank, borrow some money and get on with planning for these very vital food stocks that we all need and love and that sustain our lives going forward.

Dr LYNHAM: I have been very liberal with those opposite. HVA has been voted down by this chamber. They are talking about approvals for HVA, which we have just voted against. The only approvals we are talking about now are relevant approvals for thinning. That is why I have been liberal and not jumped up to raise the point of relevance. We are only talking about approvals for thinning, which is outlined in clause 17.

For the past five minutes members opposite have been talking about something totally irrelevant. I have listened and I have been polite, but I want to bring their attention to the fact that clause 17 relates to approvals for thinning. Basically, two of the three amendments are gone. There is one amendment that they can still talk about, but it is only for approvals for thinning. The approvals for thinning are set out. The chamber has voted down HVA.

Mr PERRETT: I rise to speak in support of the sensible amendments put forward by the shadow minister for natural resources. This is very clear: the LNP has listened to farmers who want a future for their families and their children. We are providing a pathway for development applications to manage vegetation for the purpose of high-value agriculture or irrigated high-value agriculture. I know that the minister might disagree, but I am going to make the point regardless of what the minister may or may not think. I have heard the minister today—

Dr LYNHAM: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Gympie, I remind you to come back to the clause that we are debating.

Mr PERRETT: Thank you for your guidance, Mr Deputy Speaker. As I was saying, the minister has made much of various matters with regard to category X and its fit-for-purpose suitability around this state. Minister, I draw to your attention—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Through the chair, please.

Mr PERRETT: Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw to your attention to the fact that not all the land that the minister mentions is suitable for further development. For the minister to suggest that it needs to be developed further would create more environmental concern to me with respect to pushing that land beyond its capacity. I mention the region that I represent, which is a reasonably high rainfall area, in most cases. Let us say you are going to put a plough into your land to try to develop it further, perhaps to grow crops. It might be category X and I can talk about my own property. As soon as you use a plough to develop category X country, you will create an erosion problem. Not only that; you will also create a problem—

Dr LYNHAM: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. My point is on relevance. It is about deemed decisions; it is not about category X, development and ploughing.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Gympie, I ask you to speak to the clause.

Mr PERRETT: I will continue to speak, because this is relevant to the debate. That will create all sorts of problems. I can talk about the thinning codes if the minister wants. As the shadow minister for agriculture, I have had reports that landholders are extremely concerned about the process of being able to thin and, in particular, the draconian suggestions about the maximum standards per hectare and trying to do that by mechanical means. I raise the point of being able to deal practically with this legislation.

I touch on the issues of deemed approvals and the process for development applications, which are of significant concern to me. I spent 12 years in local government, and I have seen many businesses apply for development approvals and I know of some of the difficulties that they face. Therefore, I think in the agricultural industry, particularly with what is being proposed, there is a necessity to have a process to allow the department to act swiftly so that applications can be deemed approved within 30 days. That being the case, I support the shadow minister's amendment.

Ms LEAHY: For the benefit of the minister, I wish to clarify that amendment No. 2 amends clause 17 of the bill. It actually inserts a new section 22B. We are talking about amendment No. 2 and amendment No. 3, which insert a totally new section. As I understand it, the minister said that it has already gone. I am sorry, but it has not gone as there are two brand-new sections here.

These particular clauses have been workshopped through at great length with AgForce, QFF and other industry organisations. There is a need to have these high-value agriculture areas and irrigated high-value agriculture areas because that provides the pathway to enable future food areas to be developed.

It also does something particularly important in relation to deemed approval being a maximum of 30 business days. I have actually had experience of this with some of my constituents. They would absolutely love to have a deemed approval within 30 business days because they went for about two years and spent something like \$20,000 on their high-value agriculture application. They were entirely frustrated by the department and the things that the department was requiring of them such as soil assessments. They are already irrigating cotton. I am sure they are pretty well aware of the soil types they have. I am pretty sure these are not small operators. They are pretty sure of their financial situation and their future financial situation.

They were frustrated by the department. They would really benefit from having a deemed approval of 30 business days. I think this amendment should be supported. I urge members to support this amendment. This needs to be in place so people can get these high-value agriculture and irrigated high-value agriculture applications through. It is not just food producers but also fibre producers who utilise these particular provisions in the legislation. As I mentioned earlier, there are councils that want to develop food production in their areas. They too look forward to being able to utilise high-value agriculture areas.

That is one of reasons it is important that we support these two amendments. These amendments that the shadow minister has put forward are very good. I urge members to support them.

(Time expired)

Mr MICELBERG: I rise tonight to speak to the member for Burdekin's amendments to the Vegetation Management and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. It is clear that those opposite simply do not care about the impact that this legislation will have on the farmers and graziers of Queensland.

The member for Burdekin's amendments seek to provide greater scope for the development of high-value agriculture and irrigated high-value agriculture which is, despite the minister's comments, essential to drive economic opportunity in rural and regional areas. One only needs to look at the Mareeba-Dimbulah irrigation area to see the effect that development of irrigated high-value agriculture has had in supplying the food needs of Queenslanders, Australians and indeed the rest of the world.

Avocados, mangoes, pawpaws, citrus, pineapples and beef are just some of the food which is only able to be cultivated in that country due to land that has been cleared in the past and with water from Tinaroo Dam. We need to continue to support our rural producers in their efforts to expand food and fibre production. As we are a growing state, a growing nation and a growing world we will need more food and fibre.

Those opposite have seen fit to ignore the effect that this legislation will have on agricultural productive capacity in Queensland. This amendment seeks to remedy that. No modelling has been done and none will be done. It is not good enough. These amendments seek to address the effect that this bill will have on agricultural production and provide a clear pathway for development approvals for high-value agriculture and irrigated high-value agriculture.

During the committee process we heard submissions from the Australian Agricultural Company—one of the largest food producers in the world—that they were not consulted and that they may well not proceed with significant investments in high-value agriculture and irrigated high-value agriculture in Northern Queensland as a direct consequence of this legislation. That will result in significant lost opportunities for those in the north who can least afford it.

We heard from producers in Longreach who explained that the existing high-value agriculture and irrigated high-value agriculture provisions allow them to grow crops that mean they can rest country that would otherwise be grazed much more heavily. It allows farmers to diversify their production, resulting in improved business viability and a greater ability for farmers to manage their land sustainably and with a focus on balancing environmental and financial outcomes.

Ironically, by reducing the ability of farmers to develop high-value agriculture and irrigated high-value agriculture, this bill may well result in poorer environmental outcomes. I urge members on both sides of the House to support the sensible amendments moved by the member for Burdekin.

Mr WATTS: I rise to speak in support of the amendments moved by the member for Burdekin. I am particularly interested in supporting these amendments for the deemed approval process. If someone is in business and they risk their own capital then they might be able to sit and wait, but if someone has financial loans in place or has an ability to borrow to get on and add value to their high-value agricultural land then having some certainty around the time line and process for that will be fundamental. If someone has financial arrangements in place they come at a cost.

For a department to run the process over whatever period of time they might see fit and with no set format or time line, or for someone not to be able to talk to their financier about how long it is going to take, makes it very difficult. If someone goes to borrow money from a financier and they cannot give them certainty, the simple response they will get is that it is risk versus reward. There is greater risk if there is less certainty; therefore, they will charge people more interest.

The deemed approval part of these amendments is very important. People need to understand that, if we want some of the most efficient farmers on planet Earth and if we want to have some of the cleanest and greenest produce being supplied on the Cathay Pacific flight out of Wellcamp every Tuesday, we need to give investors some certainty because certainty will lead to a lower cost of borrowings. I think there are plenty of other protections in here in terms of whether it is the right location, it is economically viable, the land is suitable or there is adequate water.

This is not carte blanche destruction, as described by some during the debate, and putting at risk the Great Barrier Reef. It is none of that. This is simply for small parcels of land. Deemed approval will give farmers the opportunity to borrow money at the lowest possible interest rate because they have certainty around their investment.

Dr ROWAN: I rise to speak in support of the two amendments moved by the shadow minister, the member for Burdekin. These amendments relate to the approval process for applications for high-value agriculture and irrigated high-value agriculture. What the LNP is proposing with these amendments is very sensible and very fair.

The LNP, as many speakers have said, has listened to farmers who want a future not only for their families but also for their children and their grandchildren. The LNP is providing a sensible pathway for development applications to manage vegetation for the purposes of high-value agriculture and irrigated high-value agriculture.

We have listened to industry groups. As the shadow minister has outlined before, these include AgForce and the Queensland Farmers' Federation. The shadow minister has outlined that the proposed application process is rigorous and would stand up to scrutiny. Under the LNP's proposed amendments the development approval process is defined and provides certainty. It provides that if an approval is not provided within a maximum of 30 business days the application is taken to have been approved.

Farmers in rural and regional Queensland do not need uncertainty and a drawn-out development application assessment process. If they have jeopardy then that can lead to poorer productivity and it can also lead to poorer economic outcomes right across Queensland. Any delay and uncertainty will negatively impact the profitability of farms and also our agricultural sector here in Queensland.

If our farms have less profitability then they have less certainty for the future. What we do not need in Queensland is to see our farming families—those who are contributing to our regional and rural communities, those who are contributing to our domestic economy and also those who are contributing to our exports here in Queensland—not able to survive. The LNP through these sensible amendments is ensuring that a future exists for them.

Dr LYNHAM: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on a matter of relevance again. The member is drifting off the topic about the specific clause we are debating.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Member for Moggill, I ask you to speak to the clause.

Dr ROWAN: In finishing my contribution on the amendments, the LNP amendments seek to establish a head of power to consider a guideline made by a minister. That would be developed in consultation with all stakeholders, farmers, environmentalists, builders and communities. That is because we consulted with people in Queensland, as the shadow minister has outlined before, in relation to these amendments. We have consulted with AgForce and with the Queensland Farmers' Federation. We will always listen to stakeholders. We will listen to rural and regional communities. We will get the balance right in relation to the agricultural sector here in Queensland and also in relation to the environment. These are sensible amendments that the shadow minister has moved. I would encourage all members to support them.

(Time expired)

Mr BOYCE: I rise to speak on the amendments moved by the shadow minister, the member for Burdekin. The Palaszczuk Labor government's bill removes the current exemption for high-value agriculture and irrigated high-value agriculture.

Dr LYNHAM: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on a matter of relevance. HVA and irrigated HVA have been voted down by the chamber.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Callide, you need to be relevant to amendments Nos 2 and 3. If you are not, I will ask you to resume your seat.

Mr BOYCE: Thank you for your guidance, Mr Deputy Speaker. The LNP is committed to expanding further fibre production. This is most important to the agricultural sector in Queensland and the Queensland economy. It is most important that Queenslanders have the opportunity to enjoy the fruits of agriculture. Without clear pathway development approvals for high-value agriculture—

Dr LYNHAM: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on a matter of relevance. In talking about irrigated HVA and HVA, the member is drifting off the subject yet again.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The amendments that were moved were Nos 2 and 3. Amendment No. 3 proposes to insert new sections which talk about vegetation clearing applications for high-value agriculture or irrigated high-value agriculture. The minister ought to not look at just the words 'amendment No. 3'. He needs to look at the sections that amendment No. 3 is inserting. The member is being very relevant to the amendment and the sections that it proposes to insert.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Again, member for Callide, I ask you to speak to the amendments and keep it relevant.

Mr BOYCE: Thank you for your direction, Mr Deputy Speaker. The LNP has listened to farmers who want a future for their families and their children. Those opposite obviously do not want to encourage agriculture at all. They do not want to look after rural and regional Queensland. We are providing a pathway for development applications to manage vegetation for the purpose of high-value agriculture or irrigated high-value agriculture. It is a common-sense process. The application must include the following: the location and extent of the proposed clearing—

Dr LYNHAM: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on a matter of relevance.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, I have actually been listening very intently. I do have the explanatory notes in front of me that were provided around for these amendments. I believe that the member is speaking to those.

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have given my ruling.

Mr BOYCE: Thank you for your direction, Mr Deputy Speaker. The application must include the following: the location and extent of the proposed clearing; particulars of the clearing, including when it is expected the clearing will be completed; details of the proposed high-value agriculture or irrigated high-value agriculture; evidence that the owner of the land on which the clearing is proposed has access to an adequate water supply to support the high-value agriculture or irrigated high-value agriculture.

The chief executive may be satisfied the vegetation clearing application is for high-value agriculture or irrigated high-value agriculture only if the clearing is likely to be economically viable; the clearing to be undertaken is limited to that required for the proposed high-value agriculture or irrigated

high-value agriculture; the land the subject of the clearing is suitable for the proposed high-value agriculture or irrigated high-value agriculture; and the owner of the land on which the clearing is proposed has access to an adequate water supply to support the proposed high-value agriculture or irrigated high-value agriculture. I support these amendments.

(Time expired)

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (5.36 pm): I move—

That the debate be now adjourned.

Mr SPEAKER: A division has been called. Ring the bells for one minute.

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

AYES, 47:

ALP, 47—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Miller, Mullen, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

NOES, 45:

LNP, 39—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Costigan, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

Resolved in the affirmative.

MOTION

Suspension of Sessional Orders; Allocation of Time Limit Order

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (5.40 pm): I move—

1. Notwithstanding anything contained in sessional orders, the hours of sitting and order of business for the remainder of today's sitting contained in temporary sessional orders circulated in my name be agreed to effective immediately;
2. That so much of the standing and sessional orders be suspended to allow all remaining stages of the Vegetation Management and Other Legislation Amendment Bill to be completed by 10.30 pm on this day's sitting including:
 - (a) consideration in detail to be completed by 10.25 pm
 - (b) question on third reading to be put by 10.27 pm
 - (c) question on long title to be put by 10.30 pm; and
3. At the time so specified, Mr Speaker shall put all remaining questions necessary to complete consideration of the bill, including clauses en bloc and any amendments to be moved by the minister in charge of the bill, without further amendment or debate.

Temporary Sessional Orders

6.00pm—6.30pm

Government Business

6.30pm—7.30pm

Dinner Break

7.30pm—until adjournment moved

Government Business

This bill has been debated for the entire week. We have spent the entire day on consideration in detail. This is a matter, as many on the other side have said, that has been debated in this chamber for a long time now. I know those on the other side thought we would just come in and guillotine this, but we are saying that you have until 10.30 tonight. You decide how you want to use that time.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs D'ATH: Mr Speaker—

Mr SPEAKER: I have not called you yet, Leader of the House.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I do not need any guidance from you either, Leader of the Opposition. Members, this will not descend into a circus. There is a motion before the House. The Leader of the House is speaking to the motion. I could not hear the points made. Leader of the House, I ask you to direct your comments through the chair.

Mrs D'ATH: If those on the other side want every one of their speakers to speak on one amendment and one amendment only, that is their choice. If they want to deal with their amendments, they can do it in an efficient way without tedious repetition and get on with passing this bill.

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (5.42 pm): The arrogance we spoke of earlier in the week is on full display tonight. The Leader of the House has said, 'You can be more efficient: just have one or two of your members speaking.' It is the right of every member of this House to speak on these bills.

Mr Mander: Why don't you believe in socialism?

Mr BLEIJIE: It is not only socialism. It is a dictatorship when they come in here and say, 'Just select one or two to speak on it.' The Leader of the House is effectively saying that not every member deserves the right to speak. What we are seeing is a guillotine and an extension of the hours of parliament. They are extending the hours of the parliament again. Members will recall only three hours ago I warned that we were on a slippery slope to suspending standing orders because family friendly hours were out the window. Little did I know it would be only three hours later and we would be debating suspending the sessional orders.

They do not have to suspend the sessional orders to sit later tonight. They can finish at six o'clock with the automatic adjournment and we will come back when parliament sits next time and complete the debate on vegetation management. They said that if we are not finished at six o'clock we will adjourn on a Thursday night. Do members remember the big speech they gave? It is to allow the regional members of parliament to book flights and go home. How much money has the government now cost Queenslanders for flights that have been booked tonight because of these family friendly hours? Is this what we are doing with the family friendly hours? It does not make sense. This government is a rabble.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Kawana, you are being disorderly in the House. You will not tear items up and throw them to the floor of the chamber. I warn you under the standing orders.

Mr BLEIJIE: This government has turned into a rabble and a circus. If they are going to do this on this Thursday night, as they did with the sessional orders for the budget week earlier today, they might as well throw out the family friendly sessional orders and return to what we had. Then we would not be wasting all this time and debate on the silly politics they play.

I hear that the Premier has not accepted the Beef Week invitation just yet. We look forward to that. They do not want this cloud hanging over the agricultural sector with the laws not having been passed through the parliament. It has now been three or four times in the last four hours that the Leader of the House and the arrogant Labor government have used their numbers in this House to completely throw out protocol, precedent and any resemblance of democracy.

An opposition member: They guillotined somebody mid speech.

Mr BLEIJIE: Earlier halfway through a member's speech the debate was guillotined to stop the member from speaking. Now the sessional orders are being suspended to extend the hours tonight. As I said earlier, we are happy to stay here and debate the laws. The point is that if they cannot manage their own side of the House how can they manage Queensland? That is the point I made before about the Leader of the House. It is not acceptable to continually come in here after we have sessional orders in place, voted and debated on by members of this chamber, and because they cannot manage to get their bills passed this week everyone else has to suffer.

As I said, how many members have already booked flights because this Labor government told regional members they could get back to their constituencies on Fridays by booking a flight on a Thursday evening. That was the excuse for family friendly hours. As I said, we might as well throw out the sessional orders because it is going to change from week to week. For goodness sake, it has changed in the last three hours. It changes from hour to hour under this government.

This is what is going to happen every sitting week now. As the member for Mermaid Beach said only a few hours ago, he warned about this many months ago. What we are seeing unravel now is what we warned the government about. The government got into the position a few sitting weeks ago where they had no bills on the agenda to talk about. Now they have put bills in. They have 17 bills before committees or being reported on. This issue will keep arising in the future because they cannot manage the House. They cannot govern themselves.

I remember the Premier who was the opposition leader at the time sitting over here, and every time an issue like this arose she would be the first to call for someone to be sacked. It is corruption. It is arrogance. It is hubris. That is what the Premier, the member for Inala, said on many occasions in this House. Where is the member for Inala now? Where is the high moral standard that the Premier set back when she was opposition leader? Where are her standards now? She is happy now because she has a majority. She has the numbers and she can ride roughshod over Queenslanders.

Ms Jones: Are you joking?

Mr BLEIJIE: No, I am not joking. I am absolutely serious.

Ms Jones interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Cooper, I warn you under the standing orders for your repeated interjections.

Mr BLEIJIE: This is an abuse of process, the privileges and immunities of this parliament. When the Leader of the House was in opposition and she was talking about these sorts of things in previous parliaments, she promised that this would never happen under Labor's watch. She said, 'This will never happen,' but Labor have a history of guillotining debates. In fact I think they guillotined the vegetation management laws in 2009. They say one thing at one particular time but they change it the next day.

I have seen the member for Woodridge interjecting over there. He is the worst offender of the lot. The arrogance that we see exude from the Premier's office is also through his office, the Deputy Premier's office and, last but not least, the member for Cooper's office. That is the arrogance of this government. I ask all honourable members to oppose this motion tonight because it is again an abuse of process, but what would we expect from an arrogant government covered in hubris?

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Cooper—ALP) (Minister for Innovation and Tourism Industry Development and Minister for the Commonwealth Games) (5.50 pm): Mr Speaker—

Mrs Frecklington: Mr Speaker—

Mr SPEAKER: The call came from the member for Cooper.

Ms JONES: Pursuant to standing order 88, I move—

That the question be now put.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Speaker!

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I will take your point of order in a moment, but I will say that members must seek the call, and standing in your place is simply not seeking the call. Members must seek the call and it was clear that the member for Cooper spoke first. What is your point of order, Leader of the Opposition?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Speaker, my point of order is in relation to standing order 88 and the fact that there has not been sufficient debate. There are 12 amendments yet to go through from the opposition. This government is shutting down the debate, and again on a motion that its own government—

Government members interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: The government is shutting down debate—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Leader of the Opposition, you rose on a point of order, not to commence a speech. Your point of order relates to standing order 88, if I heard you correctly?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Yes, and there not being sufficient debate.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you very much. Please resume your seat. That is a separate question to what has been discussed here. The motion which has been put by the member for Cooper was that the question be now put. I have listened to what you said but that is a separate argument so there is no point of order.

Mr NICHOLLS: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. My point of order goes to standing order 88. Mr Speaker, it will not come as any surprise to you that I make the same points that I made the last time around because it goes to the procedural motion that is now being put by the member for Cooper that the question be now put. Standing order 88 actually states—

(2) If the Speaker is of the opinion that the question has been sufficiently debated and a motion in (1)—
that is, that the question be now put—

... is not an abuse of the rules of the House or an infringement of members' rights—

Mr SPEAKER: Member, I am going to stop you. Just in terms of my ruling to the Leader of the Opposition previously, this is not a chance to make a speech. You have highlighted the standing order that you are referring to. I accept the point of order that you have said and that you are trying to highlight. I understand what you are saying, but I would ask that you resume your seat.

Mr NICHOLLS: Mr Speaker, with no disrespect to you, I think I am entitled to complete my point of order, which I had not completed.

Mr SPEAKER: It is a relatively lengthy point of order.

Mr NICHOLLS: I am not seeking to argue with you on the point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: I will give you some leniency but it had better be a strong argument, member for Clayfield.

Mr NICHOLLS: Absolutely. The point of order goes to the decision that you are obliged to make under the standing orders. This is a standing order. I do not seek to relitigate the Leader of the Opposition's point in relation to the 12 amendments and those things. I simply seek to ask whether adequate debate has occurred on the motion and it is not an abuse of the rules of the House. I simply seek to say to you when exercising your judgement—and it is your opinion on that—that two speakers, one for and one against, is not an adequate consideration of the matter before the House or a proper ventilation of the arguments.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Clayfield. As per the previous point of order some time ago, you raised a similar point of order at that time regarding standing order 88. My view now is the same as my view then. I believe there is a significant difference between substantive motions and procedural motions and—

Mr NICHOLLS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

Mr SPEAKER: Member, I am not finished. Please resume your seat. The fact here is that we have had a speaker from both sides—the government and the opposition—to clearly put points. I would argue that this would be tedious repetition to have further contributions, but I as a Speaker have not moved this. It has been moved by the member for Cooper and the motion is that the question be now put. Are you rising on a point of order?

Mr Nicholls: I was waiting for you to finish, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: I will be suggesting that I have made a ruling and my ruling will be that the question be put. The question is that the question be now put. Those of that opinion say 'aye'—

Notice of Motion, Dissent from Speaker's Ruling

Mr NICHOLLS: In that case, Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I give notice that I shall be moving a motion of dissent from your ruling.

Mr SPEAKER: You are entitled to do so, member for Clayfield. The question is that the question be now put. Those of that opinion say 'aye'; those against 'no'. I think the ayes have it.

An opposition member: Divide.

Mr SPEAKER: A division has been called. Ring the bells for one minute.

Division: Question put—That the question be now put.

In division—

Mr CRANDON: I rise to a point of order, Mr Speaker. I question the time for the bells, being four minutes or one minute. This is not on the clauses. Why are we moving to a one-minute bell as opposed to a four-minute bell?

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member. My rationale is that we have just experienced a division. There has been, as I can see it, almost no members leaving the chamber and I can also see that we have not had a substantial period of time pass, which is why I have put for the benefit of the House a one-minute division.

While we are waiting for the votes to come forward, member for Coomera, I should just point to standing order 88(2), which says that 'the Speaker shall put the closure motion forthwith without amendment or debate'. That is another reason why I deemed the one-minute division to be reasonable.

Ms SIMPSON: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order with respect to the ruling you just made where you quoted standing order 88. You made reference to the fact that the Speaker could move to act forthwith but that is not with respect to the issue of the timing of the bells. I respectfully draw your attention to the fact that the ruling you have made is not relevant in respect of the timing of the bells and the time that members have to get to the chamber, and that is actually not accurate—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I would like to hear the point of order. My apologies, member. I missed the last few moments because I could not hear due to interjections.

Ms SIMPSON: Mr Speaker, with respect to the closure motion in standing order 88, you referenced that the Speaker can move forthwith, yet the point that the member for Coomera was making was with respect to the period of time that the bells were to ring. That is not the same issue with respect to the debate and forthwith with respect to the bells.

I respectfully draw your attention to the fact that if that is to be a ruling from here on, that is I believe to the deficiency of the rights and privileges of members to have sufficient time to come to this chamber. That is not the intention of standing order 88 as printed and which you quoted.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member. I will say that was not the only rationale given. If you listened to my statement I also made reference to the fact that—and part of the role of Speaker is to be aware of what is going on in the chamber at all times—I could not see that any members had left the chamber since the division, which has only been on for about 10 minutes—

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

Mr SPEAKER: I am giving a ruling.

Mr BLEIJIE: I rise to a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: I am still speaking.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, I have a point of order. It is now six o'clock; the House is automatically adjourned. The sessional orders have a six o'clock automatic adjournment and so we should be heading straight into adjournment speeches.

Mr SPEAKER: Member, first of all, I took a point of order from the member for Maroochydore and obviously that was in the middle of actually reading the results of a division. Time is at the discretion of the Speaker. I will continue to read the results of the division, which is what I will do and it is at my discretion to do so. If that is the case, we will then deal with the matter following that.

Mr NICHOLLS: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Further to the point of order raised by the member for Maroochydore in respect of the provision for divisions—and this is actually quite critical—standing order 103 sets out the rules for putting questions and calling a division. It states—

... the Speaker shall order the division bells to be rung for four minutes—

which is the standard, normal procedure. It goes on—

If there has already been a division in respect of that order of the day or motion, and there is no intervening debate, the Speaker may order the division bells to be rung for one minute.

Mr Speaker, there had been no prior division and there had certainly been intervening debate. In respect of the question that was put, the power under standing order 103(4) to shorten the time to one minute does not exist if you read standing order 103(3), which says for four minutes 'unless there has already been a division' of which there had not been any.

Mr SPEAKER: Member, thank you for your point of order. I have made a ruling. If you wish to dissent from the ruling, as you indicated you would for a previous ruling, you are welcome to do so. The results of the division—

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

Mr SPEAKER: Member, I hope you are not reprocsecuting the same argument because I have made a ruling.

Mr NICHOLLS: No. Mr Speaker, I question this then. Is it your ruling that you are entitled to make the decision that you made that the bells be rung for only one minute—and I would ask you to identify under which standing order that occurs so that the members of the House are aware of it.

Mr SPEAKER: Member, there is an appropriate way to conduct this. You have said you would seek to dissent from a ruling. I would encourage you to write to me on the matter. Right now I am continuing to use the discretion of the Speaker to ensure that this division is at least completed.

AYES, 48:

ALP, 47—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Miller, Mullen, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 44:

LNP, 39—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Costigan, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Resolved in the affirmative.

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

Mr SPEAKER: The question now is that the motion be agreed to—

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. We had dealt with that division as you indicated. We are now three minutes past the House adjourning—

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Kawana.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order, members. Member for Kawana, I have also made the statement three times now that the time of the House is at the discretion of the Speaker. I have made that clear. We have finished dealing with this previous question that had been put. That motion has been resolved by way of a division. Now the question is that the motion be agreed to.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. In your previous ruling when I raised the issue just after the division previously, you ruled that you would deal with the matter of the House already having adjourned after you had announced what the vote was. You have now announced what the vote was. I put to you that we now adjourn the House.

Mr SPEAKER: No, member for Kawana. Standing order 88(4) says—

If a closure motion is resolved in the affirmative, the Speaker must put the main question at once, without further amendment or debate.

That is what I intend to do.

Mr BLEIJIE: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I understand that and I understand the standing order, but nothing gets away from the fact that the sessional orders have the House adjourning four minutes ago.

Mr SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The question is—

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

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Caloundra, I hope that this is going to add something to this and not be repeating the same argument.

Mr McArdle: Mr Speaker, I certainly take the comments you have made with regard to standing orders 88(2) and 88(4). My comment would be that if the House is no longer jurisdictionally sitting how can you—

Mr SPEAKER: Are you dissenting from a ruling? Otherwise there is no point of order.

Mr McARDLE: Mr Speaker, with respect, can I complete my point of order? Then you have every right of course—and I respect the ruling you make. In my opinion, standing order 88(4) is prefaced on the fact that the House jurisdictionally is still sitting. The standing orders have made it quite clear that at 6 pm we automatically adjourn—

Mr SPEAKER: Member, I will interrupt you. Please resume your seat. I have just made the same point to the Manager of Opposition Business that the timing of the House is at the discretion of the Speaker. The House is still sitting because the automatic adjournment has not been declared by me as Speaker. The House is still sitting and is in session, so it is not a valid argument. There is no point of order. The question is—

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

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

Mr SPEAKER: The question is that the motion be agreed to—member, resume your seat.

Mr WATTS: I have a point of order, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: I am following the standing orders also, which says that the motion should be put immediately. If you have a point of order you can make your point of order following the question.

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

Mr SPEAKER: Ring the bells for one minute.

AYES, 47:

ALP, 47—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Miller, Mullen, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

NOES, 45:

LNP, 39—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Costigan, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Mr BLEIJIE: I rise to a point of order. Sessional order No. 2, 'Automatic Adjournment', states—

(1) Standing Order 56 is suspended for this session.

It then says—

(2) At the time specified for the Automatic Adjournment in the Order of Business for each Sitting Day, the Speaker shall:

- notify the House that it is the time for the Automatic Adjournment of the House;
- shall call on up to ten members to speak for no more than three minutes each to make an adjournment statement; and
- at the conclusion of the members' statements in 2(b) above, shall declare the House is adjourned to the date and time previously agreed to by the House.

Mr Speaker, nothing that I can see in the sessional orders gives a discretion in terms of continuing the House at the discretion of the Speaker. The sessional orders are quite clear that at the time specified, six o'clock this evening, the Speaker shall advise the House that it is time for the automatic adjournment and then immediately call the 10 members to speak.

Mr SPEAKER: I will make a couple of points. Time is at the discretion of the Speaker. Given that we were in the middle of a division, I would ensure that the business of that division is completed. I would make the point that it would have been completed a little earlier, but several points of order were raised.

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order, members to my right! I do not believe there is a point of order. Again I invite you to dissent from my ruling if that is indeed what you wish to do.

Mr McARDLE: I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, you have used the word 'clarification' now on two separate occasions in relation to your power to deal with time.

Mr SPEAKER: Member, at the moment I am seeing several frivolous points of order, because I have been very clear in my ruling—

Mr McARDLE: I am clarifying—

Mr SPEAKER: There is nothing to clarify, member for Caloundra, because I have made a ruling. The process is that if you wish to dissent from that ruling you are welcome to do so.

Mr McARDLE: I am not seeking to dissent—

Mr SPEAKER: Member, it is bordering on disrespect to the chair at this point, so I ask you to resume your seat. We have just had two divisions where questions have been put and passed by the House. That is, as far as I am concerned, the end of matter. If you wish to revisit the matters we have just voted on as a parliament, then that is a separate issue.

VEGETATION MANAGEMENT AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Detail

Resumed from p. 1028.

Resumed on clause 17, to which Mr Last had moved amendments—

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

AYES, 43:

LNP, 39—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Costigan, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

KAP, 2—Dametto, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 48:

ALP, 47—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Miller, Mullen, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendments (Mr Last) negatived.

Mr SPEAKER: We are just clarifying one of the votes as it was read into the record by the Clerk versus what has been announced as the division result. The result of the division is not changed and we will clarify it with the Clerk.

Division: Question put—That clause 17, as read, stand part of the bill.

AYES, 50:

ALP, 47—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Miller, Mullen, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 42:

LNP, 39—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Costigan, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 17, as read, agreed to.

Clause 18, as read, agreed to.

Clause 19, as read, agreed to.

Clause 20—

 **Mr LAST** (6.20 pm): I move the following amendment—

4 **Clause 20 (Amendment of s 30 (Power to enter places))**

Page 19, lines 19 to 21—

omit.

This is a consequential amendment to remove the heading for new entry powers and I will talk to the substance of this amendment during the consideration of clause 21.

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

AYES, 44:

LNP, 39—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Costigan, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 48:

ALP, 47—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Miller, Mullen, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Mr Last) negated.

Division: Question put—That clause 20, as read, stand part of the bill.

AYES, 49:

ALP, 47—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Miller, Mullen, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 43:

LNP, 39—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Costigan, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 20, as read, agreed to.

Mr SPEAKER: Members should note that the member for Burdekin's amendment No. 5 proposes to delete clause 21. Therefore, the proper procedure is for the member to vote against the clause.

Clause 21—

 **Mr LAST** (6.27 pm): My proposed amendment removes the power for authorised officers to enter properties without the landholder's consent or a warrant. This is nothing but an attack on the property rights of farmers and it has certainly not been justified. As a former police officer this set off a lot of alarm bells for me when I was first made aware of this particular provision within the bill. That is a concern that is shared by the Queensland Law Society which also made quite a lengthy submission expressing its concerns with the power that would be granted to these enforcement officers to enter

property without a warrant and without the consent of the landowner. Could members imagine the uproar in South-East Queensland if these people started walking into people's yards down here and what that would mean and how that would be received? It is not much different for our farmers, yet these authorised officers are being given the authority to enter land as they see fit.

When one thinks about the training and the authority that police officers have and the procedures and the policies that they must comply with, we all know that they have powers of entry. However, they also have safeguards and very strict procedures built into that where they are required to complete post search approval orders under the authority of a magistrate. This particular provision ignores the property rights of landholders. I would be very interested in hearing from the minister what the next steps are with regard to these officers. What sort of protection are they going in with? Are they wearing vests? Are they going in with radios? Are they being given handcuffs? What is the next step for these enforcement officers? Will they carry tasers? Where do you stop with this? It is quite scary when you think about it in that these enforcement officers are going on to isolated properties throughout Queensland and what that might mean in terms of their safety. I can tell members right now that farmers will not take kindly to finding someone walking around on their property in the middle of nowhere.

Mr Krause interjected.

Mr LAST: As my colleague has just pointed out, there was an officer killed in New South Wales under very similar circumstances. We on this side of the House are very concerned with this particular provision. Our recommendation is that it be omitted and my amendment is that this be omitted. It beggars belief that the Labor Party would seek to subject our farming families to these laws.

(Time expired)

Sitting suspended from 6.30 pm to 7.30 pm.

Interruption.

PRIVILEGE

Alleged Contravention of Parliament's Terms and Conditions of Broadcast

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (7.30 pm): I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising. Earlier this evening, as he often does, the Minister for Transport and Main Roads tweeted. I table a copy of the tweet for members.

Tabled paper. Extract, undated, from Twitter Account of Minister for Transport and Main Roads, Hon. Mark Bailey [615].

I believe that this tweet is in direct contravention of Mr Speaker's ruling only two days ago in this House and also in direct contravention of the Speaker's ruling in the last parliamentary sitting. The Minister for Main Roads and Transport has a habit of this. Only two days ago the Speaker made a ruling about the publication of photos of the parliamentary broadcast. I believe that the minister has breached that and I will be writing to the Speaker about that.

DEPUTY SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Error in Division

 **Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Stewart): Order! Honourable members, as the Speaker advised before the dinner break, there was an error in the calculation of the votes in division No. 11 earlier this evening. The division was on the member for Burdekin's amendments Nos 2 and 3 to the Vegetation Management and Other Legislation Amendment Bill.

The error does not affect the outcome of the vote. However, the record needs to be corrected. The result of the division was, in fact, ayes 43, noes 48. In accordance with standing order 106(11), I have instructed the Clerk to amend the *Record of Proceedings*.

VEGETATION MANAGEMENT AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Detail

Resumed.

 **Mr BATT:** I rise to speak in support of the proposed amendment to remove the new powers of enforcement officers to enter private property without a warrant. This amendment will stop vegetation enforcement officers being able to enter private property on only a suspicion of committing a breach and also reaffirms the need for enforcement officers to apply for a warrant to enter the property.

Proposed section 30 provides for entry without a warrant. It is noted that the trigger to exercise the power to enter a place is that an authorised officer believes on reasonable grounds that a vegetation clearing offence is happening, or has happened, at a place. The Queensland Law Society queries whether in many cases the reasonable grounds belief would be sufficient grounds for a magistrate to issue a warrant. The Queensland Law Society considers that the most appropriate course is to obtain a warrant, given that it is a fundamental legislative principle that legislation confers powers to enter premises and search for or seize documents or other property only with a warrant issued by a judge or other judicial officer.

I want to respond to the minister's claims that he made earlier today that I made misleading statements and that, as an ex-police officer, I should have known better. This is what I said in the House in my earlier speech to which the minister referred—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order! One moment, member. Is this relevant to the clause that is being debated currently?

Mr BATT: Yes, it is. It is in relation to this amendment.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: If you wish to respond to comments made against you, you need to do it as a matter of privilege.

Mr BATT: I will withdraw that part about the minister's claims and continue.

Mr WATTS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. It is not a matter of privilege. The member is simply responding to words that were said. Following the guidance you have just given, it would mean that the minister cannot respond to anything that any of us say.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. I will take that into consideration but I will bring you back to the clause that we are debating.

Mr BATT: Thank you. Under the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act, police officers have powers to conduct investigations into certain offences. Under the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act, police have a power to enter a place without a warrant. However, the police officer then has to apply to a magistrate as soon as reasonably practicable after exercising the power for a post-search approval order to have the entry and any evidence seized authorised as if a warrant were obtained.

If section 30A is to remain, a similar post-search approval order should be included in that section to have the entry and seizure of any evidence approved by a magistrate. As an ex-police officer, I stand by those comments. If the minister would like to know anything about that part of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act, I am very happy to give any lessons on it to the minister outside of here.

As I said, I rise to speak in favour of this amendment. These powers are far beyond what they should be and far beyond what a police officer could do under the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act in similar circumstances and should not be allowed.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I rise to speak in support of the amendment moved by the shadow minister in relation to clause 21. I do not believe that there would be one member in this House who does not think that the mental health and wellbeing of our regional men and women—in fact, all Queenslanders—is not at the forefront of all of our minds. We know that wonderful organisations assist particularly the mental health of rural men.

I speak to this clause and the need for this amendment to be agreed to because it will enable a bit of peace of mind for our landholders. I remind those in the House of the unfortunate, terrible, fatal incident that occurred in New South Wales in relation to a departmental officer entering a property and carrying out their duties. It needs to be at the forefront of our minds that we protect these departmental officers who will be doing their duty under extraordinarily hard circumstances that will be made even harder because of these draconian laws. We need to ensure that we are putting in place amendments to not only protect these departmental officers but also, and most importantly, give peace of mind to our landholders.

When we talk about giving departmental officers more power than our police have, we need to be careful. I thank the member for Bundaberg for the work that he has done in the past as a serving police officer. The shadow minister is also a former police officer. They explained the need for this amendment. Given that Labor's proposed entry powers for authorised officers are simply unwarranted and without precedent, this amendment is simply common sense. Our police do not have powers as extensive as the ones proposed by this minister, this cabinet and this Premier.

They want to give these people more power than our police. They purport to look after our rural and regional people. I beg this minister to consider the mental health of everyone—

(Time expired)

Dr MILES: Contrary to the claims made by those opposite, the land access provisions that they are seeking to amend here simply align the provisions in the Vegetation Management Act with those that exist under the Water Act and the Land Act. There is therefore nothing unusual and it is entirely appropriate that they remain unamended in the government's bill.

While I am on my feet, earlier in the debate on this bill, while we were discussing amendments proposed by the Queensland Greens in relation to allowances of broadscale land clearing, I made a statement—

Mr WATTS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I am seeking guidance as to whether this is relevant to the clause and the amendment that is put forward.

Dr MILES: It is my earliest opportunity to correct the record.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, I ask you to speak to the clause we are debating.

Dr MILES: I seek an opportunity to correct the record about a statement I made earlier.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The minister may want to seek to do this or that but he cannot. You cannot talk on a clause that has been ruled on before. He may want to do it but he cannot.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: One moment, please.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members. Please bear with me. I am taking counsel from the assistant clerk and will make a determination. I ask you to not debate across the floor or have discussions across the floor. Thank you.

Minister, it is a matter suddenly arising so I would ask that when you are on your feet and we are addressing the clause that you actually address the clause. You will have an opportunity to correct the record as a matter suddenly arising at another opportunity. Had you finished?

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Members on my left, you will not make the determination whether the minister or any other speaker has finished.

Mr MANDER: I rise to speak in favour of the shadow minister's amendment. This part of the legislation defies every sense there is of natural justice. What would someone like Terry O'Gorman say about laws where somebody can enter your property without consent, without a warrant and make some sort of inspection and some sort of judgement? Could members imagine somebody in the suburbs of Brisbane—

Mr Stevens: South Brisbane!

Mr MANDER: I will take that interjection from the member for Mermaid Beach. Imagine a police officer coming into somebody's home in South Brisbane—into the minister's home itself—without any warrant, without any consent and basically doing what they want. This defies every sense of natural justice. How can those opposite allow this to happen? It was bad enough when they reversed the onus of proof. The pressure from the public was so great that they had to admit that they got it wrong and remove it. They need to go a step further. The fact that these officers can have more power than a police officer is beyond belief.

We think this is a reasonable amendment by the shadow minister. Anybody in their right mind would say that this is reasonable. Imagine what Tony Fitzgerald would say about this if he knew about these elements of the bill. We are simply asking that common sense prevails and that common decency applies so that people on the land can feel safe and secure and not have to worry about whether somebody will come in at whatever hour of the night, I am not sure. There are many other ways that these inspections could take place without going to the degrees that this part of the bill allows.

Ms Leahy: It could be drones.

Mr MANDER: I take that interjection from the member for Warrego. Drones are another option. This can be done without authorisation, without warrant. Again imagine if it happened here in South-East Queensland. This is what our country cousins cannot believe. They think there are two standards being applied. It is very difficult to argue against that point. We think it is pure common sense and plain decency to change this along the lines that the shadow minister has suggested.

Mr PURDIE: I rise tonight to speak to amendment 5 to clause 21 relating to powers of entry. As I said yesterday, I am a boy from Brisbane who now lives at the beach so vegetation management is a matter I have been happy to let other members here who have a closer connection to the land elaborate on. One thing I do have a connection to is the laws of this state as they relate to investigative powers, particularly as they relate to powers of entry, search and seizure.

The powers proposed in this bill, as it currently stands, are unprecedented, extraordinary and excessive. The Queensland Police Service and other agencies charged with serious and major crime investigations, such as the Crime and Misconduct Commission and even the Australian Federal Police who conduct terrorism investigations, have to justify and articulate their reasons and grounds, usually before a magistrate or judge, to execute a search warrant or enter someone's private property. I have conducted murder, rape, child abuse, drug trafficking and other major crime investigations where the grounds for my search warrant application have been laid out in over 50 pages of intelligence. The evidence sought in these investigations is often of the nature that it can be easily and quickly destroyed or concealed, like a murder weapon or drugs, and in most cases time is of the essence.

The powers in this bill which grant vegetation management officers extraordinarily intrusive powers not only are excessive but also seem to be totally unjustified and unnecessary. Police do have, in urgent circumstances, as we heard the member for Bundaberg elaborate on, the ability to execute an emergent search warrant where there is a belief that evidence of the offence is likely to be destroyed, removed or concealed. I cannot think of any circumstances where evidence of land that has been cleared could be concealed. I concede that I am a boy from the city, but I am pretty sure once you have knocked down some trees that it is not that easy to put them back up. Asking the tree police to justify their grounds for entry is just common sense.

I have not heard any member from the government side of the House even attempt to explain why these extraordinary powers are justified. That is why I support these sensible and fair amendments by the member for Burdekin.

Dr LYNHAM: I take this opportunity to clarify a few of the issues raised. The clause proposes to allow an officer to enter a property without a warrant. That power already exists under the Water Act and the Environmental Protection Act. The power of entry is limited to where there is a reasonable belief that a vegetation clearing offence has or is occurring. Why is the power of entry required when you can see that trees are down? The power of entry is required when there is an imminent risk of serious and often irreversible impacts on biodiversity and land degradation occurring, or where obtaining the consent of the occupier to enter the place is not practical or possible.

I specifically address the issue of entry to a person's home. The member for Everton said it would be like giving a vegetation management officer the power to enter the minister's home in South Brisbane. An officer may not enter a dwelling on the property. As was explained, the powers of the police are greater as, in an emergency, they can enter a home without a warrant. Under this clause, written notice to the owner-occupier must be made 24 hours before entry.

Those on the other side of the House are engaging in shameful scaremongering. They are trying to scare decent farmers, decent people from regional areas and decent people who live on the land. They are scaremongering for their own political gain and it has to stop.

Mr LISTER: When I arrived here, I made the perhaps naive assumption that this state implicitly accepted the rule of law. This government is proposing to treat farmers as second-class citizens in the face of the law. The member for Everton made a very good point. He asked how this would go down in South Brisbane and rattled off a list of eminent civil libertarians who would gravely object to it. I can add one more name: Wayne Goss, a former Labor premier of this state and a noted civil libertarian. What would he think of the idea of depriving some citizens of the rights that those in the city might have?

The Leader of the Opposition made the point that we need to be cognisant of the mental health of all Queenslanders. It is well known that in the bush there is a higher incidence of depression and mental illness because of the challenges people face. The implication in this bill that farmers are less trustworthy than others in the rest of the state is a terrible thing.

Mr Costigan interjected.

Mr LISTER: They are treating us like dodgy car dealers; I take the interjection from the member for Whitsunday. It is a fundamental tenet of the rule of law, stemming from the Magna Carta, that the arbitrary power of the state—

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order!

Mr LISTER: I know the Labor party is full of lawyers. I supposed there would be a few who would understand what I said. I am an Air Force officer and I know about it.

Mr Pegg interjected.

Mr LISTER: I am a member of parliament now. I take what the minister said as being flannel. It is window-dressing on what is a fundamentally repugnant innovation. This is no way to treat hardworking farmers. They work hard to grow things from nothing and their taxes and economic activity pay for welfare, for police, for nurses and for all the services that we need in this state. We are talking about people in business. To disrespect them in this way and to imply that none of them can be trusted is absolutely appalling. I urge everyone who in their hearts knows that this is wrong to support this amendment. I am sure there are people on the other side of the House who would agree with me.

Ms TRAD: Last night I attended my 14-year-old son's school debate and the calibre of that debate and the intellect of those 14-year-olds was much better than anything I have heard from that side of the chamber tonight. Let us be clear about what this amendment proposes: it proposes laws that will not be enforced by enforcement officers. They are seeking to not have these laws enforced. It is abundantly clear that from 2012 to 2015, when those opposite gutted the environment department, they did not want environmental laws in this state enforced by public servants who were working on the ground with people to try to ensure that the laws of this state were understood and enforced in the places where our environment matters. Let us be clear: these laws currently exist in other pieces of legislation. We are extending them.

Mr Millar: It doesn't make it right.

Ms TRAD: It actually does make it right. When we are talking about laws, let us be clear: we are the lawmakers here. That is our responsibility. That is what we put up our hands to do and that is what we are debating tonight. It is ridiculous to suggest that we can put forward better regulations and better laws in terms of managing the balance between native vegetation and agriculture in this state without the capacity to enforce those laws because the people working on the ground do not have the powers they need to back them up. Quite frankly, members opposite have not met a public servant they did not want to sack or—

Dr Miles: Or a tree they didn't want to cut down.

Ms TRAD: I take that interjection from the Minister for Health.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I find those comments offensive and I ask the member to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order! Leader of the Opposition, I do not believe that those comments were of a personal nature. Therefore, there is no point of order.

Ms TRAD: As I was saying, those opposite have not met a public servant they did not want to sack and the employment figures bear that out. The employment growth—

Ms Simpson interjected.

Ms TRAD: I take that interjection from the member for Maroochydore. I remind the member for Maroochydore that when Labor first started introducing these very sensible laws in 1999, 2004, 2006 and 2009, the Queensland agricultural industry continued to grow, prosper and create profits that went back into the agricultural industry. Labor is the only party in this chamber that can be trusted to get the balance right. If we want to get the balance right, we need laws that are enforced. If we need laws to be enforced, we need people to enforce them. If we are going to have people to enforce them, we need to give them the powers to enforce the laws.

Mr CRISAFULLI: Before I begin my contribution, I have to say that there is a touch of irony in what was just said by the Deputy Premier. Last night my daughter also had her school debate, but it started at 7 pm and I was not able to make it, despite the family friendly hours. The irony of that is not lost on me.

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members, I will not continue to scream 'Order!', only to have to get to my feet. I expect some level of respect, as has been shown throughout the debate so far. I expect that to continue.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I lend my support to the amendment that the shadow minister has put forward. Over the past couple of days in this place, I have listened to the debate and there have been some excellent contributions. During a debate, even though you might not agree with every point, you can

still respect somebody's point of view. I listened to the contribution of the Minister for Health. Whilst I did not agree with a lot of his sentiment, certainly I heard a person who believed in what he was saying. In a place where there are half a dozen former police officers on both sides of the chamber, surely we cannot suggest that the amendment put forward by the shadow minister does not make sense.

Mr Hart: A former police officer.

Mr CRISAFULLI: He is a great former police officer. We are not debating an issue about land clearing. This issue is about a right of law. This issue is about somebody's right to the presumption of innocence. It is an issue about not allowing somebody to go traipsing through another's property. This is the same right that every person in this House would expect for their dwelling, as the member for Everton said. To suggest otherwise is wrong.

You cannot get a new Akubra out and just put it on your head. By the way, it does not look that good. That is a little bit of free political advice. If you do not normally wear an Akubra here is some free advice—do not wear it for the cameras; it looks really bad. Assuming you still think you can pull it off and you go out, please do not think that you can put on a hat and bluff people.

Did you look at the whites of the eyes of the people out there? You can dress up what you are saying all you like, you can head out west and pay lip-service all you like, but all you have done with this clause and by not accepting—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Members! Member for Broadwater, I counsel you to direct your comments through the chair.

Mr CRISAFULLI: No matter how you dress it up, by not accepting this sensible amendment says that those opposite believe that every single farmer in this state is a crook.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will make it very clear again that members will not stand in an attempt to get the jump on the call if the member speaking still has time allocated to them. I make that very clear.

Mr BAILEY: What a fascinating treatise from the member for Broadwater who deserted regional Queensland for the comforts of Hope Island. We all know that he is not really speaking to the legislation but speaking to the leadership challenge in 18 months time—the shark who is prowling on the LNP benches. Let me get to the point.

Mr WATTS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. We are talking about a very important clause

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

Mr WATTS: It is relevance.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, I will direct you back to the clause that is being debated.

Mr BAILEY: It is a logical implausibility to come to this place and suggest that legislation should not be enforced. It is an absurdity. The opposition is—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr BAILEY: I do not care what one's background is. We all have something to contribute in this place no matter what our background is. To suggest that laws should not be enforced is ridiculous. This is a sensible piece of legislation and it ought to be supported.

Mr MILLAR: I support the amendment moved by the member for Burdekin, the shadow minister for natural resources. It removes the power for authorised officers to enter a property without the landholder's consent or a warrant. What the minister has done here is open up an old sore. There are a few members in this place—members such as the member for Callide, the member for Warrego, the member for Gympie and the member Condamine, to name a few—who remember when the Labor Party last introduced their vegetation management laws and the ill-feeling when it came to the tree police.

When we go out there and meet with people and talk to them about the enforcement provisions that this vegetation management legislation will have it frightens people. It also says to the hardworking people who produce our food and put fibre on our backs that those opposite do not trust them and that there are no other ways to enforce the provisions rather than setting up an enforcement agency that will see people driving out in Hiluxes and making landholders fearful of departmental officers.

We have to remember that these departmental officers live in those communities. They live in Emerald. They live in Roma. They live in Cloncurry. There was a sense of friendship between these people. They played cricket and footy together. They were in Rotary together. They worked together.

Mr Dick: As if that is going to stop.

Mr MILLAR: I take the interjection from the minister. I would invite the minister to come out with me and meet with those landholders, talk about this enforcement and see their reaction to this provision coming in. They feel that we do not trust them when it comes to managing their land and conducting operations which are environmentally sustainable. They feel we do not trust them at all when we have local departmental people as the tree police and enforcers in local communities. There will be distrust between the people in town and the people on the land.

We do not need this sort of legislation and this sort of enforcement out in regional Queensland. There is an element of trust and an element of people getting on with each other and being able to conduct their businesses and explain their actions. The last thing we need is to have these sorts of laws which propose entry powers for authorised officers. They are unwarranted. They are not without precedent because they were included the last time the Labor Party introduced their vegetation management laws. Do not do this to rural people.

Mr KNUTH: I support the proposed amendment that officers cannot enter a property without approval or a warrant. I dispute what the minister said when he said that we on this side are scaremongering. Members will remember that it was Labor last term that tried to introduce the reverse onus of proof. That move was defeated. That basically meant that a person was guilty before being proven innocent. I mentioned yesterday that even terrorists have a better deal than farmers.

Labor introduced the ERMPs. It was a \$75,000 fine if people did not fill out the form properly. I dispute what the minister said. This is a good amendment. If landowners did not fill out the form they faced a jail sentence. That is not an illusion. That is not in dispute. The member for Whitsunday mentioned yesterday and a couple of members mentioned today the term tree police. This is not an illusion. We have the Water Police. We have the dob in the farmer hotline. We have spy in the sky satellites.

At one time the department of natural resources was there to assist and advise landowners how to get the best outcomes and production from their properties. The last thing we want is to turn the department into a mini Gestapo. This amendment is fair because it treats farmers with dignity and not as criminals.

Mr POWER: As we heard so eloquently explained before, it is vital that we have laws and that those laws are enforced. We have also heard that these enforcement provisions mirror what is in the Land, Water and Other Legislation Amendment Act.

An opposition member interjected.

Mr POWER: That is the exact point I wanted to respond to. If we look at the Land, Water and Other Legislation Amendment Bill—and those opposite will know the date it was passed—that would have been the chance for this House to change those provisions. The bill was introduced on 5 March 2013. It had many amendments to both the Land Act and Water Act.

Those opposite talk about this grossly unfair mechanism of enforcement, but did they take the opportunity to make any change to it whatsoever? No, not at all. There were amendments to the Land Act 1994 and the Water Act 1994. The person who introduced it into the House was no less than the former member for Hinchinbrook, Mr Cripps. It was introduced on 5 March and received assent on 14 May. It was rushed through the House just like this and it kept those provisions in place because those opposite supported it that time.

Mr HUNT: I want to echo the words of the member for Broadwater. I too have been in this House and listened to a lot of this debate. I understand that those on that side of the House have an ideology about saving the planet and saving the reef. I understand that they do not trust the hundreds of farmers who travelled hundreds of kilometres to come here to be heard in this place. I understand all of that.

This particular clause is about enforcement. Yes, you have to enforce laws but you have to protect basic human rights, and the right to the enjoyment of your property without somebody invading it without a warrant is a basic human right. They might have provisions in the Land Act et cetera that say that authorised officers can search without warrants, but that does not make this right. Enforcement officers have to give 24 hours notice to a landowner. That is plenty of time to go and get a warrant. I urge everyone to consider this particular clause in isolation from the vegetation management laws. I get the government's ideology and that they want to bring in these laws.

This comes down to the rights of the farmer. I am an ex-police officer myself. I spent a lot of time as a detective, as some other members have, investigating major crime. If I wanted to invade somebody's privacy, invade their land, invade their house, I had to go and swear my grounds to a magistrate, to an independent person, to a justice. I had to swear on an oath that those grounds were reasonable and they had to assess those grounds. The powers that have been given to enforcement officers in this legislation is an overreach.

The other concern that I have is for the safety of authorised officers. The farmers out there are angry. We are sending those officers into that situation. This clause allows the use of reasonable force and reasonable help. Police officers have a lot of training. They have annual training in operational tactics. They have a lot of use-of-force options available to them when they are facing angry people in situations where they are invading people's privacy.

I am concerned about these tree police and their training, their instruments and the use of force that they have at their disposal. Police have capsicum spray, tasers and firearms. They have all of those use-of-force options that they have been trained to use when they are put in situations of danger when enforcing laws. Now we are going to send environmental officers in to those situations without training, without a warrant, on just their speculation of reasonable grounds. I ask members opposite to consider all of those things in this clause. I commend the amendment to this clause.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order! Before I call the member for Gympie, I know the whips are trying to do their job and get around to members who are going to speak. However, it makes it very difficult from this position to see who is seeking the call. If the whips can do their job without getting in the way, I would appreciate it.

Mr PERRETT: I rise to speak on the clause. The government's proposal ignores the rights of landholders. The proposal is aggressive and destroys any level of trust between rural landholders and the government. It creates mistrust in small regional and rural communities where those who have that unfettered power live side by side in the same communities as rural landholders and their families.

Our police do not have powers as extensive as the ones proposed by Labor for authorised officers to police vegetation management. The entry powers are unwarranted and without precedent. No-one would tolerate this if the same powers existed for departmental officers to enter backyards here in Brisbane or in South-East Queensland. The Queensland Law Society has raised concerns about the powers of entry, which would allow authorised officers who believe on reasonable grounds that a vegetation clearing offence has happened, or is happening, to enter or re-enter a property to investigate by giving 24 hours notice to the occupier. The Queensland Law Society said—

QLS commends the inclusion of a notice requirement and the prescription of specific information to be included in the notice; these requirements are lacking from similar provisions in other legislation. Providing for a reasonable period of notice is a matter of natural justice to owners and occupiers and is also a safety issue, given that many rural properties are operational workplaces and exercising broad powers of entry could give rise to genuine operational concerns about security of livestock or disruption of harvesting.

However, it is noted that the "trigger" to exercise the power to enter a place is that "an authorised officer believes on reasonable grounds that a vegetation clearing offence is happening, or has happened, at a place."

QLS queries whether in many or most cases, the "*reasonable grounds*" belief would be sufficient grounds for a magistrate to issue a warrant. For example, the officer may have access to satellite imagery indicating clearing is occurring without approval. The use of satellite imagery to monitor clearing activities is referenced on the Queensland Government's website ... It is clearly stated that this is used to address "potentially unlawful clearing events rapidly."

...

In these circumstances, QLS considers the most appropriate course is to obtain a warrant, given that it is a fundamental legislative principle that legislation confers power to enter premises, and search for or seize documents or other property, only with a warrant issued by a judge or other judicial officer.

QLS also recommends that formal guidelines be prepared for the purposes of training authorised officers about what meets the requirement of "reasonable belief".

Granting these powers without providing any oversight provisions, no training and no safeguards is bad law. It is unjust, unfair and effectively deems farmers guilty on the subjective assessment of the departmental officer. It is bad law.

Mrs McMAHON: I rise to talk about this clause in relation to the land entry provisions under this legislation. The members opposite would have us believe that in the middle of the night some SWAT based tree police is poised to enter the homes of Queensland residents. This is not the case.

Mr Mander interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order! Member for Everton, you have had your go.

Mrs McMAHON: This is scaremongering and this is what is causing fear and anxiety amongst people out west. There are no emergent search provisions in this legislation. The attempt to equate what is in this legislation with emergent search powers is erroneous and false at best.

The reality is that this bill requires 24 hours notice to be given to a resident before entry can be gained—24 hours. If police had to apply and give notice of 24 hours before they executed a search warrant, it would be absolutely pointless. If we had to give terrorists 24 hours notice before we executed any search warrant, it would be absolutely ludicrous.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members!

Mr Saunders interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Maryborough.

Mr Saunders interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Maryborough, you are now warned under the standing orders.

Mrs McMAHON: The information that is required in the notice is not dissimilar to what is already required in a search warrant—the provisions for the entry, the reason for the entry, stating the times and dates for the entry, giving 24 hours notice. Can you imagine the restrictions that would be placed on a police officer ordinarily doing that job? You cannot equate the laws that apply in the PPRA to deal with criminal offences to what is in this legislation.

If I were someone who worked for the environment department who was charged with this, I would be absolutely aghast that those opposite think that I have absolutely no training, no skills or no qualification to carry out my job. I have faith in the people who are employed in the minister's department. These are people who are doing their job. They are going to be applying the law as it stands. There is oversight. There are plenty of oversight mechanisms in this legislation and within the department. I believe that we need to be telling people the truth about what this legislation actually does and stop the scaremongering.

Ms SIMPSON: After listening to the previous speaker, the member for Macalister, one would think that Labor has a superior system than putting a warrant of request before a magistrate. How extraordinary! Under this Labor government's system they do not need magistrates to provide a check and balance upon the power of entry. They think this is a better way. That is not what the civil libertarians or the legal profession are telling us. They are saying that, if there is going to be a power of entry such as this, there should be an appropriate check and balance. There should be appropriate scrutiny that comes about by having a warrant process where a magistrate is involved, not a dodgy, mickey mouse, silly system we have just heard from Labor which is exposing people, despite the glee and the giggles from the Deputy Premier about this issue. It is offensive.

The way that those opposite are treating farmers like criminals—in a way that they do not even treat paedophiles in this state—is completely offensive to the law-abiding landowners of this state. The tree police that have been put in place means that people are not being protected by the appropriate mandate that would come about by a warrant process before a magistrate. I support the shadow minister's motion before the House to have Labor's provisions struck down.

It is completely farcical for the Deputy Premier to stand up and say that this provision is about enforcement. If they were serious about treating enforcement with the appropriate checks and balances, they would have a warrant process where these matters go before a magistrate. This is a lazy Labor government that is trying to take short cuts while demonising the landowners—the farmers who are sustainably managing their land. We should be working with people rather than allowing a Labor government to treat them like criminals. They are removing basic checks and balances that should be in place. My colleagues, particularly those who are former police officers and who understand the rule of law, know what checks and balances they had to follow to protect the rule of law and everybody in the process.

Ms LEAHY: I rise to speak in support of the amendment that removes the clause allowing authorised officers to enter a property without the landholder's consent or a warrant. I want to make a point which I think the minister should listen to very carefully, because the minister is placing his departmental staff in a very risky situation. I do not think he fully understands what he is doing in relation to this provision, nor do I think he understands some of the alternatives, but I can tell him that it is

different in this situation. There may well be a situation where a landholder is exercising their right to utilise their damage mitigation permit. If they are unaware that authorised officers have entered their property—

Mr Power: There is 24 hours notice; you haven't even read it.

Ms LEAHY: They might not have got that notice. There may be some issue. Telecommunications are so great—

Opposition members interjected.

Ms LEAHY: They do not understand.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order! Members, I do not care to bellow over the top of the noise. When I call order I expect everyone to cease talking and listen for directions.

Ms LEAHY: We are not talking about small 800-square-metre properties; we are talking about properties that have thousands of hectares of land. It may well be that a landholder is out doing a controlled fire burn with the rural fire brigade. He might not be able to get a mobile service away from the property. He may not get a mail run. Some people get mail runs twice a week if they are lucky. There is not the ability to check emails when you are out on a thousand-acre paddock. Even with 24-hours notice it is not necessarily possible to get that.

The government will place those staff in danger, because they will not know where the macropod harvester is or where sporting shooters who are doing pest control are on the property. Even if they get the notice, the staff—the authorised officers—may be in a situation of danger. I think that is very disappointing. There are alternatives. If QGC can use drones and spot a glove that is not on somebody at 2,000 feet, I am sure there are other ways to do this. There is also a satellite that passes over every 16 days looking at vegetation cover and vegetation change. Why can this satellite not be used?

There are other alternatives to this clause in this legislation. That is why I support the shadow minister in having this provision removed from the bill because it makes good sense. There are alternatives that the department is already using in relation to the satellite. One only has to talk to landholders and they will tell you about that satellite, because I am pretty sure they are well aware of what it is doing as well.

(Time expired)

Mr JANETZKI: I rise to make a contribution in opposition to the power of entry proposed by the government. We often get lectured on this side of the House by the Labor government about rights and liberties. I would say that this Labor government has serious form when it comes to chipping away at the rights and liberties of Queensland, and what we see in this clause is exactly that.

Let us turn our minds back to 2016 and the reverse onus of proof—the mistake of fact—that was proposed and the vehemence with which the legal profession and the Queensland Law Society spoke against these things which chip away from the rule of law. For as long as I have been here all we have ever heard about from the moral high ground of the Labor Party is rights and liberties. I would put to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that this power of entry chips away at that right and that liberty of our citizens—of their presumption of innocence, of everything they have worked for throughout their lives.

I know what the Queensland Law Society has said on this occasion. It believes that there should at least be a notification period, not a presumption of wrongdoing. These people have not murdered. They have not peddled drugs. They are just farmers trying to manage their land in a lawful and law-abiding manner. The Queensland Law Society has talked about the inclusion of a notice requirement and the prescription of specific information to be included in the notice, and these requirements are lacking from similar provisions in other legislation. We know from 2016 with the reverse onus of proof that they have form with mistake of fact, and with this provision here tonight they also have form.

I would also like to pass comment on the mental health issues that we have briefly talked about. We had hundreds of farmers outside the other day. As I have said, they have not murdered, they have not peddled drugs, they have not committed a grave offence, and yet here we are sending officers on to their property to potentially use reasonable force against them. They are law-abiding, hardworking citizens of our state, and yet we rush into these laws without any recourse for the law-abiding citizens who are simply doing lawful activities on their land. When it comes to rights and liberties, this Labor government has form. We saw it in 2016 with the mistake of fact defence being removed. We saw it with the reverse onus of proof, and tonight again we see it with this power of entry on to farmers' land.

Dr ROWAN: I rise to speak in support of the amendment moved by the shadow minister and member for Burdekin. At the heart of this amendment is a fundamental principle of law about protecting the presumption of innocence. As legislators in this place, we need to care about that. This amendment is about property rights. This amendment is also about decency, fairness, the right thing to do by rural landholders and proper legal due process. The LNP's amendment is about ensuring the presumption of innocence and ensuring that the property rights of Queenslanders are not abused.

As we have heard from previous speakers, the real risk in Queensland is that there will be a culture of fear between rural and regional landholders and the government—and that is the last thing we need in Queensland; we need a vibrant agricultural sector—because landholders have to achieve the environmental outcomes that the government wishes to achieve. We do not need a culture of fear where rural landholders fear a knock at the door and are not appropriately notified. As the Queensland Law Society has clearly indicated, this is not in the best interests of Queensland.

Labor's proposed entry powers for authorised officers are unwarranted. They are extraordinary. Our police do not have powers that are as extreme as the ones proposed by Labor in this legislation. Importantly, as well—and I would like the minister to clarify this—we do not have any clarity as to the oversight provisions of this process. There is no information on the training in relation to these officers or the safeguards that will be put in place. The minister needs to express some clarity tonight on those issues. Labor is ignoring the property rights of landholders. Labor's proposals with respect to power of entry are an abuse of legislative process in my opinion and an abuse of property rights.

As I have said, with this culture of fear, there is the real risk that there will be additional mental health distress and emotional trauma in many rural and regional communities. This is why the LNP's proposed amendment should be supported. The last thing we need is this legislation causing any additional mental health distress or trauma amongst farmers and our rural and regional landholders in those communities. This legislation has been poorly thought out and there has not been appropriate consultation. The Labor government seems deaf to adopting any of the sensible amendments that the LNP is moving here tonight. It will be interesting to see what the crossbench does in relation to this, particularly the Greens. Are they going to support a very important principle of law tonight when it comes to this as a legislator or are they going to squib it?

(Time expired)

Mr WATTS: I rise because this proposal put forward by the minister leaves me with some concerns both legally and for the safety and protection of some of the officers who will have to go and do these things. These are not little blocks just around the corner from where people live. They are often remote properties that take some distance to travel to. They are often very large properties where people conduct many activities.

In relation to the 24-hour notice period, I would suggest that some of the members opposite spend some time on one of these rural properties and maybe get on a horse or a four-wheeler and drive around the property and just see how easy it is to check their tweets and emails as they are going around. If landholders are working sun-up to sundown, there is a good chance they will not know that this notice has been given. Even if one person who is managing that property does know that the notice has been given, there is no guarantee that everybody managing that property will be aware of it.

I am concerned for the safety of the public servant who will be going there to find out if any illegal activity has happened. I am concerned about the process that is put around them. I caution the minister to make sure that we do not end up with a situation like the one that happened in New South Wales. We need to put some of those protections in place. It has been mentioned by others that there may be some other acts that we should put some more rigour around when people are entering people's property.

The quiet enjoyment of a piece of freehold land and the management of that land is something that we all in this chamber should value and respect. As we slowly chip away at those rights, we need to be careful that we do not start undermining the rule of law in this state—undermining what it is to be a free citizen and undermining what it is to own and control a piece of property. Australia was founded on a great Constitution, not on some politburo's good idea of how to instruct everybody to be. I am concerned that legislation like this that rides roughshod over people is removing a fundamental right.

(Time expired)

Mr McDONALD: Mr Deputy Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to speak to these very quizzical laws. I congratulate the shadow minister on this sensible and common-sense amendment here tonight. I really appreciated the words of the member for Gregory when he talked about working with the community. These officers live and work in the community. I have lived in a rural community

for many years and I can tell the House that you get far better outcomes when you work with the community. In fact, I was so pleased to be elected as a councillor in that same community I was a law enforcement officer in. I know from firsthand experience that you can achieve great things when you work together as a team—building a positive culture, not fear and angst.

As we saw out the front of this honoured building yesterday, these laws are already placing great stress on our farmers. If those opposite need any further evidence of the importance of working with the community, I draw their attention to Mr Glen Turner, the father of two who was gunned down by a landholder in Croppa Creek in northern New South Wales. I mention for the clarity of the House and to avoid any sub judice issues that the offender was convicted and later died of a heart attack on his way to jail. That is real evidence of how the mental health of our landholders can be affected.

I believe in evidence. When there have only been 18 prosecutions since 1999, I do not see why we need ever-increasing powers for our departmental officers. If these environmental officers are not already known as the tree police, they soon will be. I ask the minister to speak to the Minister for Police to see if we can negotiate some improved powers for police like this provision, with no safeguards and other controls. I trust the departmental officers and I trust that these laws are made with good intention, but if we do not put the right controls in place then bad things can happen, as we have seen in the news over the last few days. I encourage the House to support this amendment proposed by the member for Burdekin, the shadow minister.

Mr DICK: I want to put a few things on the record tonight to correct the record in my opposition to this thoughtless amendment. I want to take up where the member for Lockyer left off. There has been this theme that has run through the speeches of the LNP members tonight that somehow this provision, which has been in the law of Queensland for many years—in the Environmental Protection Act and there are similar provisions in the Land Act and the Water Act—is going to cause stress to landowners, when they have been the subject of this same principle in Queensland.

I want to say to the member for Lockyer that Ian Turnbull was a premeditated, cold-blooded killer. That landowner went out of his way to murder a hardworking member of the New South Wales Public Service. That anyone should try to make excuses for premeditated murder, particularly from a party that talks at length about how many former police officers serve in their parliamentary party, is a disgrace.

He went out of his way to lie in wait for a hardworking public servant and murder him. Everyone in this House should not make excuses; they should condemn that outright. He was rightly sentenced to 35 years in jail. So outraged were the LNP members that when they were in government the member for Nanango, the member for Everton, the member for Broadwater when he was the member for Mundingburra—all of those members opposite did absolutely nothing to change the law in Queensland. Let us face it, they were not debating whether division bells should ring for four minutes then. They were not slow to rip things through the parliament in record time in the middle of the night to change the law. There was no nicety about parliamentary procedure, which we have been debating at length today, wasting time.

Those opposite can put as many slurs on me as they like. I was proud to serve in the Pacific as an Australian volunteer. Let us call this out for what it is: this is an attempt by the LNP to stave off the hard right of politics in Australia. They are dog whistling to One Nation, and the member for Lockyer knows well; he was in a—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order! One moment.

Mr McDONALD: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I am offended by that comment of dog whistling to One Nation.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Lockyer, I do not believe it was directed at anyone and, therefore, I do not see it is as a point of order.

Mr DICK: The LNP members are dog whistling to the right that seeks to consume them. There is a reason they do not hold any seat north or west of Burdekin. It is because they are out of touch. This is a sad and pathetic attempt to try to regain ground that they have lost which they hope they can recover.

(Time expired)

Mr DAMETTO: I rise to speak against this clause relating to government rights of entry. Let me paint this into a bit of a human picture for honourable members. I can take this lead because I am the son of a farmer who walked off the land due to legislation, hard times and all sorts of things that made

it too hard to continue farming. Say a farmer is lying in bed at night wondering, 'Am I going to be able to pay the bills this week? Are the crops going to come off this month? Is it going to rain?', and the next minute he is thinking about the water police coming in, then the land police and now all of a sudden the tree police. No wonder a man would think about walking down to the shed and not doing the right thing by his family and finishing it all.

I can tell honourable members that there is a lot of stress on farmers and this is just one more thing this government is going to put in their minds. Members opposite have talked about scaremongering. I can tell them that thinking sometimes makes it so. When that is in the back of someone's mind, they will be thinking about all sorts of things. I just want them to think about that.

Mr HART: What a disgraceful contribution from the member for Woodridge. I support the sensible amendments moved by our shadow minister. Anybody who is watching this debate tonight would think that we are talking about murderers, kidnappers or drug runners. If a policeman in the bush somewhere suspects a farmer is growing drugs on their property, they need to go and get a search warrant to search that particular farm. However, if that farmer has been accused of tree clearing or somebody makes a vexatious comment about that, all of a sudden they can go straight onto their property within 24 hours without a search warrant.

We are talking about land clearing here. If these farmers have cleared land—they have knocked some trees down—I hardly think they are going to be able to stick them back in the ground and make them grow again in the 24-hour period in which someone can go and get a search warrant. Are we in this House being serious? We have heard other members here talk about drones, helicopters and satellites. Could we not have a look without invading someone's personal territory without a warrant and see whether these things are real? Could we not gather some evidence? Evidence would be good. We could then take that evidence—

Mr Crisafulli: Fill out a warrant.

Mr HART:—and fill out a warrant; I take that interjection. They could get a search warrant and then go to the property with it—all due diligence done. If these farmers are then found to be breaking the law, by all means take some action. Give them the necessary fine, put them in jail—whatever it is they are going to do—if they have broken the law. Why do we not make this evidence based to start with and have a bit of a look at it? After all, as I said before, they cannot just go and stick those trees back in the ground and hide the fact they have been land clearing. It is not possible. That is the problem with those city based MPs who do not know what they are talking about.

Mr COSTIGAN: I rise to speak in support of the amendment as moved by my fellow North Queenslander the member for Burdekin. I want to go back to some of the comments made by the member for Woodridge, particularly in relation to mental health.

A government member interjected.

Mr COSTIGAN: If people want to interject and laugh and ridicule right now—everybody says when it is that time of the year it is a serious business. Does that mean that for the rest of the year we just laugh and ridicule each other?

I am no expert in the area of mental health. However, I think a couple of our colleagues on this side of the chamber have touched on it tonight in this debate and in speaking to the amendment. Primary producers are tough people. Farming is intergenerational; it is passed on down the line. They can handle low commodity prices and the banks and they can handle drought, flood, cyclone, bushfire—and on it goes. However, the tipping point is when there is government intervention.

My original political hero was a former meatworker—he is dead now—Alby Schultz MP, the former member for the federal seat of Hume. Honourable members will remember Lee Kernaghan passing the hat around back when that drought was on in Western and Southern New South Wales in the early 2000s. It is part of folklore now. Alby would go out the back of Boorowa and Crookwell and there were blokes there—and I will say it here in the chamber tonight—who were ready to top themselves.

A government member interjected.

Mr COSTIGAN: Members opposite can laugh. It was expected and it is sad. It is really sad.

A government member interjected.

Mr COSTIGAN: It does not matter what the member is laughing at; I think it is poor form.

Mr Power interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Logan, you are not in your designated seat; you should not be interjecting. Before I get you to resume your speech, member for Whitsunday, I encourage you to talk about the clause we are debating.

Mr COSTIGAN: My concern, Mr Deputy Speaker—and I appreciate your guidance—is that there is no oversight in relation to these provisions. I know Alby talked a lot of people out of doing you know what right on the verandah. It terrifies me. The minister and member for Woodridge and those who have spoken against the amendment tonight are playing with fire. The government members will only have themselves to blame and they will have blood on their hands if this turns out the way I fear it will. I hope I am wrong, but I will be the elephant in the room—the elephant in the House. I support the amendment as moved by the member for Burdekin.

Mr KATTER: To put some context around the impact of this clause and this amendment in particular, according to 2017 Australian Bureau of Statistics figures the average age of the Australian farmer is 56—17 years above the average age of the Australian worker—and that age keeps going up. I would like to paint a picture: a lot of these people are not well versed or well educated in relation to these things, which brings me to a critical point. You cannot separate compliance officers from extension officers. As the member for Hill said previously, you used to have officers out there to help you, and that was an attitude that farmers out there would accept.

There was all sorts of animosity when the first tranche of tree-clearing laws came in. We heard a lot of horror stories because a lot of these people do not understand. They are just out there trying to do the best they can. We are not talking about crimes, but you put cannot put the trees back up. As the honourable member said, we do not think there are going to be SWAT teams. We are not trying to say that, but there are a lot of elderly people who do not understand this. It does cause a lot of angst, and you can really feel that. If you talk and mix with people out there, we have all heard numerous stories of people who get really worked up by this. It is a very real thing and nothing to laugh or joke about.

The compliance officers should not be different people because then you set up a separate office for the tree police, and that is what they will focus on. It will really generate animosity out there. You cannot put too fine a point on it. The reality of it is what is happening on the ground. If you spend time out there you really pick up on how it creates a lot of drama for people. It does not need to be there and it is really an overreach of the law. We are not talking about horrific crimes. At worst it is mismanagement and not complying with laws that, in my view, are ridiculous and do not help the environment. It is definitely an overreach, and to say that it is like SWAT teams is sensationalising it. It is not like that, but it does create angst for these people. It is a real thing, and you have to appreciate that these are not people who are following these laws and are right up-to-date with everything that has to be done. There are fewer extension officers out there to help educate these people now, and it is a combination of all those things that really does affect that. It is no wonder that the average age of the farmer keeps going up. That is a statistic that we should be very, very worried about in this House.

Mr McARDLE: I rise to speak in support of the amendment moved by the shadow minister. There is a maxim that a man's home is his castle, and that should be inviolate unless there are compelling and urgent reasons to overturn it. The history of legal culture in England and this country clearly states that either a warrant exists or significant reasons exist not to get a warrant, but after that event takes place it must be proven that a warrant should have been issued in the first place.

These laws are draconian. Not only that, these powers will be given to people and we have no idea of their training or background. I have no idea as to the qualifications of these people and their understanding of their obligations, as opposed to police officers who are trained over and over again in what they can and cannot do. I do not know what the selection process will be to choose these people. Police officers go through a rigorous process to assure the public that they are the right people to be police officers. There is nothing in this bill or any of the regulations that indicate the training process that these people will undergo, nor are there any regulations to tick off what requirements there will be before a notice is issued.

The other point is there has been much made about this 24 hours notice. That means nothing, because there is no oversight in this bill as to when and why that notice should issue. To obtain a warrant you have to go before a judge, a magistrate or a JP and explain to that person why the warrant should issue. There is nothing here that justifies the process to issue a notice of entry at all. There is nothing in this bill that allows the home owner, on receipt of a notice, to seek a review of that notice before it is executed. There is no power for the home owner to go before a magistrate or a judge to question why the notice has been issued and potentially overturn it—nothing whatsoever. The 24 hours

notice is simply a sop, because nothing can be done to overturn the notice under this bill or any other act that exists in legislation in Queensland. There is no requirement to justify post entry why entry did occur. There is no protection for the home owner at all—

(Time expired)

Mr BENNETT: For me this is about trust. I want to go back a little way to when I first considered running for parliament. I can tell members about the fear that was in my community about the so-called tree police.

A government member: There was fear alright.

Mr BENNETT: Those members who came in a bit later too who should not be here should probably hold their tongue and show some respect. Those people in my community spoke long and hard about what the entry powers of those people, whom they did not trust, meant for their decisions. This is about the investment decisions they made. This is about the decisions they made every day about managing their land.

We have spoken for a long time this week about what best management means for those hardworking families. When we had best management practice we had a whole heap of other things, but we had external forces always looking down our throats walking down the path, walking down the street. For these hardworking farming families the trust is lost. I think what we are doing here tonight is returning to the bad old days of the tree police, the bad old days of Labor interfering in people's lives, the bad old days of the agricultural sector being demonised.

When we talk about these people coming onto the land, can we honestly trust these bureaucrats—and that is what they will be— instructed by a minister we do not trust and a government we do not trust to make decisions? What will happen when those decisions are made? There will be court cases and fines. There will be the most draconian laws we can ever imagine imposed on our farmers, and that is why we have to stand up to these laws. That is why we are all standing here tonight to take a stand and make sure that those people in our electorates—

Government members interjected.

Mr BENNETT: You can all across on the other side make fun—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Direct your remarks through the chair, please.

Mr BENNETT: Through the chair, of course, Mr Speaker. The emotions tonight will be nothing compared to the emotion there will be in our electorates as this bill passes. We have to realise that we cannot—and we should not ever in this place—pass laws that are so offensive.

A government member: You did! You were there in 2013.

Mr BENNETT: Again, we can warn people in the back row about their interruptions. When farmers in my electorate wake up on Monday morning and this bill receives assent from the Governor, they know the DNRME officials will be walking down the path onto their land with these absolutely extensive powers—which they never had before—and it will be back to the bad old days. I can only remind people. If they thought the government was bad, can they remember what happened in 2011 when we talked about vegetation management and what was happening in Queensland? That is why we had the result we did in 2012, and here we are going back to policy that is bad for our environment and bad for our farmers. This is a terrible, terrible outcome, and I can only implore all members to take the right stance here tonight.

Mr MICELBERG: I rise to speak in support of the member for Burdekin's sensible amendment. The proposed clause with regard to the right of entry ignores the property rights of landholders. It is a denial of natural justice and it is an abuse of process no different from what we have seen in this House tonight. There is no oversight and no safeguards, and nothing we have heard from those opposite tonight justifies the inclusion of that clause in this bill apart from to align it with the provisions in the Water Act.

I refer to the committee's proceedings on 19 March where Mr Batt asked a question. Mr Batt asked—

In relation to fundamental legislative principles, section 30A(4) relates to entering without the occupier's consent or a warrant and it states that it is the intention of the bill to prevent serious impacts. Why would you need to be able to enter without warrant or consent of the owner if the offence has already been committed?

Mr Hinrichsen, who is in the gallery tonight, said—

To gather appropriate evidence to establish that that indeed is the case.

Mr Batt then asked—

You could do that with a warrant and with the owner's consent?

Mr Hinrichsen replied—

Indeed. This goes beyond those existing provisions.

It seems to me that this provision has been included purely for the simple fact that this government believes that farmers cannot be trusted to do the right thing. It fails to take into account that farmers have been custodians of the land for generations and they seek to look after their land, that they know best and that they should be supported in doing so. It is an insult to the farmers of Charleville, Longreach, Cloncurry, Townsville, Rockhampton—

Mr Costigan: Mareeba.

Mr MICKELEBERG: Mareeba—I take the interjection from the member for Whitsunday—Lockyer and right across this state. This shows why this legislation was introduced in the first place—that is, it is an ideological fight. It does not take into account the effect that this legislation across-the-board will have on the landholders and the farmers and the graziers of Queensland. It is unacceptable. That is why I will be supporting the member for Burdekin.

Mr BLEIJIE: I rise to speak to this provision, noting that the amendment sought to be moved by the honourable shadow minister in fact is to delete this particular clause, so we will not be voting for this clause. There is a reason we will not be voting for it, but I think my colleagues have been very polite in their contributions this evening. Let me tell my honourable colleagues how it actually is. This is nothing more than the Deputy Premier getting back at farmers across Queensland. This is the green army moving in to rural and regional Queensland. Earlier in the night during members' contributions I noted that the Deputy Premier was just loving it and she was sitting there smirking.

Mr Mander: Smiling like a Cheshire cat.

Mr BLEIJIE: She was smiling like a Cheshire cat because I know in her mind all she was thinking when I flippantly said that the Deputy Premier will have these public servants decked out with tasers was, 'Why didn't I think of that before?' I feel sorry for them because no doubt she is working out how to do it. This issue is so serious. We know that the minister who has carriage of this bill has no responsibility in this regard. We know he is the puppet to the puppetmaster, the Deputy Premier. This minister does not want to be moving this vegetation management legislation. This is coming from the Deputy Premier's office.

Mr Mander: Bill Byrne left the job because of this. He did!

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection: Bill Byrne could not stand the heat in the kitchen and he got out because of these vegetation management laws. Members will remember that at the time there was the reshuffle and the Deputy Premier took over the legislation because the former member for Rockhampton refused to do the bidding of the Deputy Premier, and the bidding for the Deputy Premier is all about South Brisbane, and it is green.

Mr Mander: Now it is. It will be Toohey shortly!

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection: South Brisbane will be green shortly and Toohey will have the current member for South Brisbane, because we know that members over there flip and flop to seats that they can win. We know the Greens are on the march.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order! Member for Kawana, I ask you to come back to the clause that we are debating this evening for the remaining time on the clock.

Mr BLEIJIE: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, and if you could indulge me and remind me of the clause that I am meant to be speaking to that would be helpful. The green army—the officers, the tree police—will have the ability to storm farms when farmers are doing what they do best, and that is farm their land. As the honourable member for Warrego said, some of these farmers might be on the other side of their property. It could take days to get back, especially if it is raining. How are they going to know that 24 hours notice has been given?

Mr Mander: They haven't got a laptop.

Mr BLEIJIE: They do not have laptops. Do those opposite think that they get the telecommunications services that you get in South Brisbane? This is nothing more than the Deputy Premier stomping on the rights and liberties of Queensland farmers. Everybody in Queensland needs a farmer, even the Labor Party.

Mr FURNER: Mr Deputy Speaker—

Mrs Frecklington: Oh, here we go!

Mr FURNER: That is right: here we go.

Mr Bennett interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Burnett, I was on my feet and you continued to have conversations across—

Mr Bennett interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Burnett, I was on my feet. You continued to have conversations across the chamber. You are now warned under standing orders.

Mr FURNER: I have heard a lot this evening with respect to this particular clause and others and I want to put some depth into it and also kill some of the myths involved with it. I want to go back over the history. It is important that we revise history with respect to this matter and other opportunities related to this particular issue in this House.

I return to the Land and Other Legislation Amendment Bill debated in this House in 2014 when at least three current members in this House stood in this place and supported it and did not care for one moment to be consistent in terms of providing the arrangements that the minister is seeking to maintain. That is inconsistent with the rights of those officers who are public servants to exercise their suspicion should the matter arise in terms of a breach under this legislation.

The point must be made that these authorised officers will be trained with respect to identifying matters of breach and will be trained with respect to obtaining evidence. Some of that evidence may be evidence obtained through satellite imagery. That may be one opportunity to consider—whether there is a need to seek a right of entry with 24 hours notice to enter that property. Those three members were the member for Burleigh, the member for Scenic Rim and the member for Nanango, the Leader of the Opposition, who said—

I am extremely proud to stand in this House to give that short contribution to the debate on this important land reform. I am also very proud to see our government putting its full support behind our most important regional areas and our primary producers ... the four pillars of our economy.

Do members remember those four pillars of our economy—those pillars that they forgot, those pillars that fell over?

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Members, this is the second time I have been on my feet in two minutes. It is unacceptable. Two members have already been warned this evening. We will continue to listen to the minister.

Mr FURNER: We remember those four pillars by those opposite that fell over and the effect they had on our economy—the termination of 14,000 hardworking public servants. They were the conditions they put on our public servants and they were the conditions they put on our economy when they were in government. I hope they are never in government again because they will repeat what they have done before and they will repeat—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Minister, I think you have strayed from the clause that we are debating this evening. I ask you to bring your remaining comments back to the clause we are debating this evening.

Mr FURNER: There is nothing to be strident about with respect to this matter put forward by the government. There is nothing to be scared about. There is nothing with regard to the fearmongering that those opposite continue to do in this example and all of the other amendments that they have put forward with respect to this bill. There is nothing at all to be frightened of. Landholders should have nothing to fear with respect to what the government is putting forward.

(Time expired)

Mr WEIR: If the minister for agriculture will not get up to speak about the concerns of the agricultural sector, I will. During the course of these committee hearings around the state an issue that was raised at every forum was these penalties and provisions that are going to bring out the tree police, as we have heard so many times.

The reason people are so concerned is that these laws are based on false mapping and they are unworkable. We have not reached those provisions relating to thinning or mulga harvesting yet, but people have serious concerns about them. People are worried that they are going to get caught up and

be found guilty of something that they were not guilty of doing through a mistake of fact. They are very concerned about this. They raised this issue constantly. These people believe that the penalties have been ramped up so strongly to put the fear of God into them. It is a big stick.

I remember years ago that, when this legislation came in, I had an issue with mapping. I had to get the departmental officers to come out and make some inspections of my property to correct the mapping. I am going right back to when Stephen Robertson was the minister. When those departmental officers came out, they echoed the comments that I heard from the members behind me. Those departmental officers said that they did not enjoy their job anymore, that they did not sign up to be police. They signed up to help the rural producers. They signed up to help landowners get through their problems and help them work their way through the departmental guidelines. The last thing they wanted to do was be a police officer.

The entry without notice and without warrant provisions are a bridge too far. Why does the government need them? If a farmer has a bulldozer pushing down scrub, that is not hard to find. We could fly over it in an aeroplane and see it, or put a drone over it. We have heard that that is not hard to do. Departmental officers do not have to come in on the ground, which also raises biosecurity issues in terms of weed wash-downs. So many different issues come with that. What are going to be the circumstances around that? This provision is ill conceived, it is a knee-jerk reaction and it is totally unnecessary.

I have some serious concerns about these departmental officers when they walk into a very volatile situation. When somebody has done the wrong thing by mistake, suddenly he has departmental officers in his face. It is a recipe for disaster. These provisions are ill conceived. They are a horrible overreach. They are a horrible overreaction. The department does not want them. The landowners do not want them. Throughout the state we heard from landowners that they do not want them.

Division: Question put—That clause 21, as read, stand part of the bill.

AYES, 48:

ALP, 47—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Miller, Mullen, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

NOES, 44:

LNP, 39—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Costigan, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 21, as read, agreed to.

Clause 22, as read, agreed to.

Clause 23, as read, agreed to.

Clause 24—

 **Mr LAST** (9.15 pm): Clause 24 goes hand in glove with the previous clause that we debated. This clause relates to the seizure of evidence. The previous provision referred to the power of entry. Certainly, members on this side were right to point out that those powers that are granted under that provision were excessive and not required.

I know that a number of my colleagues on this side, as former police officers, will speak to this clause as well. There are strict protocols in place for the gathering of evidence and how that evidence is handled and stored. If these officers are going to go on to these properties without consent and, in some cases, seize evidence without the knowledge of the owner, we start to appreciate the ramifications of what might be involved. If these enforcement officers are going on to these blocks and possibly seizing tractors, trucks, or fuel without the knowledge of the property owners, we can only imagine what is going to happen when that property owner finds out.

I ask the minister: what evidentiary standards are in place regarding the gathering of this evidence? Where are these evidentiary items being taken to? Who wears the cost of transporting those vehicles away, if they are taken off properties, to be stored? How long are they stored for? In many cases, the items that are being seized as evidence are used in the day-to-day operations of those properties and are an integral part of their operations. Without those items, the functionality and viability of some of those properties are put in jeopardy.

In simple terms this clause, along with the previous clause that we debated, should not be in this bill. It is our submission that this clause, along with the previous clause, should be omitted from the bill before the House.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I rise to speak in support of my colleague and the shadow minister for natural resources who raised this amendment. It is another common-sense amendment that has been formulated by working in lock step with our agricultural producers. At this juncture I acknowledge the contribution of the LNP members of the committee: Pat Weir, the member for Condamine; Brent Mickelberg, the member for Buderim; and David Batt, the member for Bundaberg. These members worked with the industry to get the amendments right.

Mr Speaker, with your indulgence, I want to refer to the last clause that we debated. One of my local bush coppers sent me a message. He said, 'I could knock up a warrant in less than 30 minutes, find a JP, another 20 minutes, and job done. Warrant done.' That goes to show the common sense of not only our landowners but also our coppers, who are saying that they do not need these provisions either.

Why are we talking about compliance? We should be talking about farming. Full stop. Common sense should prevail. We do not need this clause. That is why our amendment takes it out. I ask the Minister for Natural Resources to listen to the common-sense contribution that was just made by Ann Leahy, the member for Warrego. She talked about the use of drones to gather evidence. I refer the minister to when the member for Burleigh used a bit of common sense and said, 'Well, you can't put the tree back in the ground. I'm pretty sure the evidence is still going to be there.' It is obvious that we should be able to use common sense whilst gathering evidence. I think it is extraordinarily obvious to those on this side of the chamber.

I refer to the contribution by the member for Condamine, who referred to the 13,000 landholders who made a submission to this legislation, even though the government gave them only six weeks in which to do so and there was Easter, the Commonwealth Games and everything else in between. This clause is not needed. It is not warranted. The opposition's amendment is that it be withdrawn. We do not need it. Let us fight for farmers.

Mr HUNT: I rise to support the LNP's amendment in relation to the search and seizure laws. My concern is the overreach. We are treating farmers worse than we treat criminals. Those on the other side of the House will have us believe that the provisions in this bill are similar to those in the Water Act. Never before have laws been made that have made people so angry. Hundreds of farmers have come here in the last couple of days. I spoke to them. No Labor member did. We could hear their anger from in the House. Those opposite would have us send tree police into this volatile situation without taking their grounds to a magistrate and now we are talking about seizing farmers' property. We are going to take their bulldozer. We are sending the tree police into these farms to take property off these farmers. Do we not think that they are going to get angry? What will we do to protect these officers?

We heard from the member for Lockyer in relation to the tragic circumstances in New South Wales. We are not making excuses for that murder, by the way. Nobody tried to make excuses for it. People are just pointing out how angry people are about these laws and how volatile this situation can be when people are going onto farmers' land and seizing their property with no training in the use of force. We talk about not needing SERT teams, but we are talking about properties where people will be agitated and angry and we are asking these officers to seize their property. Most of these people are armed. This is a dangerous, volatile situation.

These laws have not been thought through in relation to obtaining search warrants, swearing information before a magistrate, taking it to an independent person to have it assessed before the warrant is issued or after the case, as police officers have to do. We are talking about sending people into a volatile situation to gather evidence, take property off farmers who are angry—we saw them here—without training in the use of force. Police officers have annual training in use of force options: firearm training; tasers; capsicum spray; handcuffs; baton techniques. This has not been thought through. This section has tree police sweeping onto farms and taking evidence without warrants and

oversight. We are talking about human rights. We are talking about the rights of property owners. I urge those on the other side to look past their ideology in relation to the vegetation management laws and look at the rights of the farmers.

Mr LISTER: This clause is similar to the last one in its implications for fairness and justice. Until tonight I used to think that it was a universally accepted tenet of our system of government and society that everyone's rights are equal before the law. I would say that the government contends that in the eyes of the law those who live in the bush and operate farms and have forestry that they may need to clear deserve less protection, less oversight and less opportunity for review than those who live elsewhere. That is the clear implication here. When there were hundreds of farmers outside the House on Tuesday morning they were very angry about many parts of this bill, but I think one of the most insulting things is the implication that they are environmental wreckers, that they cannot be trusted and there has to be draconian enforcement measures just for them.

As my honourable friend the member for Nicklin pointed out, we are talking about large pieces of equipment that are valuable. Without any judicial oversight, without any right to review before it happens, an officer could come in and confiscate a piece of equipment such as a bulldozer. That is totally repugnant and it is disproportionate. I think this and the other clause reflect a deep disdain for those who live and work on the land. It has been evidenced in the way the government has approached this legislation and the way it has been rammed through.

I urge all members to support the amendment to show those who are going to be affected by this terrible law that they are at least seen as equals to those in the city. The mental health of people in the bush is important to me. I know if we send them a message that they are lesser people in the eyes of the law, they are lesser people in the eyes of this parliament, we are giving them a slap in the face and we are making things worse. This is an iniquitous provision and I absolutely support this amendment and urge all members to do so.

Dr LYNHAM: As the Minister for Agricultural Industry Development and Fisheries said, those opposite had the opportunity to change what is set out in clause 21 when they introduced amendments to the Land Act in 2014 and they failed to do so. This is crucial to the debate so please listen: what you are debating we have not changed from your act. We never changed it. It is the same as what you put in when you changed the Vegetation Management Act.

Mr SPEAKER: Through the chair, please.

Dr LYNHAM: This is the same legislation that those opposite introduced in the Vegetation Management Act in Campbell Newman's day. We have not changed it. We are debating what they put in the act. This is madness. We only changed clause 21. Where is the previous member for Hinchinbrook when you need him, Leader of the Opposition? I wish to finish the debate on this amendment. I just do not know where those opposite are going.

Mr HART: Let us bring a bit of common sense back into this.

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Members to my right, I would like to hear this contribution.

Mr HART: Thank you for your protection, Mr Speaker. What the minister has just said is irrelevant.

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Members, it is getting a little late. I understand people have been in the chamber for a long time. The member for Burleigh has the call. Members will either listen to the contribution or they will leave the chamber if they wish to have other conversations.

Mr HART: It is irrelevant whether this part was in the legislation; we are saying it should be removed. If evidence is important in this matter, I am sure that a photograph would work. With today's technology, we have drones and helicopters that, believe it or not, take photos and videos.

Dr Lynham interjected.

Mr HART: No, I am not joking. The minister might learn something if he listens. It is possible to take videos that have GPS stamped on them. Maybe the police officers in the room could enlighten us about whether a video with GPS would be suitable evidence. Why would a bulldozer need to be taken away? Is the dirt on it going to be tested, to prove that it knocked over a particular tree? Are the trees going to be dragged away for testing, to make sure that they came out of a particular hole? That is exactly what they want to do. They want to take all this stuff away and rob—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Toowoomba North, I can hear you above the speaker. I ask you to please lower your voice. Deputy Premier, I can also hear you.

Mr HART: If you take away a farmer's bulldozer and then there is a flood or a dam busts, how is he going to fix that? A photo or video is enough evidence. Why do we need to go to these lengths? Let us use some common sense in this. It does not matter whether it was in the legislation to start with; we are saying that it is not needed, so take it away. Twenty or 30 years ago, maybe you did need to take away the chainsaw or whatever to check that the wood came from a tree that had been chopped down. Nowadays, you can take a photo or a video. There is GPS available. That is all the evidence that is needed. Surely, even you guys over there—through you, Mr Speaker—can see—

Mr SPEAKER: That does not qualify it, member. Speak through the chair, please.

Mr HART: Even those on the other side of the House should be able to work out that a photo or video would suffice, as far as evidence goes.

Mr KRAUSE: In supporting the amendment moved by the member for Burdekin to omit this clause, I will raise a couple of issues and perhaps the minister might be able to clarify some things. During the debate on the second reading, I referred to this power. It is an extraordinary power. Tonight we have heard about the tree police. I refer to them as the green gestapo. They have free rein to enter properties. This clause is also about the seizure of evidence.

The only body that I can think of that has such powers is possibly the CCC, but the CCC is subject to a lot of oversight through the parliamentary committee and also the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Commissioner. A whole regime has been set up to oversee the CCC and its extensive powers. Perhaps the minister can clarify who is going to monitor the use of these powers by the enforcement officers. We have not heard that question answered in this debate. That should be clarified if, indeed, the government rejects the very sensible proposal of the member for Burdekin to delete this provision altogether.

When someone goes onto another person's property without a warrant, based only on a reasonable suspicion and without the knowledge or consent of the landholders, and under these provisions with the ability to take evidence of whatever type they choose, there should be some accountability and oversight of those powers. That will give some semblance of balance to the exercise of those powers under these laws, which are very extensive. Obviously, the provision should go. The amendment presents a fair proposal. However, if the provision is not going to go, perhaps the minister could shed some light on those important issues.

Mr WATTS: I am concerned about the oversight of the power to seize property. I will paint a picture: say you are contacted via email or some other method that we are not yet familiar with to let you know that an officer might be coming, but then you see them disappearing down the road with your bulldozer. I am concerned about how that might end on a rural property. If someone turned up and started taking things off my property, I might get a little bit upset. I might call the police or another officer to try to understand what was happening. The purpose of the seizure power is simply to gather evidence. I heard the Deputy Premier say that it was to get soil. Surely the soil would be underneath the dozer. To get the soil, you hardly need to take the dozer away; you could simply take a soil sample if that is what you needed.

Let us say that unauthorised land clearing had occurred and someone had a warrant to go onto the property to confirm or ground truth the images that they have collected. When we were discussing the bill, I spoke about ground-truthing evidence. In some ways, it is good that officers will be going to those properties. However, the circumstances in which they go and their behaviour when they are there potentially puts them in danger or at some level of threat. How do people know what it is exactly that they are doing and why they are there?

We have heard about the need to give 24 hours notice. We have already discussed what that might mean for telecommunications, emails and other forms of contact, especially if the mail comes only once a week. If you are driving through your property and you see someone climbing all over a piece of your farming equipment and potentially trying to drive off with it, it would be somewhat naive not to intervene, although hopefully not violently, because they could be a thief or an officer of the Crown sent into a dangerous set of circumstances. I think this should not—

(Time expired)

Mr MOLHOEK: I feel incredibly sad listening to some of the debate in the House tonight. I have spent a lot of time in the bush. I have seen firsthand the challenges that many families face. Frankly, my concern is about who is going to police the police. The fear of farming and grazing families from

across Queensland is who is going to police the police. In my days as a city councillor when former premier Anna Bligh was the premier of Queensland, the department of state resources came in and accidentally cleared several hectares of Blackbutt bushland and koala habitat to build an industrial estate. Plans were approved for a certain area of clearance, but someone turned up and accidentally dozed down an extra 10- or 15-metre-wide buffer zone and destroyed important koala habitat on the Gold Coast. Who would police the police in that situation?

It seems to me that there is no dual accountability in these proposals, because on the one hand the government—and we should all trust the government—can come in and do whatever it likes. The government can send in the green police or the tree police as we have referred to them in this House. However, when it comes to their mistakes or something that they want to achieve, there is a completely different standard. That is a concern.

Over the past 20 years, we have seen successive Labor governments maliciously and intentionally work to undermine the great farming and agricultural industries of our state. I do not know about the members on the other side of the House, but I am sure members on my side of the House will remember as students in primary school being taught about how important agriculture and mining are to the Queensland economy. We learnt about places such as Charleville and Mount Isa, as well as other parts of the state.

Mr FURNER: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. My point of order relates to the amendment before the House that we are debating. The amendment is to clause 24 which refers to the gaining of evidence. I do not think the member for Southport has once mentioned the intent of the amendment which is around the gaining of evidence. I ask that the member be directed to be relevant.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you for your point of order. I am listening to the member's contribution. I think he is straddling the clause. I am listening closely.

Mr MOLHOEK: I thank the member for Ferny Grove for his contribution. It is probably the only decent contribution he has made all night because he certainly does not—

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

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Members! I call the House to order. Member for Ferny Grove, what is your point of order?

Mr FURNER: I am deeply offended by the inference that the contribution I just made is the only one I have made. I ask the member to withdraw that statement.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Southport, the member for Ferny Grove has found your comments offensive. I ask you to withdraw.

Mr MOLHOEK: I withdraw, but—

Mr SPEAKER: Member, you cannot follow that with 'but'. It is an unconditional withdrawal.

Mr MOLHOEK: I withdraw unconditionally. I go back to my earlier point. Who is going to be responsible to police the police? Who is going to hold the government, their green police and their environmental officers to account and assure the farmers and graziers of Queensland that they will get a fair go which is everything they should expect given that that side of the House claims to be the party for a fair go?

(Time expired)

Mr McDONALD: I am very pleased to be able to speak to the sensible amendment moved by the shadow minister, the member for Burdekin. The committee's own report talks about the fundamental legal principles involved in this matter.

I thank the minister for the compliment before when he talked about the LNP debating these laws. We have nine brand-new members in this cohort and we are pleased to be able to make a very relevant and serious contribution to the debate in this House from opposition and importantly hold the government to account. That is our job. Unfortunately we do not have the treasury benches. In two years and six months time we look forward to that contest.

I bring some practicality to the entry and seizure provisions as this clause instructs. I will use my own experience as a police officer. When officers go to a place and, in this case, need consent, they have to engage with the person to get consent. That is a conversation. If they do not get consent, by this rule they can give 24 hours notice and enter. That is not a good way to work with people. Upon that entry, without any other safeguards or other authority for being there, they can then seize property. That is an invasion of people's rights.

I come to the fundamental legal principles outlined in the committee's report. It talks about entry into premises and the power to seize things. The commentary instructs on the rule of common law that protects the property of citizens. There is some justification on page 77 that says that this is not about entry into a premises; it is just entry onto land.

I can tell members that our hardworking farmers are attached to their land like our Indigenous cousins. To be able to have that power of entry and then be able to seize items is a far stretch. I genuinely believe that, like the power of entry, this power of seizure with no justification or authority by a justice, as has been outlined, is a far stretch. I ask that members support the amendment.

Division: Question put—That clause 24, as read, stand part of the bill.

AYES, 48:

ALP, 47—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Miller, Mullen, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

NOES, 44:

LNP, 39—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Costigan, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 24, as read, agreed to.

Clause 25, as read, agreed to.

Clause 26, as read, agreed to.

Clause 27, as read, agreed to.

Clause 28, as read, agreed to.

Clause 29, as read, agreed to.

Clause 30, as read, agreed to.

Clause 31, as read, agreed to.

Clause 32, as read, agreed to.

Clause 33, as read, agreed to.

Clause 34, as read, agreed to.

Clause 35, as read, agreed to.

Clause 36, as read, agreed to.

Clause 37—

 **Mr BERKMAN** (9.49 pm): No matter how futile it might seem at this point in the evening, I move the following amendments—

14 Clause 37 (Insertion of new pt 6, div 13)

Page 32, line 27, after 'indigenous land'—

insert—

, unallocated State land, land the subject of a lease under the *Land Act 1994* for a purpose other than agriculture or grazing,

15 Clause 37 (Insertion of new pt 6, div 13)

Page 33, lines 5 to 7—

omit, insert—

freehold land, indigenous land, unallocated State land, and land the subject of a lease under the *Land Act 1994* for a purpose other than agriculture or grazing in the same way it applies to remnant vegetation on that land.

16 Clause 37 (Insertion of new pt 6, div 13)

Page 35, lines 12 to 25—

omit, insert—

136 Particular area management plans that are to remain in force for 1 year

- (1) This section applies to an area management plan that relates to clearing for a purpose other than—
 - (a) controlling non-native plants or declared pests; or
 - (b) ecological restoration.
- (2) The plan continues as an area management plan under this Act and remains in force until 8 March 2019.

These amendments seek to reduce loopholes that persist in the government's legislation. I support the government strengthening its protection for high-value regrowth vegetation. I welcome changes to expand the tenures it applies to and to change the definition of 'high-value regrowth vegetation' to include vegetation not cleared for 15 years. I do not feel that these amendments go far enough. I am proposing in these amendments some very minor tweaks that do provide very real environmental outcomes. In addition to freehold and Indigenous land, this amendment would expand the definition of 'high-value regrowth' to include unallocated state land and other leasehold land. High-value regrowth vegetation is valuable on all tenures and on all land uses and it should be protected as such.

We also return in clause 16 to area management plans. I will take the opportunity to clear up some of the feigned confusion on the part of members here earlier. Clause 16, as has been mentioned previously, would reduce the transitional period from two years to one for area management plans. These plans have provided the basis to clear significant areas of land with little to no scrutiny. The Labor Party's bill would give landholders a further two years to keep that clearing going. This is why I have proposed to tighten those provisions by reducing the transitional period from two years to one. That is not to say that there is not potential value in retaining those instruments for weed management and conservation purposes which is why I have proposed amendments elsewhere. I hope that explanation is of some assistance to those who were confused earlier.

Whatever hubris we hear from government members, there is no resemblance between anything contemplated in my amendments and those proposed by the opposition. It is just unconscionable, deceptive nonsense that we have been hearing from the government on this issue and others. To cast any or all of my amendments as being in favour of ongoing broadscale land clearing is just rot. What nobody in this chamber will say in this debate, neither the government nor the opposition, is that this legislation will lock in 23 million hectares of completely unregulated land. That is a loophole you could, in fact, drive a number of bulldozers through.

Whatever clearing might be prevented under the phase-out of area management plans, it pales in comparison to the 23 million hectares of category X land that can be cleared indiscriminately—and this includes, on the department's own figures, more than half a million hectares of remnant vegetation. If this legislation were capable of being amended to protect this half a million hectares of remnant vegetation, I would have moved just such amendments, but the Labor government is not willing to take this vital step. Its base political inclination is again to mislead with constant hyperbole and rhetoric—

(Time expired)

Non-government amendments (Mr Berkman) negated.

Mr LAST: I move the following amendment—

7 Clause 37 (Insertion of new pt 6, div 13)

Page 35, lines 14 to 16, 'other than a plan made by the chief executive under section 20UA,'—

omit.

This amendment is to allow for the retention of the *Managing fodder harvesting: mulga lands fodder area management plan* to allow for the self-assessment of mulga to continue. Shortly we will hear from the members for Gregory and Warrego about the impact the drought is having on their electorates and just how important mulga is for keeping livestock and, in particular, sheep alive in those areas impacted by drought. Those areas, as we know, have been in six or seven years of continuous drought. If it were not for the fact that those graziers out there were able to pull mulga to feed those stock then they would be sustaining huge losses in stock numbers. The last thing that we need is to

have that happen. Those graziers are hanging on by their fingernails. This sustained drought is taking an enormous toll not only financially but also mentally on a lot of those graziers. It has also had a flow-on impact on the neighbouring communities. When you look at towns like Charleville, they have certainly suffered the effects of this drought as well.

When it comes to mulga, the graziers who are out on this country have been managing the pulling of mulga for stockfeed for decades. On Tuesday morning out the front here, one of the graziers who lives out at Charleville said to me, 'Dale, you need to understand that mulga grows back like hairs on a cat's back,' and that is exactly right. Whilst those on the other side would have us believe that when we are pulling mulga we are decimating all of this country and it lays barren for years and years, that is not the case at all. Mulga regenerates. It comes back thicker than what it was in its original state. It is an absolutely crucial stockfeed particularly in times of drought.

The government is imposing a level of red tape, if you like, making the process of managing and pulling mulga for stockfeed in drought so much more cumbersome. We are saying: keep the current system of self-assessable codes so that farmers who know best, who know how to manage it, who know how to sustainably manage their properties, can do so into the future without having to go through this cumbersome process every time they want to go over 500 hectares.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I want to give my support to the shadow minister's common-sense amendment. I will be brief because, quite simply, the shadow minister has put it exactly the right way. The reason why graziers need mulga on mulga lands is usually because of droughted stock. When a farmer is droughted, times are pretty tough. At times they need assistance financially. They need assistance to keep their stock alive, to water their stock et cetera.

I put to the minister that, without our amendments, the legislation that is in front of this House is clunky. It will make it onerous on a landholder, it will make it more expensive for a landholder and it just is not common sense. I plead with the minister: this amendment is one of the amendments that the farmers and the graziers spent a lot of money and took the time to come down and march at Speakers' Corner about earlier this week. This was the issue that went to the heart of it. It went to the heart of what is so wrong with this legislation and why we on the opposition benches have attempted to move amendments to this flawed legislation. We want to make some common-sense changes to make this bad law acceptable, to get rid of the clunkiness, to get rid of the expense and to get rid of the red tape and make the laws slightly more workable for those people who rely on the mulga lands for their livelihood.

Ms LEAHY: This amendment moved by the shadow minister which I support allows for the retention of the *Managing fodder harvesting: mulga lands fodder area management plan* and it allows for the self-assessment of mulga to continue. That area management plan came into place with a lot of consultation that was done back in 2013. The department sat down in Longreach and in places like Cunnamulla in my electorate. They sat down with landholders and asked, 'How can we make this work?' Back then there was recognition that mulga is a haystack. It is not something that is necessarily used during drought times. It is a native species, but it is also a woody weed that is very, very good to use as drought feed.

Mulga regenerates incredibly well. There is no broadscale clearing of mulga under this particular management plan or the self-assessable codes. Fodder harvesting was recognised as being a very legitimate purpose for which a landholder could apply to manage native vegetation. However, there were lots of rules in place and I believe there were bees attached prior to 2013. What it means in the self-assessable code is that, instead of applying for permit after permit after permit every time you need to do another area of fodder, you simply need to notify the department. Send them an email—that is if your internet is working and you are in a mobile coverage area, because you cannot check your tweets in the back paddock. There was recognition that people do not go out in the mulga lands and indiscriminately remove that vegetation. They manage it so carefully because it is so necessary for the ongoing profitability of their business.

It is certainly used during drought times, because what we find is that there is drought everywhere. You have to cart fodder all the way from Victoria. It is far better—and the landholders know this—to manage their mulga so they can use that haystack rather than having to buy somebody else's haystack. This is an animal welfare issue in a way, because if landowners have to spend that time doing paperwork every time they do another 400 or 500 hectares it is going to be difficult for them because they are focused on managing their property and responsibly managing their mulga so it is there for not only this generation but also the next generation.

Mr MILLAR: This is an incredibly important issue for people in Western Queensland. This is about animal welfare. The LNP amendment seeks to preserve the current *Managing fodder harvesting: mulga lands fodder area management plan*. This will allow farmers to feed their beasts in drought without being tied up in red tape. We are not talking about graziers being able to make a profit in this regard. When we harvest mulga for fodder, it is about keeping breeders alive.

We have had seven years of drought across Western Queensland, and one of the biggest issues we faced is that a lot of cattle have left the region and that includes very important breeding stock. What mulga in Western Queensland does is it allows primary producers not to rely on bringing in hay or looking at donated hay but using the natural resources they have on their place to keep their breeding stock alive. Their breeding stock is everything to them once this drought breaks. When the drought breaks and they have breeding stock, they have at least another 16 months before they can put something to the meatworks. Once it rains, it does not rain money but what the mulga does for people in Western Queensland is it allows them to have some confidence to offload as much cattle as they possibly can but keep their core breeding stock on the property. That means that once it rains they will have confidence they will start getting some grass and some herbage during winter. By using mulga on their property it keeps the breeding stock alive and allows them to get back into the game quicker.

The LNP believes drought affected farmers should be able to feed cattle without being tied up in red tape. When the size limit is 500 hectares, it will cost around \$1,500 in floating costs to put the bulldozer out there. Then you will only be able to have a limited amount of mulga that you can cut down and then you have to put the bulldozer back on the float and back into town. That is \$3,000 plus costs just to get the machine out there.

I think we should have a lot more trust in our people in Western Queensland and in graziers right across Queensland. By using mulga we do not have to tie primary producers up with red tape. Mulga is a resource we can use to keep the breeding stock alive. That is so important. Once the drought breaks, they have core breeding stock available which allows them to get back into the game quicker, to put new progeny on the ground, to be able to put money in the bank to get them back on their feet again.

Mr KRAUSE: I am supporting the amendment proposed by the member for Burdekin. Of all the provisions in the government's bill and all of the things that are wrong with the bill, this has to be one of the most egregious for graziers. It is a kick in the guts, especially for graziers affected by drought or who may be affected by drought in the future. Mulga is one of their lifelines for their cattle, for their businesses and I am sure in some cases for their livelihoods as a whole.

The inability on the part of graziers to be able to use mulga in an easy manner is a massive kick in the guts for graziers. As I said, there is a lot wrong with this bill but this one is really beyond the pale. As has been said, mulga is a native species which regrows quickly but it is a very useful fodder stock for cattle. I do not represent any mulga country, but I do represent a lot of beef country and there are deep connections between my region and those parts of Western Queensland that rely on mulga for their feed.

If this is enacted, it will be another blow to drought affected farmers. It is a sensible amendment that we are proposing. It has been working ever since 2013 in line with the codes that were set out at that time. This is a targeted amendment proposed by the member for Burdekin that has been worked out in consultation with stakeholders—with grazing groups such as AgForce and other farmers who know what needs to happen on the ground when times get tough. We did this with real consultation on the ground between members of our team and those stakeholders.

Most of all, the amendment proposed by the member for Burdekin to keep in place the area management plan for mulga is fair and balanced. Most importantly, as the member for Gregory alluded to, it is workable. It does not tie graziers up in excessive fees and bureaucratic compliance measures which, when times get tough and things get busy, is the last thing they need.

I urge all members to think about drought affected graziers. Do not deliver them another kick in the guts tonight with the removal of this area management plan. Do what is right for them and what is right for their families, their health and their livelihoods. I support the amendment moved by the member for Burdekin.

Mr WEIR: This was probably one of the most overwhelming areas that we went to. Charleville was the hotbed for area wide management plans and that was because of mulga. Mulga is such a unique species. Mulga in the western area is both a blessing and a curse. In dry times it is a source of

fodder. As the season dries, if you are ever driving out in that country you will see that the stock, whether they be sheep or cattle, have eaten every leaf off every tree as high as they can reach. There is no grass. The only way you can bring the fodder up to them is to bring the bulldozers in, push the trees down and then they feed on those trees on the ground. Most times the tree is still alive on the ground. There are still roots in the ground so it still grows and produces.

When it rains, mulga grows like the grass in your backyard. Then it becomes a curse and that is when you need to be able to thin it, because if you cannot thin it you will grow no grass. Where you have thick mulga you will grow no grass. The area-wide management plan is so important in mulga land. Not only will grass not grow underneath it; it leads to erosion. Everyone we talked to in Charleville brought photos with them and they talked of their experiences with watercourses being eroded because of the thickening of mulga.

The way the codes are set out at the moment means they are practically unworkable. Cameron Tickell came in and gave some evidence. He is not only a landowner; he also has a bulldozer and he does contracting. I went to school with his father, as I found out that day. He spoke about the rules for state code 16. He said—

... we read on to find that landholders can thin only 400 hectares, or 10 per cent of their category B country, whichever is the lesser. Thinning an area of 400 hectares of a typical 10,000-hectare property will not have an impact on the thickened vegetation in that region. The DA application for this minuscule 400 hectares of thinning will cost the landholder \$3,000 per application.

As we talked about earlier, the time frame for getting these DAs is also important. You can still have a certain body of grass but, if you get a fall of rain of 20 or 30 millimetres, suddenly that grass is valueless and you are into a feeding situation in a matter of days. Circumstances can change very, very quickly. I fully support this amendment as moved by the member for Burdekin.

Mr MICELBERG: I rise to speak to the amendment moved by the member for Burdekin, which seeks to allow for retention of the *Managing fodder harvesting: mulga lands fodder area management plan* to allow self-assessment of mulga to continue. This amendment is very important because drought affected farmers should be able to feed cattle without being tied up in red tape and incurring excessive expense.

Put simply, this is an animal welfare issue. Labor have put Greens votes ahead of animal welfare. In its pathetic attempt to pay back their Greens friends here in Brisbane, Labor have ensured that graziers will not be able to adequately push mulga, and cattle and sheep will starve as a result. I suspect that few of those who sit opposite have ever had to deal with starving livestock, but I have and it is heartbreaking to see emaciated and weak cows bogged and too weak to stand, to see menacing crows loitering to peck at the eyes of cows that are too weak to fend them off, to have to put down stock that are too weak, day after day, while you are doing all you can to keep alive the rest of your herd, which is your livelihood. It is heartbreaking, and it is something I hope I never have to do again.

Those in the south-west raised this as their No. 1 concern when we visited Charleville. The number of people who turned out to our hearings should be an indication of how seriously they feel this affects their livelihood. The farmers of the south-west deserve better. The people of Charleville deserve better. The grazing industry in the mulga lands is completely reliant on mulga as a fodder crop during periods of drought. It should be retained in the existing clauses so that farmers are able to utilise mulga as a drought crop in an unbureaucratic way, without the red tape that this current legislation proposes. This legislation would make it unworkable.

Dr LYNHAM: I thank the members for their contribution, including the heartfelt contribution we just heard, but I would just like to reiterate that it is still a self-assessable code. Mulga can be harvested for fodder under a notification. Not much has changed.

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

AYES, 44:

LNP, 39—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Costigan, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 48:

ALP, 47—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Miller, Mullen, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Mr Last) negated.

Mr BERKMAN (10.16 pm): I move the following amendment—

17 Clause 37 (Insertion of new pt 6, div 13)

Page 35, line 32, page 36, lines 1 to 31 and page 37, lines 1 to 12—

omit.

I move this amendment with a grand total of nine minutes left in debate time this evening. I think the biggest question for me to try to resolve within myself while I am talking on this amendment is whether it is worth calling for a division at the end of the debate on this particular amendment. I feel like it would perhaps be—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr BERKMAN: We are back on area management plans again. For whatever I might have to offer in the debate here, it is kind of farcical and I really cannot help but wonder what it is I am going to achieve by adding much more, given the approach that we have taken to the debate tonight. There is clearly plenty more we could debate if the time allowed, and only a small fraction of the amendments I might have liked to have spoken to tonight will get up. It is not my style to freestyle up here—

An opposition member interjected.

Mr BERKMAN: I take the interjection—the rap is yet to come. I am not going to say any more to this amendment. I am going to leave it at that and see what we can come up with in the next eight minutes.

Non-government amendment (Mr Berkman) negated.

Mr LAST: Considering that amendment No. 7 was voted down, I withdraw amendments Nos 8 and 9 circulated in my name.

Mr BERKMAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, where do we take it from this point?

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order! Members, allow the member for Maiwar to speak to amendment No. 18 that he has circulated in his name.

Mr BERKMAN: Given where we are at in the evening I am not going to move the amendment circulated in my name.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you withdrawing it?

Mr BERKMAN: Yes.

Dr LYNHAM: I move the following amendment—

2 Clause 37 (Insertion of new pt 6, div 13)

Page 39, line 13, '140'—

omit, insert—

141

It is a consequential amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 37, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 38—

Mr BERKMAN (10.21 pm): Once again, these two amendments Nos 19 and 20 circulated in my name are definitional amendments that are of no moment given the remainder of my amendments that have not passed the House, so I will not move them.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Maiwar, can I ask that you withdraw those formally, please?

Mr BERKMAN: I withdraw my amendments Nos 19 and 20.

Mr LAST: I withdraw amendment No. 10 circulated in my name.

Mr BERKMAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, it might not surprise you to know that amendment No. 21 is, once again, a definitional, consequential amendment and I do not propose to move it. I withdraw that amendment.

Mr LAST: I move the following amendments—

11 Clause 38 (Amendment of schedule (Dictionary))

Page 40, line 17, '15 years'—

omit, insert—

29 years

12 Clause 38 (Amendment of schedule (Dictionary))

Page 40, after line 20—

insert—

irrigated high value agriculture means agriculture carried out to establish, cultivate and harvest crops, or pasture, that will be supplied with water by artificial means, but does not include plantation forestry.

This first amendment amends the definition of high-value regrowth vegetation to an area that has been cleared other than for relevant clearing activities for at least 29 years. This provides farmers with certainty and does not change the goal posts on farming families who have made investments and business decisions based on previous legislation.

The control of regrowth on farming land is absolutely vital to ensure the ongoing viability of that land. For those of us who live in those areas where regrowth can be a huge problem—and the Brigalow Belt runs through most of the Burdekin—when we drive through that country and we see the regrowth and the extent of it, we appreciate the challenges that our graziers face in managing that regrowth. The fact that during the course of the public hearings we heard that mapping of regrowth had not taken place and was not measured in any way, shape or form is an important consideration in this debate tonight.

I can assure honourable members that when they fly or drive across Queensland there is an unbelievable amount of regrowth right across the state. For that reason, our farmers need the certainty going forward to be able to manage that regrowth. The move by the government to bring that time period of 29 years back to 15 years might sound like not a lot. However, I can assure honourable members that it has a huge impact, particularly on those properties which are substantial in size or may be impacted by drought. If we look at Charleville—and we were just talking about that—which has been in the grip of a drought for six or seven years, that change would push their plans back, and impact their cash flow, by that period of time. All of a sudden 15 years does not take very long to pass at all. For that reason, we are saying we want it to go back to 29 years. Overwhelming, the evidence given at the hearings was to go back to 29 years. The feedback that we are receiving from our farmers is that we should revert to what it was previously.

Mr PERRETT: I rise to speak in support of the shadow minister's amendments. Farmers need certainty—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Gympie, I will ask you to resume your seat, please. Under the provisions of the resolution agreed to by the House and the time limit for the consideration in detail of the bill having expired, the question is—

That postponed clause 2, clauses 38 to 56 and the minister's amendments Nos 3 to 5, as read, be agreed to.

3 Clause 38 (Amendment of schedule (Dictionary))

Page 40, line 31, 'diversity'—

omit, insert—

biodiversity

4 Clause 47 (Amendment of sch 10 (Development assessment))

Page 48, line 2, 'Schedule 10'—

omit, insert—

(1) Schedule 10

5 Clause 47 (Amendment of sch 10 (Development assessment))

Page 48, after line 5—

insert—

(2) Schedule 10, part 3, division 4, table 3, item 1, column 2, paragraph (b)(iii), after ‘indigenous land,’—

insert—

land the subject of an occupation licence under the Land Act,

Mr SPEAKER: Ring the bells for one minute.

Division: Question put—That postponed clause 2, clauses 38 to 56 and the minister’s amendments Nos 3 to 5, as read, be agreed to.

AYES, 49:

ALP, 47—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D’Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Miller, Mullen, B. O’Rourke, C. O’Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 43:

LNP, 39—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Costigan, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O’Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 2, as read, agreed to.

Amendments 3 to 5 agreed to.

Clauses 38 to 56, as amended, agreed to.

Third Reading

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Under the provisions of the resolution agreed to by the House and the time limit for the third reading of the bill having expired, the question is—

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

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

AYES, 49:

ALP, 47—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D’Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Miller, Mullen, B. O’Rourke, C. O’Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 43:

LNP, 39—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Costigan, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O’Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill, as amended, read a third time.

Long Title

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Members, under the provisions of the resolution agreed to by the House, and the time limit for the long title of the bill being agreed to having expired, the question is—

That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

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

AYES, 49:

ALP, 47—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Miller, Mullen, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 43:

LNP, 39—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Costigan, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Motion agreed to.

Resolved in the affirmative.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Parliamentary Procedure

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, earlier this evening after the Leader of the House moved the motion for the suspension of sessional orders and an allocation of time limit order, there were a number of procedural issues that arose about which there were a number of points of order and notices of dissent flagged. To assist the House I thought it appropriate to highlight each issue that arose and restate, clarify or amend rulings made.

The first issue that arises is in relation to points of order made when the closure motion pursuant to standing order 88 was made by the Minister for Tourism. The Leader of the Opposition and other members rose on points of order and essentially sought to argue that there had not been sufficient debate. I will simply state that the members were in fact not rising on points of order but were in fact arguing the merits of the matter that the Speaker had to decide; that is, whether there had been sufficient debate. That is an issue that is not open for debate. Standing order 88(2) makes it clear that it is a matter for the Speaker's opinion or discretion and not open to debate. All of the creative or obstructive arguments raised by members when the closure motion was put were simply doing what is prohibited by standing orders; that is, they were debating the question. It is axiomatic that, when the Speaker puts the closure motion after it is moved, the Speaker is of the opinion that there has been sufficient debate. The Speaker needs no assistance or constant recital of the issue to be decided, which is in reality simply debate of the issue.

The second issue that arises is disrespect to the authority of the chair. When the Speaker makes a decision on a matter, points of order seeking clarification or restating the issue is at best simply obstruction and at worst disrespect to the chair. If a member disagrees with a ruling, if it is in fact a ruling, then the member may exercise their right of dissent, otherwise their arguments will simply trespass on disrespect.

The third issue is whether the Speaker's opinion that there has been sufficient debate is a ruling that can be dissented from. I referred to the forming of such an opinion as a ruling tonight, but on reflection I do not believe it is a ruling but simply the exercise of opinion or discretion.

The fourth issue was the time for the bells to be rung on the division for the motion pursuant to standing order 88. I am humble enough to admit misapplication of an earlier order on this issue. I should have called for a four-minute division and not one minute, as this was a substantive and separate question to the bill. However, I note that it was apparent that all members were in or about the House, as I reflected earlier in my comments, and that no rights were actually interfered with.

The fifth issue goes to the automatic adjournment time occurring whilst in division. If a division is in progress at the time fixed for the automatic adjournment, it is unmistakably evident that the division and any division consequent on that division must be completed and the result announced. I make this very strong point: the House is the master of its own proceedings subject only to statute law that may expressly interfere in those proceedings. We were in the midst of a substantive, but procedural, motion to suspend sessional orders. It was ultimately for the House to complete its decision, which can supersede previous decisions. It would be a nonsense to allow obstruction to prevent the House from deciding its own destiny. I also note that, once the question to put the previous question had been agreed to, standing order 88 required me—I repeat, required me—to forthwith put the main question.

Lastly, every sitting week the chair has some discretion about time to allow speeches or items of business to finish.

PRIVILEGE

Vegetation Management and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, Correction to Record of Proceedings

 Hon. SJ MILES (Murrumba—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (10.40 pm): I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising. Earlier today when the House was discussing amendments submitted and withdrawn by the Queensland Greens seeking to allow clearing of remnant vegetation for HVA to continue I suggested that the Environmental Defenders Office may have helped develop these proposals. Ms Jo Bragg of the EDO has written to me to assure me that the EDO did not develop and does not support those amendments. I welcome her clarification and the opportunity to convey that to the House.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (10.40 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Moggill Electorate, Anzac Day

 Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (10.40 pm): I rise to highlight a number of services that were held on Anzac Day 2018 in the electorate of Moggill and to make particular mention of the late Corporal Mathew Hopkins. Corporal Hopkins was killed whilst serving with the 7th Battalion Royal Australian Regiment in Afghanistan on Monday, 16 March 2009. He was 21 years old. Mathew was a Kenmore State High School student from 2000 to 2004. On Friday, 27 April 2018 Kenmore State High School officially opened a walkway in his honour, the Mathew Hopkins Avenue. The concept of naming the school's walkways began with an idea generated by the 2016 Kenmore State High School year 12 school leaders. Current year 12 prefect Tessa Van Swinderen spoke about a connection to the idea which her elder sister, Lena, had contributed to as school vice-captain in 2016.

Affectionately known as 'Hoppy', Corporal Mathew Hopkins will always be remembered as a beloved father, husband, son, soldier, hero and a valued member of our local community. The naming of Mathew Hopkins Avenue represents links between past students, present students and the notion of service to the school and the wider community which is a core element of Kenmore State High School. It was an honour to attend the opening of Mathew Hopkins Avenue, particularly given Corporal Hopkins's mother and family were in attendance. The legacy, sacrifice and contribution of Corporal Hopkins lives on.

Anzac Day is a significant event in the electorate of Moggill, as it is around Queensland and indeed across Australia. Many services are held throughout the day, with the Shell Green T20 cricket match being held in the afternoon at the Brookfield Showground. The dawn service and gunfire breakfast is held at Bellbowrie. It is heartening to see attendance numbers grow each and every year. This was followed by the Anzac Day march and morning service at the Kenmore War Memorial. I particularly want to thank the Kenmore-Moggill RSL Sub-Branch for all of its tireless work in organising local services and I take this opportunity to acknowledge Rick Maher, Trevor Dixon, Frank Beattie and Pastor John Robertson. Refreshments were provided by Kenmore Rotary and our local Girl Guides, so many thanks to those organisations as well as all of our local schools and many other community organisations for their involvement on the day.

Fairview at Pinjarra Hills and the Mount Crosby Bowls Club again held their respective services, and well done to Pam Scherman Carr, Robert Carr and Pat O'Brien. As I mentioned earlier, the Shell Green T20 cricket match was very successful. The match, first played in 2012 between the Lord Mayor's XI and the Army XI, has now become a tradition for many at the Brookfield Showground. It is played in honour of the daring and notorious Shell Green cricket match during World War I when members of the Australian Army played a cricket match in Gallipoli as a diversionary tactic to ensure the safe withdrawal of troops. This year Jude Coleman, Lee Carseldine and Aussie superstar Beth Mooney lent their skills to the Lord Mayor's team. On Anzac Day we pay our respects to those who have made the ultimate sacrifice on behalf of our state and nation. We also salute all ADF personnel who continue to serve Australia. Lest we forget.

Anzac Day

 **Mr MADDEN** (Ipswich West—ALP) (10.43 pm): Since 1999 I have had the honour of being the convenor of the Woodend Anzac Day service in Ipswich. This year marks 100 years since the armistice was signed on 11 November 1918, ending the First World War. In the First World War, as in all conflicts involving Australian forces, women have played a vital role. On Anzac Day this year right across Australia the role of women in our defence forces was acknowledged. In Darwin, the Sunshine Coast and Sydney, as well as many other centres, servicewomen led the Anzac Day parades. This recognition of the role of women in our defence forces is long overdue.

Female service in the Australian military began in 1899 when the Australian Army Nursing Service was formed as part of the New South Wales Colonial Military Forces which led to Army nurses serving in the Boer War. More than 2,000 women served in the Australian Army Nursing Service during World War I and were important members of the Australian Imperial Force. Australian women played a larger role in World War II. The RAAF established the Women's Auxiliary Australian Air Force, of which my Aunty Stella McGuire was a member, and the Army formed the Australian Women's Army Service and the Australian Army Medical Women's Service while the Navy established the Women's Royal Australian Naval Service. In 1994 almost 50,000 women were serving in the Australian military and thousands had joined the civilian Australian Women's Land Army.

The role of women in the Australian military began to change in the 1970s with reforms that allowed women to deploy on active service and support roles. The Defence Equity Organisation was established in 1997 and it developed a framework to facilitate the acceptance of women throughout the Australian Defence Force, the ADF. Since 2016 women have served in front-line combat positions. Women now occupy senior roles across the ADF and they include Major General Simone Louise Wilkie. In 2011 she became the Australian National Commander in Afghanistan. As such, she was responsible for approximately 1,500 Australian personnel serving in the combat zone. Since 2013 Major General Wilkie has been Commander of the Australian Defence College, Duntroon. When our servicewomen led the Anzac Day parades in Darwin, the Sunshine Coast and in Sydney they deserved to hold their heads high for their vital contribution to the defence of Australia. Their courage, their comradeship and their sacrifice are the true embodiment of the Anzac spirit that Australians celebrate each year on our national day, 25 April—Anzac Day.

Bribie Island Emergency Services Expo

 **Mrs WILSON** (Pumicestone—LNP) (10.46 pm): I urge everyone to mark this date on their calendar—Sunday, 14 October 2018. This is the date that the Pumicestone electorate will proudly be hosting the Bribie Island Emergency Services Expo for 2018. As the leading expo of its kind in Queensland, the Bribie Island Emergency Services Expo exhibits our emergency services of both land and water with organisations across local, state and national bodies supporting and participating in this terrific event. Today saw the first coordination meeting for the expo and I am delighted to say that the plans are already well underway to make this expo bigger and better than last year. The dedication and hard work of these organisations, many of which heavily rely on volunteers, cannot be overstated. Their commitment to educating our community on the importance of our emergency services and preparing for our fire and storm seasons is honestly second to none, and to all involved I say thank you.

In just a matter of weeks we will be celebrating National Volunteer Week, so what better time to show our appreciation to all volunteers who work tirelessly to bring this expo together than a barbecue luncheon during this week. I know that I cannot wait to attend and say thank you on behalf of our community. Volunteers are the lifeblood of our Pumicestone community, and that in particular is evident in our very own Volunteer Marine Rescue Bribie Island.

VMR is one of the many wonderful hardworking volunteer groups in the community, fostering and promoting boating safety amongst locals and the boating public as a whole, and I am proud to be its patron. These men and women, who dedicate their time unpaid to support not only our community but the many who visit our beautiful electorate, do so to provide a rescue service with the sole goal of saving and preserving life at sea. Just last week I caught up with the members and local residents as VMR opened its doors and boats to give locals a tour of their lifesaving facilities. It may only be May, but the excitement and anticipation already is building for October's expo and I warmly extend an invitation to all members of the House to come to Pumicestone on 14 October to see firsthand our terrific emergency services in action.

Vaisakhi Festival

 **Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (Minister for Local Government, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (10.49 pm): According to the 2016 census, more than 12,000 people of the Sikh faith now call greater Brisbane home. As the member for Sandgate and the Minister for Multicultural Affairs, I am proud to say that many reside in my electorate. The Sikh community makes a positive contribution to my local community and to the broader Queensland community.

Tonight, I rise to acknowledge this contribution through the tremendous work of Singh Sabha Gurudawara Brisbane. This terrific organisation held its annual Vaisakhi festival last Sunday at the Sandgate Hawks AFL Sporting Club. It gave me great pleasure to attend the festival along with my parliamentary colleagues the member for Nudgee and the member for Aspley and Deagon ward councillor Jared Cassidy.

As expected, Vaisakhi 2018 was a colourful event that was well attended by people with a wide range of backgrounds from Taigum and beyond. Vaisakhi marks the founding of Khalsa, of the Sikh faith, which is traditionally celebrated across the northern Indian subcontinent, particularly in the Punjab region, coinciding with the Punjab new year and the harvest festival.

The annual Vaisakhi festival at Taigum has become a great opportunity for people to celebrate with those of the Sikh faith and enjoy the best of food, culture and sports. Along with the member for Aspley, I particularly enjoyed the kabaddi contest. For those who have not been initiated into the joys of Kabaddi, I point out that it is a combination of red rover and wrestling. It is pretty impressive to watch. Vaisakhi not only keeps alive the rich cultural traditions of the Sikh community but also extends to northsiders more broadly an opportunity to get to know their Sikh neighbours. By promoting goodwill towards our neighbours and friends we can all play a role in creating a more inclusive and fairer society for us all.

This was also a very special day for 18 new Australian citizens who formally cemented their ties with our great nation at the Vaisakhi festival through an integrated citizenship ceremony. I think it is particularly important to note that the people who became Australian citizens were not all from the Sikh faith. People from 13 different countries were represented at that ceremony.

The Palaszczuk government is working to create a more inclusive and welcoming Queensland. There is no doubt that, in this regard, events such as the Vaisakhi festival have an important role to play. I want to acknowledge in particular Parminder Singh, Randip Singh and Garry Singh for their continuous engagement in their local community and the way in which they worked very hard with a whole bunch of other volunteers to put on a terrific Vaisakhi festival and the work and assistance of everyone else who is associated with Singh Sabha Gurudawara Brisbane.

Toowoomba Second Range Crossing

 **Mr WATTS** (Toowoomba North—LNP) (10.52 pm): I rise, as I have on many occasions in this place, to talk about the Toowoomba Second Range Crossing—a great piece of infrastructure that has been funded by state and federal LNP governments. The only thing the LNP did not do was appoint the contractor. The contractor was appointed by the incoming Labor government.

On 11 May 2017, I rose in this place and brought to the attention of the minister that I was hearing that there were some serious safety concerns about the range crossing. I was given an assurance that there were no issues with the contractor. A year later, I have found that there have been many safety breaches on the range crossing. I was pleased that, eventually, on 23 February the minister went to Toowoomba to start addressing some of the issues by appointing an independent auditor, because nobody should go to work with the expectation that they will not be getting home safely.

Now, a year later, we are addressing the safety issues, but another issue has come to my attention. Today, I have spoken about it briefly. The contractor subcontracts many parts of the work. I am concerned that the infrastructure that is being built is not going to be of the lasting standard that we were promised. I am also concerned about ongoing safety issues, because the subcontractors are being pushed too hard. Those are the same words that I used a year ago. When I do my regular roadsides in my electorate—and I will be there again on the weekend—people tell me that those same subcontractors are not getting paid appropriately for the work they are doing. They are considering having to launch potentially expensive legal action to ensure they get paid both for their original contract and for some of the variations.

I wanted to make sure that that was on record, because the Second Range Crossing should be a great piece of infrastructure. It should be a great good-news story for Queensland. This project will unlock Western Queensland's potential. It will lower our logistics costs. It will help our farmers compete in international markets. This minister has been asleep at the wheel on safety, contract administration and on so many other facets of this infrastructure. I hope that he can turn his attention to it briefly.

Workers' Memorial Day

 **Mr KING** (Kurwongbah—ALP) (10.55 pm): It is good to follow someone else who has talked about worker safety. Sadly, since Anzac Day, I have had to attend another memorial service. Even more sadly, it occurs each year. I refer to Workers' Memorial Day, when we remember those workers who lost their lives at work, those who were injured and who cannot return to work, and those workers who also suffer from work related illnesses such as mesothelioma and asbestosis, and those who, sadly, take their own lives because of events in the workplace.

Workers' Memorial Day is about remembering all of those people and pausing to reflect on the wreckage that these deaths and injuries cause families and friends. Sadly, the risk of death and injury at work is a reality for all workers, no matter what industry. Helping to keep workers safe is a responsibility of all of us and it is a major focus of the union movement, which is much demonised by those opposite.

So far this year, nearly 40 Australians have been killed at work. In 2017, there were 184 deaths at work Australia wide, including the deaths of 22 Queensland workers. That is clearly not acceptable. We are not even halfway through the year and we have lost nearly 40.

I am proud to be part of the Palaszczuk Labor government that has led the way in trying to curb these terrible figures by being the first state government to introduce industrial manslaughter laws. These laws will see bosses and corporations whose workers died owing to unacceptable and unsafe practices held accountable with significant jail sentences and large fines. My government has always acted on making safer workplaces.

When those opposite malign my government for listening to the unions about workplace safety, when they mock my government's introduction of good legislation that has the intent of curbing the shocking rate of workplace deaths, we have to wonder why. We should all be pulling together to make sure that every worker in this state has the fundamental right to come home from work in the same physical and mental state in which they left home.

Last year, when the unions held a protest outside this place to bring to our collective attention the number of those avoidable workplace deaths, we saw tweets from those opposite, such as the effort by the member for Kawana who tweeted, 'Get back to work you bludgers. The pubs will do all right this arvo.' I know who the speaker at that protest was, because I went out to listen to him. He was the father of Jason Garrels, who was an electrical apprentice who tragically died in a workplace accident. I do not think that Mr Garrels was off bludging from work.

I get it that, in my opinion, the member for Kawana appears to despise unions and the workers they represent, but I am yet to see any similar outrage against bankers, or any similar protest when this week we had farmers who protested outside this House. We on this side support the rights of people to protest. I would certainly not go to social media to malign these groups like the members opposite do.

Maybe every member of this place should attend Workers' Memorial Day next year so that they can see the workers. Then one day we can work together to make sure that we do not have a memorial day; we have a celebration of no deaths.

Gold Coast, Short-Term Holiday Rentals

 **Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (10.58 pm): I rise in this House, as I have done on numerous occasions, to talk about the proliferation of short-term holiday rentals, commonly known as party houses, that are unfortunately coming back to the Gold Coast after a long hiatus after the LNP government introduced legislation into this House. The issue has been an ongoing concern to my constituents and the broader community of Mermaid Waters, Surfers Paradise, Broadbeach Waters and Clear Island Waters. Local residents have had to put up with antisocial and disruptive activity at all hours of the day and night. This is intolerable for hardworking residents and their families and clearly changes the activity of a quiet residential suburb.

These are businesses that are deliberately being run as short-term holiday rentals and are acting without any council approvals. The internet enables people to run these very lucrative businesses in suburban areas and in many cases without care for the amenity of the neighbours. These properties are in very expensive suburbs close to the entertainment precinct of the Gold Coast and as such are ideal for short-term letting.

It was the introduction of the local area planning instrument in May 2015, brought about by clear legislative changes giving powers to the local councils to enforce restrictions on short-term holiday letting businesses in residential areas, which initially brought about the eradication of the unapproved licentious party houses that have been impacting residents for years with a solution that was in the best interests of suffering communities.

Now we find there is a resurgence in short-term holiday letting on the Gold Coast, in particular since the Commonwealth Games. There were many people making money out of letting houses out through Airbnb, Stayz and other short-term accommodation sites. There was even a public housing tenant who became entrepreneurial over the period to make a little bit of money. This will be a problem for the Gold Coast and other tourist destinations. There is an acceptance of this new form of making money out of suburban houses without approvals. We will see this become a bigger problem. The government needs to address this matter. Quite clearly there will be major ramifications if it does not. We are here to help and assist if there is any movement from the government in these matters.

Mackenroth, Hon. TM; Hansen, Dr J; Foster and Kinship Carers

 **Ms PEASE** (Lytton—ALP) (11.01 pm): Sadly, this week Terry Mackenroth passed away and I offer my condolences to Mary and his family and acknowledge his commitment to his family, community and the great Australian Labor Party. He will be sadly missed and has left a proud and significant legacy.

This morning baysiders paid their respects to Dr Jack Hansen who recently passed away after a long illness. Jack, together with Dr Frank Fry and Drs Peter and Paul Smith established Manly Clinic in 1959. These doctors met as young men at the University of Queensland while studying and continued their friendship and medical practice over the years delivering quality health care to the bayside.

Jack was also the club doctor of our mighty Wynnum Manly Seagulls and he represented Queensland in lawn bowls. He also established the Waterloo Bay Leisure Centre. Jack and his colleagues were on call 24 hours a day and they were certainly the old-style doctor, loved by all of our community. My thanks to Dr Jack Hansen for his dedication to his patients and the community and my condolences to his family. He will be sadly missed.

Last week the Queensland government said thank you to 35,000 foster and kinship carers who provide a safe, loving and stable home to more than 8,000 vulnerable children and young people in Queensland. I was lucky to catch up with Lenore Vella. Lenore and her husband Robert, together with their two now adult children, have over the years fostered 133 children. This amazing family has provided a safe, caring and loving home for kids of all ages and Lenore told me that they have enjoyed every moment of it.

I can think of no finer family to be recognised and nor can our local baysiders. I have heard from so many of Lenore and Robert's foster children and other locals who agree that Bob and Nor's kindness is known far and wide. Lenore, Bob and their family are still in touch with their foster children today. Lenore made sure that the children in her care had the opportunity to join Scouts and other sporting activities and drove them to their activities and ensured that they were able to continue with their interests after they left her care, continuing her legacy by paying the next year's fees to make sure that the children, when they moved to other homes, continued on with something that was familiar to them, which was very important to Lenore and Bob.

Lenore is always ready to lend a hand, whether it be knitting beanies for premmie babies or homeless people, collecting sanitary products for homeless women, fundraising for mental health housing or cooking food and baking cakes during weather events to help out the volunteers. She is truly an amazing woman and we are so fortunate for Bob and Lenore and I thank them for everything that they do for our community.

Theodore Electorate, Anzac Day

 **Mr BOOTHMAN** (Theodore—LNP) (11.04 pm): Last week I am sure most of us attended Anzac Day dawn services and marches throughout our electorates. I would like to thank my local RSL President Ken Golden for once again hosting a truly moving dawn service at Helensvale. It was great to see so many young people involved in this year's dawn service.

This year was truly special for one of my local cenotaphs at Upper Coomera. This year marks 100 years since its official unveiling. It was truly a great honour to address the crowd about the history of this wonderful cenotaph and the reason it came to be. I seek leave to table the speech.

Leave granted.

Tabled paper: Anzac Day speech, undated [616].

The cenotaph is located at the corner of Charles Crossing and Tamborine Oxenford Road at Upper Coomera at the former entrance to the Bonnie Brea property. It was officially unveiled on Saturday, 18 May 1918 by William A Foxwell, chairman of the Coomera District Patriotic Committee, and Sir Edward Henry Macartney MLA. This memorial catalogues the names of all the local fallen World War I and World War II diggers. The memorial is a life-size digger standing with eyes down, arms and rifle reversed. The purpose of the rifle reversed is to denote those who have fallen rather than those who enlisted, which is in contrast to some other memorials.

Over the years, unfortunately the memorial has seen its fair share of vandalism. A fair bit of restoration was undertaken in 1978 and again in 1990 and, more recently, in 2015. At one stage somebody smashed the digger's hat off. They even shot at the cenotaph—about a hundred .22 calibre bullets were removed from it. Vandals even stole the rifle. With the love and care of the Coomera Valley Rotary Club this beautiful cenotaph has been restored to its original glory.

I thank the members of our rotary club for their dedication in running a service every year at this beautiful cenotaph, in particular Malcolm Cummings, Warren Edwards, Tony Lines, Rick McElhinney and Jane Padden. There is a massive team of very dedicated people. To give members an idea, around 4,000 to 5,000 people every year turn up to the Anzac Day service at this beautiful cenotaph.

Woodridge Electorate, Anzac Day

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning) (11.07 pm): It was my great privilege to participate in a number of Anzac Day ceremonies in my electorate of Woodridge last week. Marking the centenary of the end of the Great War in 1918, this year's Anzac Day services at Logan Central were very well attended by residents of all ages. I would like to particularly thank Mr Ken Heard of the Logan & District RSL Sub Branch—Ken is the president of the branch—for his leadership and commend the Logan SES, Queensland Police and Queensland Ambulance Service officers who assisted on the day.

I was delighted to see so many young Australians participating in the services, including local school students, members of sporting clubs, including the mighty Logan Brothers Junior Rugby League Football Club, and members of the Australian Cadets and Mabel Force. Mabel Force is a civilian unit made up of students from Mabel Park State High School, one of the many great schools attended by students from my electorate of Woodridge. Mabel Park and its principal, Mick Hornby, are renowned for delivering excellence in education and innovation. Last year I visited the school to launch a trial of a new certificate III course in aviation, the first in Queensland, a pilot program to give students a new qualification enabling them to become drone pilots.

I was also pleased to visit Yugumbir State School for their very moving Anzac Day service. Speaking of the next generation, I was very pleased to see a great initiative of the Palaszczuk Labor government, designed and funded when I was Queensland health minister, the new Logan maternity and child health hubs officially opened recently at Access Gateway, Jajumbora Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Community Health Service and the Browns Plains Early Years Centre. The maternity and child health hubs are an exciting extension of the midwifery group practice at Logan Hospital. They support marginalised women's access to, and engagement with, midwifery care. They aim to improve health outcomes for Logan mothers and give their newborn children the best start in life.

Another groundbreaking initiative of this Palaszczuk Labor government is the Transurban Queensland \$512 million Logan Enhancement Project delivered as a market-led proposal by our government. Improvements around the Logan Motorway and Wembley Road interchange have moved another step closer with the first of two new, two-lane Wembley Road bridges starting to take shape over the Logan Motorway. In addition to the two new bridges, Wembley Road will be widened to four lanes between Greenfern Drive and Pagewood Street, effectively doubling capacity for motorists. Locals know the existing two-lane bridge is a major peak hour pinch point. That will be addressed by this important project. This initiative aims to reduce travel times and make for a smoother, quicker journey around the city of Logan as well as improving efficiency for the freight distribution centres in nearby Berrinba and Parkinson. I am delighted that construction of the Logan Enhancement Project is also creating local jobs for the region: 1,300 jobs delivered through the entire project as well as engaging over 100 subcontractor companies. The project is another great example of the Palaszczuk government working with the private sector to deliver vital multimillion dollar upgrades to benefit Queenslanders, particularly in the electorate of Woodridge.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.10 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Andrew, Bailey, Bates, Batt, Bennett, Berkman, Bleijie, Bolton, Boothman, Boyce, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Costigan, Crandon, Crawford, Crisafulli, D'Ath, Dametto, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Frecklington, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hart, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Hunt, Janetzki, Jones, Katter, Kelly, King, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Lauga, Leahy, Linard, Lister, Lui, Lynham, Madden, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Mickelberg, Miles, Millar, Miller, Minnikin, Molhoek, Mullen, Nicholls, O'Connor, O'Rourke B, O'Rourke C, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Perrett, Pitt, Powell, Power, Pugh, Purdie, Richards, Robinson, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Trad, Watts, Weir, Whiting, Wilson