



# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Hansard Home Page: <http://www.parliament.qld.gov.au/work-of-assembly/hansard>

Email: [hansard@parliament.qld.gov.au](mailto:hansard@parliament.qld.gov.au)  
Phone (07) 3553 6344

## FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-SIXTH PARLIAMENT

### Thursday, 17 May 2018

Subject	Page
<b>SPEAKER'S RULING</b> .....	1283
Same Question Rule .....	1283
<b>PRIVILEGE</b> .....	1284
Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by a Member.....	1284
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Bundle of correspondence regarding matter of privilege.....	1284
<b>PETITIONS</b> .....	1284
<b>MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS</b> .....	1285
Budget Review .....	1285
Trade Mission.....	1285
Royal Flying Doctor Service, 90th Birthday .....	1286
Royal Wedding .....	1287
Crime and Corruption Commission Report; van der Merwe, Mr W .....	1287
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 10 May 2018, from the Chairperson of the Crime and Corruption Commission, Mr Alan MacSporan QC, to the Director-General of the Department of Justice and Attorney General, Mr David Mackie, regarding the Electoral Commissioner of Queensland.....	1287
Cladding Audit Taskforce .....	1288
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Queensland Non-Conforming Building Products Audit Taskforce Status Report.....	1289
Natural Disasters Recovery Assistance, Federal Funding .....	1289
Myriad Festival .....	1289
Labour Hire.....	1290
Domestic and Family Violence .....	1290
Trade Mission, Innovation .....	1291
Ipswich City Council, Complaints .....	1291
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 17 May 2018, from the Acting Director-General, Department of Local Government, Racing and Multicultural Affairs, Mr Greg Chemello, to the Minister for Local Government, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Hon. Stirling Hinchliffe, regarding right to information application. ....	1292

## Table of Contents – Thursday, 17 May 2018

<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 15 May 2018, from the Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, Hon. Jackie Trad, to the Chairperson of the Crime and Corruption Commission, Mr Alan MacSporran QC, regarding complaints about Ipswich City Council (with redactions).....	1292
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 17 May 2018, from Chairperson of the Crime and Corruption Commission, Mr Alan MacSporran QC, to the Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, Hon. Jackie Trad, regarding complaints about Ipswich City Council (with redactions).....	1292
<b>Drought Declarations</b> .....	1292
<b>SPEAKER'S STATEMENT</b> .....	1292
Bells in Parliamentary Precinct	1292
<b>COMMITTEES</b> .....	1293
Estimates Hearings .....	1293
<b>SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT</b> .....	1294
<b>PARLIAMENTARY CRIME AND CORRUPTION COMMITTEE</b> .....	1294
Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Commissioner, Report.....	1294
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Office of the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Commissioner: Report on the results of the inspection of the records of the Crime and Corruption Commission pursuant to section 362 of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000, April 2018. ....	1294
<b>LEGAL AFFAIRS AND COMMUNITY SAFETY COMMITTEE</b> .....	1294
Report .....	1294
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Office of the Information Commissioner: Report No. 3 of 2017-18—Compliance audit—Ipswich City Council: Ipswich City Council's compliance with the Right to Information Act 2009 (Qld) and the Information Privacy Act 2009 (Qld). ....	1294
<b>QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE</b> .....	1294
Waste Levy .....	1294
Waste Levy .....	1295
Works for Queensland .....	1296
Gold Coast Commonwealth Games, Security .....	1296
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Email, dated 13 May 2018, regarding the Commonwealth Games.....	1296
Screen Industry .....	1297
Independent Public Schools, Review .....	1298
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Department of Education and Training, Evaluation of the Independent Public School Initiative in Queensland, June 2015.....	1298
Distribution of GST.....	1299
Independent Public Schools, Review .....	1300
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 11 May 2018, from the Leader of the Opposition, Mrs Deb Frecklington MP, and shadow minister for education and shadow minister for industrial relations, Mr Jarrod Bleijie MP, to principals regarding independent public schools.....	1300
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document titled 'Subject: A message from the Minister for Education: Independent Public School Review' .....	1300
Planning System .....	1301
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document titled 'Tim Mander MP, Member for Everton: Everton News Autumn/Winter 2018' .....	1302
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Media release, dated 14 November 2012, from the then Minister for Local Government, Community Recovery and Resilience, Hon. David Crisafulli, titled 'Ipswich Mayor backs Council reform' .....	1302
Safe Schools Program .....	1302
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from the <i>Australian</i> , dated 15 May 2018, titled 'Bill Shorten refuses to rule out reintroducing Safe Schools program' .....	1302
Innovation .....	1303
Waste Levy .....	1304
Wage Theft.....	1304
First Home Owners' Grant .....	1305
Queensland Health, Flu Season .....	1305
M1, Speed Limit .....	1306
<b>SPEAKER'S STATEMENT</b> .....	1307
Bells in Parliamentary Precinct	1307
<b>LOCAL GOVERNMENT (COUNCILLOR COMPLAINTS) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL; LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTORAL (IMPLEMENTING STAGE 1 OF BELCARRA) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL</b> .....	1307
Allocation of Time Limit Order .....	1307
Division: Question put—That the question be now put. ....	1317
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1318
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to. ....	1318
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1318
<b>LOCAL GOVERNMENT (COUNCILLOR COMPLAINTS) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL; LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTORAL (IMPLEMENTING STAGE 1 OF BELCARRA) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL</b> .....	1318
Consideration in Detail (Cognate Debate).....	1318
Local Government Electoral (Implementing Stage 1 of Belcarra) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill	1318
Division: Question put—That the amendments be agreed to.....	1319
Resolved in the negative.....	1319
Non-government amendments (Mr Janetzki) negated. ....	1319
Division: Question put—That clause 13, as read, stand part of the bill. ....	1319
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1319

## Table of Contents – Thursday, 17 May 2018

Clause 13, as read, agreed to.....	1319
Clause 14, as read, agreed to.....	1320
Clause 15, as read, agreed to.....	1320
Clauses 16 to 19, as read, agreed to.....	1320
<b>PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS .....</b>	<b>1325</b>
M1, Upgrade .....	1325
Federal Budget .....	1325
Glass House Electorate .....	1326
Keppel Electorate, Indigenous Place Names.....	1327
Water Infrastructure .....	1327
Haycroft, Mr G .....	1328
Pumicestone Electorate, Beachmere Road .....	1328
<i>Tabled paper: Bundle of photographs depicting roads in the Pumicestone electorate.</i> .....	1329
Redlands, Federal Budget .....	1329
Whitsunday Electorate.....	1329
Mareeba Hospital .....	1330
Buderim Electorate, Education .....	1331
Ipswich West Electorate, Education .....	1331
Phillips, Ms J .....	1332
Bancroft Electorate, Federal Budget.....	1333
Western Queensland, Drought.....	1333
Gladstone Electorate, Federal Budget.....	1334
Central Queensland Coal Network, Aurizon .....	1334
Cairns Electorate, Small Business.....	1335
Currumbin Creek Road, Cyclist Safety; Youth Music Venture .....	1336
Heatley, School Security; Thurston, Mr J .....	1336
<i>Tabled paper: Nonconforming petition, titled 'Petition to secure funding for Heatley Secondary College security fencing and improved facilities'.</i> .....	1336
<b>LOCAL GOVERNMENT (COUNCILLOR COMPLAINTS) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL;</b>	
<b>LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTORAL (IMPLEMENTING STAGE 1 OF BELCARRA) AND OTHER LEGISLATION</b>	
<b>AMENDMENT BILL.....</b>	<b>1337</b>
<b>Consideration in Detail (Cognate Debate) .....</b>	<b>1337</b>
<b>Local Government Electoral (Implementing Stage 1 of Belcarra) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill.....</b>	<b>1337</b>
Division: Question put—That clause 20, as read, stand part of the bill .....	1340
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1340
Clause 20, as read, agreed to.....	1340
Insertion of new heading— .....	1340
Amendment agreed to .....	1340
Clause 21, as read, agreed to.....	1340
Insertion of new clauses— .....	1340
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to .....	1344
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1344
Insertion of new clause— .....	1344
<i>Tabled paper: Local Government Electoral (Implementing Stage 1 of Belcarra) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018, explanatory notes to Ms Ann Leahy's amendments.</i> .....	1344
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to .....	1349
Resolved in the negative.....	1349
Non-government amendment (Ms Leahy) negated.....	1349
Clause 22—.....	1349
Amendment agreed to .....	1350
Clause 22, as amended, agreed to .....	1350
Insertion of new clauses— .....	1350
Amendment agreed to .....	1351
Clause 23, as read, agreed to.....	1351
Clause 24, as read, agreed to.....	1353
Clause 25, as read, agreed to.....	1353
Insertion of new clauses— .....	1354
Amendment agreed to .....	1360
Clause 26—.....	1360
Amendment agreed to .....	1360
Clause 26, as amended, agreed to .....	1360
Insertion of new clauses— .....	1360
Amendment agreed to .....	1360
Clauses 27 to 29, as read, agreed to .....	1360
Clause 30—.....	1360
Clauses 30 to 35, as amended, agreed to .....	1363
<i>Third Reading (Cognate Debate).....</i>	1363
<i>Long Title (Cognate Debate).....</i>	1363
<b>COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.....</b>	<b>1364</b>
<b>Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date.....</b>	<b>1364</b>
<b>MOTION .....</b>	<b>1364</b>
<b>Referral to Education, Employment and Small Business Committee.....</b>	<b>1364</b>
Division: Question put—That the question be now put.....	1369
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1370
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to .....	1370
Resolved in the negative.....	1370

Table of Contents – Thursday, 17 May 2018

Non-government amendment (Mr Bleijie) negatived.....	1370
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to. ....	1370
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1370
<b>PRIVILEGE.....</b>	<b>1370</b>
<b>Notice of Motion, Dissent from Deputy Speaker's Ruling.....</b>	<b>1370</b>
<b>MOTION .....</b>	<b>1371</b>
<b>Order of Business .....</b>	<b>1371</b>
<b>BIRTHS, DEATHS AND MARRIAGES REGISTRATION AMENDMENT BILL.....</b>	<b>1371</b>
<b>Second Reading .....</b>	<b>1371</b>
<b>PRIVILEGE.....</b>	<b>1373</b>
<b>Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by Members, Apology .....</b>	<b>1373</b>
<b>Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by Members, Apology .....</b>	<b>1374</b>
<b>Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by Members, Apology .....</b>	<b>1374</b>
<b>ADJOURNMENT .....</b>	<b>1374</b>
<b>Mother's Day, Flowers .....</b>	<b>1374</b>
<b>Community Hubs.....</b>	<b>1374</b>
<b>Lockyer Electorate, Schools.....</b>	<b>1375</b>
<b>Koala Protection.....</b>	<b>1375</b>
<b>Nicklin Electorate, Volunteers .....</b>	<b>1376</b>
<b>Reconciliation in Queensland Schools Program.....</b>	<b>1377</b>
<b>Coolum Beach Surf Club .....</b>	<b>1377</b>
<b>Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by Members, Apologies .....</b>	<b>1378</b>
<b>Toowoomba Second Range Crossing, Tolls .....</b>	<b>1378</b>
<b>Smith, Mr C .....</b>	<b>1379</b>
<b>ATTENDANCE .....</b>	<b>1380</b>

## THURSDAY, 17 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 RULING

#### Same Question Rule

**Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, on 21 March 2018, the member for Traeger introduced the Vegetation Management (Clearing for Relevant Purposes) Amendment Bill 2018. On 3 May 2018, the Assembly passed, with amendment, the Vegetation Management and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. I have now considered the application of the same question rule to the member for Traeger's bill and consider that clause 4 offends the same question rule. Accordingly, I have ruled clause 4 of the Vegetation Management (Clearing for Relevant Purposes) Amendment Bill 2018 out of order. I seek leave to have the ruling I have circulated on the matter incorporated.

Leave granted.

#### SPEAKER'S RULING—APPLICATION OF SAME QUESTION RULE AND THE VEGETATION MANAGEMENT (CLEARING FOR RELEVANT PURPOSES) AMENDMENT BILL 2018

Honourable Members, on 8 March 2018, the Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy, Hon. Lynham, introduced the Vegetation Management and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. The bill was passed with amendment on 3 May 2018.

On 21 March 2018, the Member for Traeger introduced the Vegetation Management (Clearing for Relevant Purposes) Amendment Bill 2018.

The issue arises as to whether the same question rule is enlivened in respect of the private member's bill, as certain of its provisions appear to relate to matters also dealt with in the bill passed by the House in the last sitting week.

Standing Order 87(1) provides that unless the Standing Orders otherwise provide, a question or amendment shall not be proposed which is the same as any question which, during the same session, has been resolved in the affirmative or negative.

As previous Speakers and I have noted, the matters do not have to be identical, merely the same in substance as the previous matter. In other words, it is a question of substance, not form.

Clause 16 of the Vegetation Management and Other Legislation Amendment Bill amended section 22A of the Vegetation Management Act 1999 to, amongst other things, provide for when development is for a relevant purpose. The section, as amended, then goes on to provide when development is for a relevant purpose which includes when the chief executive is satisfied of a number of factors. Clause 16 removed subsections (k) and (l) to remove high value agriculture clearing as developments for a relevant purpose.

Clause 3 of the Vegetation Management (Clearing for Relevant Purposes) Amendment Bill would amend section 22A of the Vegetation Management Act 1999 to require the chief executive to provide an applicant with an information notice where they have determined that the development applied for is not a development within clauses 22A(2)(a) to (l).

The intent of clause 3 of the Vegetation Management (Clearing for Relevant Purposes) Amendment Bill is to require the chief executive to provide an information notice for their decision that an application for development is not for a relevant purpose.

I consider clause 3 to be sufficiently different in substance from the question determined by the House with respect to section 22A and rule that the same question rule is not enlivened in this instance.

Clause 4 of the Vegetation Management (Clearing for Relevant Purposes) Amendment Bill seeks to amend the definition of high value agriculture clearing in the Vegetation Management Act 1999. The Vegetation Management and Other Legislation Amendment Bill amended the Schedule to remove this definition. Accordingly, the House has already determined to remove the definition and the same question rule is enlivened and this clause cannot proceed. I rule clause 4 of the Vegetation Management (Clearing for Relevant Purposes) Amendment Bill out of order.

## PRIVILEGE

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

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, on 26 April 2018, the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services and member for Murrumba wrote to me alleging that the member for Mudgeeraba deliberately misled the House on 7 March 2018 during a motion in relation to the distribution of GST. On 30 April 2018, I wrote to the member for Mudgeeraba seeking a response to the allegation. The member for Mudgeeraba responded on 9 May 2018.

On the evidence before me, I considered that the member for Mudgeeraba has made an adequate explanation for the basis of her statement, which on the face of the material before me is a differing interpretation on figures in the Department of Health's Service Delivery Statements than that of the minister. Therefore, I have decided that the matter does not warrant the further attention of the House via the Ethics Committee and I will not be referring the matter.

Honourable members, I wish to stress that in making this ruling I make no finding as to the correctness or otherwise of the interpretations of the member for Mudgeeraba nor the minister. However, I again take the opportunity to remind members of my general statement of 6 March 2018 regarding allegations of deliberately misleading the House, the seriousness of such allegations and my expectations regarding the provision of evidence against which such allegations are to be judged. I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

*Tabled paper:* Bundle of correspondence regarding matter of privilege [[696](#)].

I seek leave to have the ruling circulated in my name incorporated.

Leave granted.

#### SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED DELIBERATELY MISLEADING THE HOUSE

MR SPEAKER: Honourable Members,

On 26 April 2018, the Minister for Health, Minister for Ambulance Services and Member for Murrumba wrote to me, alleging that the Member for Mudgeeraba deliberately misled the House.

On 7 March 2018, during a motion in relation to the distribution of GST, the Member for Mudgeeraba stated:

Meanwhile, in its last budget, the Palaszczuk Government cut funding to Queensland hospitals by \$63.8 million. We have the facts in front of us ...

On 30 April 2018, I wrote to the Member for Mudgeeraba, seeking a response to the allegation. The Member for Mudgeeraba responded on 9 May 2018.

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 Member for Mudgeeraba has made an adequate explanation for the basis of her statement, which on the face of the material before me is a differing interpretation on figures in the Department of Health's Service Delivery Statement than that of the Minister.

In my view, due to the differing interpretations, it remains arguable as to whether the statement was factually incorrect or misleading. Furthermore, there has been no substantive evidence before me that the member knew at the time that the statement was incorrect or that the member intended to mislead the House.

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 wish to stress that in making this ruling I make no finding as to the correctness or otherwise of the interpretations of the Member for Mudgeeraba nor the Minister.

However, I again take the opportunity to remind members of my general statement of 6 March 2018 regarding allegations of deliberately misleading the House, the seriousness of such allegations and my expectations regarding the provision of evidence against which such allegations are to be judged.

I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

## PETITIONS

The Clerk presented the following paper and two e-petitions, lodged and sponsored by the honourable member indicated—

### BB Print Stadium Mackay, NRL Games

**Mr Costigan**, from 308 petitioners, requesting the House to encourage the NRL and its clubs to bring an annual NRL game to BB Print Stadium in Mackay, commencing from 2019 [[697](#), [698](#), [699](#)].

The Clerk presented the following e-petition, sponsored by the honourable member indicated—

#### Light Rail, Alternative Routes

**Mr Hart**, from 1,599 petitioners, requesting the House to direct the feasibility study to investigate alternative routes for the Light Rail to head South and not the Gold Coast Highway route alone [700].

Petitions received.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

### Budget Review

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.34 am): Next month the Deputy Premier and Treasurer will deliver our government's fourth budget for Queensland. It will be a budget which invests in Queensland and in Queenslanders. The budget will continue our strong, proven record of creating and delivering the jobs we need to diversify and strengthen our \$327 billion economy. It will continue the key programs and initiatives that back Queenslanders—get them back into work, expand their business or open up new markets here and overseas. It builds on our achievements by delivering the commitments we made to Queenslanders at the last election.

We are determined to keep Queensland moving by creating the jobs of the future. Through our Advance Queensland and innovation initiatives, we are creating the knowledge jobs and the advanced manufacturing jobs which sit alongside our traditional agricultural and resource industries.

We are growing Queensland. Our tourism industry is booming. Our exports have reached \$70 billion a year. Since 2015, our commitment to infrastructure and investment attraction programs has seen the creation of 160,000 Queensland jobs. Our election commitments will support another 60,000 jobs.

I have some more good news for Queensland. We are working with the private sector to support this jobs growth in industries like renewables. The 130-megawatt Clare Solar Farm near Ayr has this week started supplying electricity to the grid and Pacific Hydro had contracted to connect its nearby solar farm. Queensland's large-scale renewable energy capacity is set to double over the next 12 months as our \$20 billion pipeline of committed and potential renewable projects starts to deliver. More than \$4.3 billion worth of projects are currently either under construction or financially committed, offering a combined employment injection of more than 3,500 construction jobs across regional Queensland.

Through programs like Skilling Queenslanders for Work and Back to Work, we are getting more Queenslanders back into the workforce—more secure work, more meaningful work and more rewarding work. We are doing all of this despite consistently missing out on our fair share from Canberra. I understand that the Prime Minister might be in Queensland this week. We are doing all of this despite consistently missing out.

Despite that fact and that it is Queensland revenue that is filling Commonwealth coffers, the Turnbull government ignored Queensland in last week's federal budget. We did not get the \$460 million owed to our health system, we did not get one single cent for Cross River Rail and we suffered more cuts in training and to Indigenous and remote housing.

While there is always more work to be done, our past three budgets have delivered for Queenslanders in the city, the suburbs and the bush. We will continue to deliver world-class health and education infrastructure and the nurses and teachers we need to meet the growing needs of our growing population. Our investments in these areas will ensure that all Queenslanders, no matter where they live, can receive a quality education and access to world-class health care.

The budget we deliver on 12 June will be an investment in Queensland's future. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Deputy Premier and Treasurer and ministers for all of their support in preparing next month's budget.

### Trade Mission

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.38 am): Queensland is Australia's export powerhouse. Last year, as I stated earlier, we saw exports totalling more than \$70 billion. That is an increase of nearly 26 per cent on the previous year and accounted for almost one in every four of Australia's export dollars—yet again showing we are punching above our weight. Those are great numbers, but I want them to be even better. Later this month I will travel on a trade mission

to boost Queensland exports, Queensland trade, Queensland tourism and Queensland jobs. In Tokyo, Japan, I will visit a new global education facility where, in an innovative move for our international education sector, the Queensland school curriculum will be taught in Japan for the first time and by Queensland teachers.

To further strengthen our push towards jobs for the future, I will visit the University of Tokyo, which is working with QUT to develop renewable hydrogen as a viable energy source. In Boston I will attend the BIO International Convention celebrating the 20th time Queensland has been part of this world-leading event.

Once again, Life Sciences Queensland will be working to open new markets and innovative technological opportunities for Queensland companies, researchers and institutions. The 100 delegates attending from Queensland are a testament to the importance of this event to our state's future economic development. I look forward to meeting with the delegates today at lunchtime with the Minister for Innovation.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Apologies, Premier. Members, there is too much noise in the chamber. Please keep your conversations at a lower volume.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** The bio industry also represents potentially thousands of new skilled jobs throughout regional Queensland, which is why I will be joined in Boston by the mayors of Gladstone, the Sunshine Coast, Mackay, Townsville, Rockhampton and Bundaberg. They understand how important this is for growing jobs in regional Queensland.

**Ms TRAD:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The Premier is not being provocative and those opposite continue to interrupt.

**Mr SPEAKER:** There is no point of order. I have just given guidance to the House in terms of the volume of conversations. I have the matter well in hand.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I will also meet the proponents behind a proposed battery factory for Queensland, further entrenching Queensland's position as a leader in renewable energy. Now that the federal government has ended the uncertainty around its support for Queensland's film industry, I will have talks with an associated industry looking to establish regional headquarters here in Queensland—one that could bring more than 1,000 jobs. This visit is about selling Queensland to the world—our crops, our products, our ideas and our destinations. This visit will build upon the opportunities that North Asia and the United States offer to Queensland businesses to grow our economy and create quality jobs.

### Royal Flying Doctor Service, 90th Birthday

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.42 am): This week marks the 90th birthday of the Royal Flying Doctor Service. The RFDS is an integral part of Queensland's history, with the first flying doctor taking flight from Cloncurry in the state's north-west on 15 May 1928. The RFDS is renowned for providing vital 24/7 medical emergency care in some of our most remote communities. It also provides hospital patient transfer services right across the state in partnership with the Queensland government that stretches back more than 20 years.

The RFDS currently facilitates access for more than 10,000 sick or critically ill patients to and from Queensland's major hospitals and specialist care facilities each year, and I commend it for providing mental health services to those people in rural and remote Queensland as well. Yesterday the Royal Flying Doctor Service flew a little boy and his mum to Brisbane from Rockhampton and he is currently in Lady Cilento Children's Hospital. On Monday the Royal Flying Doctor Service picked up a lady from a remote station who had given birth and flew her and her baby boy to Toowoomba Hospital as he was one day old and had an elevated temperature.

In the last month the Royal Flying Doctor Service has landed 281 times in Brisbane bringing patients to the specialist care they need with more than 95,000 occasions of care in the past 12 months across Queensland. Its rich history and the service it provides have become an integral part of our commitment to providing health care for people living, working and travelling in all parts of our wonderful state of Queensland.

The RFDS is a much admired Australian institution, and I am proud to support the work that it does across Australia. Once again, congratulations on a magnificent milestone. Happy birthday! I am sure all members of the House will join me in commending the RFDS on the outstanding work that they do for Queenslanders.

## Royal Wedding

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.43 am): This Saturday His Royal Highness Prince Harry will marry Ms Meghan Markle. We have always had strong relationships with the British royal family. In April this year during the Commonwealth Games I had the great pleasure of hosting His Royal Highness Prince Charles and his wife, Her Royal Highness the Duchess of Cornwall—

**Mrs Stuckey** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Currumbin! I issue a general warning to members. To the point of order raised by the Deputy Premier earlier, there is a difference between when statements are provocative and when they are not. It is not an opportunity for members from either side of the House to provide commentary, and even more so if your interjections are not being taken. I would not like to have to repeat this warning again throughout this morning's proceedings.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I do note that the member for Kawana is listening. I had the pleasure of hosting His Royal Highness Prince Charles and his wife, Her Royal Highness the Duchess of Cornwall, and His Royal Highness Prince Edward, Earl of Wessex, during their visit. We thank them for visiting Queensland. On behalf of all Queenslanders, I wish Prince Harry and Meghan Markle all the very best for their future and all the happiness that Queensland can give them.

## Crime and Corruption Commission Report; van der Merwe, Mr W

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (9.45 am): As members would be aware, the former electoral commissioner, Walter van der Merwe, tendered his resignation from that position on 14 February 2018 amidst an investigation by the Crime and Corruption Commission into allegations about his behaviour. This has been a difficult time for all of the Electoral Commission of Queensland staff, and those circumstances are by no means a reflection of ECQ staff more broadly.

On Friday the CCC provided me with its completed report into this serious matter, and it is clear that there is a range of improvements required to be made to the governance and accountability arrangements that operate throughout the organisation. As a public sector agency, it is crucial that the ECQ always retains the full confidence of the Queensland public and that it reflects the highest levels of ethics and integrity in the important work that it does. Staff should also expect a healthy workplace culture that supports staff wellbeing. It is on that basis and in the interests of transparency to the Queensland public that I table a copy of the CCC's summary of its investigation.

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 10 May 2018, from the Chairperson of the Crime and Corruption Commission, Mr Alan MacSporan QC, to the Director-General of the Department of Justice and Attorney General, Mr David Mackie, regarding the Electoral Commissioner of Queensland [701].

The allegations which were formally raised with the CCC relating to the workplace behaviour of Walter van der Merwe included being intoxicated in the workplace during working hours; being absent without reasonable excuse; showing favouritism; bullying some staff; undermining decisions by management by overriding decisions; behaving inappropriately towards junior staff; and being seen in a compromising position with a temporary employee.

The CCC investigated seven allegations which are outlined in the summary I have tabled. The CCC's findings, also provided in the summary, are that five of the seven allegations are substantiated. Additionally, in relation to one unsubstantiated claim, the CCC makes a recommendation for the ECQ to develop and implement a new policy addressing the issue. As has been publicly reported, the CCC commenced prosecution proceedings against Mr van der Merwe for a charge of possession of a dangerous drug in relation to allegation 6, and he has entered a plea of guilty and was sentenced in relation to that charge.

The CCC also recommended that the ECQ develop and implement a policy that provides parameters for formal and informal contact with members of parliament during a state election. This recommendation arises from a finding that leading up to and during the November 2017 state election Mr van der Merwe received a number of text messages from various members of parliament requesting information on the new electoral boundaries and on the vote counts. CCC officers did not raise an allegation in relation to this behaviour as these types of contact were considered inherent to his role.

These recommendations are amongst seven procedural recommendations that the CCC proposes the ECQ be responsible for implementing. The findings and recommendations of the CCC report provide initial direction as to the issues and areas requiring improvement, and I am committed to

ensuring that this work becomes an immediate priority. On that basis, this afternoon I am seeking the Governor's approval for the appointment of a new Acting Electoral Commissioner to provide fresh eyes and stability for the organisation while the position is being filled permanently.

**Mr Powell:** Which Labor Party hack will this be?

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Glass House, I have already cautioned members. You are now warned under the standing orders.

**Mrs D'ATH:** Mr Speaker, I find that offensive and the member should withdraw.

**Mr SPEAKER:** You cannot find that offensive as it was not directed to you.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Members to my left! Leader of the House, the statement was not directed at a particular member; it was a general comment. This is my ruling.

**Mrs D'ATH:** I find it absolutely appalling that those on the other side would find this issue a joke. I certainly do not find this a joke, the staff at the ECQ do not find this a joke and the public do not find this a joke. These are serious allegations, the majority of which have been substantiated by the Crime and Corruption Commission, and I do not see anything humorous about this issue at all.

**Mr Bleijie** interjected.

**Mr Dick** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Kawana and Minister for State Development, you are both warned under standing orders. The statement is being made by the Attorney-General. I encourage all members to listen to that statement in silence.

**Mrs D'ATH:** I reiterate that, on this basis, this afternoon I am seeking the Governor's approval for the appointment of an Acting Electoral Commissioner to provide fresh eyes and stability for the organisation while the position is being filled permanently. That recruitment and selection process has already commenced. It is important to note that the issues contained in the CCC investigation are not related to the outcome of any election. They are, however, very serious. These serious challenges have led to the current vacancy in the role, and I am confident that this afternoon's appointment will enable the CCC's recommendations to be implemented as an immediate priority. Subject to the approval of the Governor today, I will this afternoon announce the new Acting Electoral Commissioner.

I thank ECQ staff for their continued dedication and commitment in delivering such an important service to our community and our system of government in Queensland. As I have stated previously, the government will consult with the leaders of the major parties in relation to the filling of the permanent position.

### Cladding Audit Taskforce

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works, Minister for Digital Technology and Minister for Sport) (9.51 am): The safety of our built environment is paramount. In recent years it has become apparent that the use of some cladding materials poses a significant safety risk to building occupants, the general public and firefighters. In November 2016, the Palaszczuk Labor government embarked on nation-leading reform to address the issue of nonconforming building products. This includes the international challenge of combustible building cladding. Those nation-leading laws were passed in this House in October 2017.

In June 2017, I set up the Non-Conforming Building Products Audit Taskforce. Our government appointed the Hon. Terry Mackenroth as the independent chair of the task force. The task force immediately commenced investigation on 28,000 government owned buildings and privately owned buildings within its identified scope. The task force has now delivered its interim report. The report makes six recommendations, all of which we support. I can confirm that early and immediate work is underway to implement those recommendations.

The report recommends a framework to assess, clear and, where necessary, rectify approximately 12,000 private buildings that fall within scope. In summary, this scope extends to high-rise buildings constructed since 1994. Of those, it is estimated around 1,200 are residential or budget accommodation. Based on the findings of the task force, we expect that approximately 10 per cent will require some detailed investigation to determine if any remediation is required.

The report outlines a process for supporting Queensland high-rise building owners to self-assess and rectify their building where required. Building owners in scope will receive correspondence to this end from the end of July. The first step will be that building owners will be required to complete an online self-assessment to determine whether their building requires further investigation. To support these activities, a secure online assessment tool is being developed in consultation with industry. The task force has developed a training course for fire engineers to ensure practitioners are fully able to support the assessment process. Supporting this training, in collaboration with the University of Queensland, the task force is establishing a unique materials library for thousands of cladding samples.

I want to acknowledge the collaboration of the property industry in this process. In addition to that, we have consulted and worked with the Insurance Council of Australia, Strata Community Queensland, the United Firefighters Union, the Queensland Building and Construction Commission and the Local Government Association of Queensland. I now table the Non-Conforming Building Products Audit Taskforce interim report.

*Tabled paper: Queensland Non-Conforming Building Products Audit Taskforce Status Report [702].*

In tabling this report, I want to acknowledge and thank the members of the task force, in particular members of the Queensland Fire and Emergency Services, members of the Queensland Building and Construction Commission, officials from the Department of Housing and Public Works and of course the Hon. Terry Mackenroth. I want to thank them for their tireless efforts to make Queensland safer. Mr Mackenroth put in place a solid structure and led an ambitious agenda that has seen Queensland leading the nation and the world in our response to the issue of flammable cladding. I have every confidence that he has left the task force well equipped to face the challenges that lie ahead. Additionally, I have every confidence that the Queensland Fire and Emergency Services will continue to ensure that Queenslanders remain safe.

### **Natural Disasters Recovery Assistance, Federal Funding**

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning) (9.54 am): The federal government's proposed reforms to Natural Disaster Relief and Recovery Arrangements are scheduled for implementation from 1 July this year. However, there are no details of the new NDRRA funding model outlined in the federal budget. I am advised that the Natural Disaster Resilience Program funding remains unchanged, with the budget providing no indication it will be extended beyond 2017-18. It remains of great concern to me that, just a matter of weeks away from the 1 July deadline for implementation of the new funding arrangements, we still have not been provided with the federal government's final funding model. Every Australian state, including Queensland, is being asked to prepare for the introduction of a process and a funding model without the courtesy of clear and final advice as to the requirements we will be required to meet.

Let me assure you, Mr Speaker, while Queensland is better placed than most states and territories to capably manage the introduction of the new disaster relief funding arrangements, state and local government agencies are still being placed in a position of having insufficient time to provide adequate assurance and audit scrutiny before the model is in place. More than half of Queensland's local governments are currently recovering from natural disasters, and the delay in providing certainty around their future funding arrangements is simply unacceptable. It is unacceptable that the LNP has time for preselection battles but cannot manage to finalise these important disaster recovery funding arrangements.

Queensland is more exposed to natural disasters than other states, and that is why we need the federal government to stop dithering and show us their plans. Our vulnerable communities deserve better than the way they are being treated by the Turnbull government at this time. I have today again written to the federal minister responsible for the NDRRA, Angus Taylor, expressing my concern about the current situation and I have urged him to resolve this matter immediately.

### **Myriad Festival**

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Cooper—ALP) (Minister for Innovation and Tourism Industry Development and Minister for the Commonwealth Games) (9.56 am): It was an honour to ring the Australian Stock Exchange bell this morning to officially mark the start of Myriad 2018. It is every start-up's dream to ring the ASX bell and have their company listed.

Mr Speaker, as you know, innovation is not just about Brisbane; it is vitally important to Queensland's regional communities as well. That is why I am so excited to report to the House today that more than 120 innovative business leaders from regional Queensland are taking part in Myriad. Through our Advancing Regional Innovation Program, we are supporting regional innovators to connect

with the world's best entrepreneurs and investors. We are supporting regional businesses like Gilmour Space Technologies from the Gold Coast, which is developing new rocket propulsion technology; the Townsville based biotechnology company, Coral Sunscreen, which is developing world-first sunscreen based on the natural sun protection used by corals on the Great Barrier Reef; and the Goondiwindi based InFarm, which has developed drone to tractor technology that maps weeds for precision spraying.

Companies like these from all around Queensland are the future of our innovation sector and jobs. When it comes to regional innovation, Queensland is leading the nation. The 2017 Startup Muster report found that there were more start-ups in Queensland and regional Queensland than in New South Wales and Victoria combined. Through our half billion dollar Advance Queensland program, we want to see businesses growing and jobs created across the state in all parts of Queensland.

### Labour Hire

 **Hon. G GRACE** (McConnel—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Industrial Relations) (9.58 am): I am delighted to report to the House that the new Labour Hire Licensing Act and labour hire licensing scheme are off to a flying start. Under the new laws, labour hire providers are now required to have a licence to hire out labour in Queensland. Just one month after the new laws started, we have received more than 1,300 applications, with over 145 licences approved. This is a great start.

It shows that labour hire operators are fully aware of their legal obligations and are now ready to get on with business. Labour hire providers have until 15 June to apply online for their licence if they have not done so already. As long as providers have their application in by that date they can continue to operate until their licence is approved. For all the information on the scheme, licence providers and how to apply online, the labour hire website is the place to go.

The Labour Hire Licensing Compliance Unit is operational and on the ground talking to providers and processing applications and compliance checks. With these new laws, we are finally regulating the sector that has been left unregulated for far too long. The new laws, the first of their kind in the country, respond to years of evidence of serious exploitation of workers in the labour hire industry, ranging from cases of wage theft to sexual harassment and systemic tax avoidance. These new laws are good for workers and for labour hire providers and other employers who are doing the right thing. One provider, who has already lodged their application, said in their feedback—

... we found the online application to be easy and user friendly. The process was straightforward and particularly self-explanatory with plenty of information available online. It's great to see the Queensland Government taking a hard line against providers who aren't doing the right thing by workers.

I ask those opposite to join us in supporting our new laws and calling for the federal government to establish a national labour hire licensing scheme along the lines of Queensland's model. We need to ensure that these benefits can flow across the country. It is about time! I am so proud these laws are now fully operational.

### Domestic and Family Violence

 **Hon. DE FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (Minister for Child Safety, Youth and Women and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (10.00 am): I rise to speak on the need for every workplace in Queensland to support employees and their families and carers who are victims or at risk of becoming victims of domestic and family violence. I also encourage employers to educate their workforce about the signs and triggers of domestic and family violence and how to intervene safely if they are concerned about a situation.

The Palaszczuk government's Bystander campaign shows our commitment to putting a stop to domestic and family violence in Queensland once and for all. The Bystander initiative highlights the need for cultural change and uses a powerful narrative to direct viewers to an informative website outlining how to recognise the signs of domestic and family violence and also how to take the action required.

Domestic and family violence occurs in our homes and our communities and we also recognise that it is a major workplace issue. It can affect the safety, wellbeing, productivity and performance of all employees—victims, carers and colleagues. The Palaszczuk government, as Queensland's largest employer, leads by example and delivers significant support to employees affected by domestic and family violence. Our workplaces offer paid leave and flexible work arrangements, workplace adjustments and counselling through our employee assistance programs. We have also created fact sheets and professional development toolkits, and we encourage local government, business and non-government organisations to adapt these to suit their needs.

Many of Queensland's largest businesses already support the Palaszczuk government's lead in confronting domestic and family violence. The Queensland Resources Council has vowed to educate staff and provide support to protect individuals at risk of experiencing family and domestic violence. Last year Rio Tinto introduced paid DV leave nationally and the company's efforts include more flexible working arrangements, emergency accommodation and financial assistance. Queensland's largest superannuation fund, QSuper, is supporting the work of DVConnect in ensuring all staff and members are domestic and family violence informed. I am urging every Queensland workplace to have the courage to follow our lead and the lead of these companies.

The Palaszczuk government is also working with some of Queensland's largest sporting organisations to change our culture and to do something about domestic and family violence. AFL Queensland has pledged its support throughout its organisation and network of community leagues and clubs across the state.

The Palaszczuk government has made major progress in eliminating domestic and family violence in Queensland. We continue to make significant investments in front-line DV services, the construction of new domestic and family violence shelters and the establishment of high-risk teams across our state. However, there is still so much more to do. One in six women and one in 16 men have experienced violence at the hands of an intimate partner at some time since they turned 15. We all have a role to play to do something as a government, as individuals, as employers and as part of a connected and caring society.

### Trade Mission, Innovation

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (10.04 am): Last month I undertook a trade mission to the Middle East to officially open the Queensland Innovation Hub in Dubai South, an emerging master planned city in the United Arab Emirates. The Queensland Innovation Hub is an exciting way the Palaszczuk government is supporting Queensland companies that are looking to do business in the Middle East. Our new Queensland Innovation Hub has been set up to help Queensland companies establish their operations in Dubai South. When completed, Dubai South is expected to be home to one million people.

Dubai South will also host World Expo 2020. Providing Queensland companies with office space at the hub means they can establish a presence in the market quickly and economically and access existing and emerging business opportunities across the Middle East. Many Queensland companies are making great strides in their plans to expand into this very important market.

On the trade mission I was joined by NuGrow, an Ipswich based waste management business that signed an important MOU with Dubai South. This MOU will see NuGrow establish a recycling and waste management facility at Dubai South, which is expected to be operational by the end of the year. I also witnessed a comprehensive MOU signed between Roads & Transport Authority Dubai and Gold Coast business Transit Australia Group, or TAG, to provide professional advice, services and products to address the expanding transit needs and requirements of Dubai by conducting electric bus trials.

Since my visit in April I have already been pleased to welcome to Australia a return delegation from the Dubai Roads & Transport Authority. They have wasted no time in strengthening their relationships with Transit Australia Group. In a great advertisement for Queensland's focus on the jobs of the future, our local companies are engaged in activities that support research and development and Dubai South's sustainability goals. I also witnessed the signing of an MOU between leading Queensland medical research institute QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute and the Dubai Health Authority to test and develop medical research and technologies.

Whilst in the Middle East I also re-signed the sister state MOU between Queensland and Abu Dhabi. This MOU reaffirms the relationship which was galvanised by Abu Dhabi's \$30 million contribution to Queensland for cyclone shelters following the devastating floods of 2011. The Palaszczuk government will continue to support Queensland companies doing business overseas because it means more jobs here for Queenslanders.

### Ipswich City Council, Complaints

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (10.06 am): Yesterday in the House I rose on a matter of privilege relating to misleading allegations that as local government minister I received 326 complaints

relating to corruption at Ipswich City Council. I have now received further advice from the Crime and Corruption Commission and from the department of local government. I table a copy of a letter from the acting director-general of the department confirming that the 326 pages of material that had been located as part of the opposition's RTI request was made up solely of three complaints from one complainant.

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 17 May 2018, from the Acting Director-General, Department of Local Government, Racing and Multicultural Affairs, Mr Greg Chemello, to the Minister for Local Government, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Hon. Stirling Hinchliffe, regarding right to information application [705].

As I said yesterday in the House, all of this material has been provided to the CCC for them to assess if warranted. I am now able to also table a letter from the chair of the CCC confirming that all of these matters have been assessed by the CCC.

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 15 May 2018, from the Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, Hon. Jackie Trad, to the Chairperson of the Crime and Corruption Commission, Mr Alan MacSporran QC, regarding complaints about Ipswich City Council (with redactions) [703].

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 17 May 2018, from Chairperson of the Crime and Corruption Commission, Mr Alan MacSporran QC, to the Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, Hon. Jackie Trad, regarding complaints about Ipswich City Council (with redactions) [704].

These letters further confirm that the statements made on Tuesday by those opposite were incorrect and misleading.

### Drought Declarations

 **Hon. ML FURNER** (Ferny Grove—ALP) (Minister for Agricultural Industry Development and Fisheries) (10.07 am): I have been fortunate to be the agriculture minister for just over six months. With the backing of the Premier I have been fortunate to travel extensively around the state, sitting down with producers and having conversations with them. The one thing that has struck me above all else from those conversations has been the resilience, the decency and also the courage of these people of the land when faced with difficult weather conditions.

As Queensland enters the sixth year of the current drought, I am pleased to announce that summer rains have helped decrease the state's drought-declared area from 66 per cent to 57 per cent. At the peak of the drought in March last year, 88 per cent of Queensland was drought declared. I have accepted the recommendations of the local drought committees to revoke or partially revoke the following areas following good summer rainfall: the western portion of the Banana Shire Council, Bundaberg Regional Council, Burdekin Shire Council, the northern part of the Charters Towers Regional Council, Fraser Coast Regional Council, Gympie Regional Council, North Burnett Regional Council, Tablelands Regional Council, Townsville City Council, the declared portion of the Mareeba Shire Council and the Western Downs Regional Council.

Unfortunately, not all of Queensland has had welcome rain. During the past 12 months we have also seen dry parts of the Southern Downs region and Lockyer council areas, which is unfortunate as better conditions the previous summer had allowed the Southern Downs drought declaration to be revoked. I have accepted the local drought committee's recommendations to drought declare both of these council areas as well.

Queensland has one of the world's most demanding environments in which to undertake agriculture, and we want to help producers maximise good conditions and better manage their resilience when times are tough. The Queensland Drought Assistance Package offers a wide range of in-drought business, family and community support. We have also invested in the \$17.5 million Drought and Climate Adaptation Program, bringing together the best climate scientists, climate advisers and cutting-edge researchers to help producers better manage drought and climate impacts. I look forward to travelling to Mackay and again talking to producers. Hopefully we will see more rain in rural and regional Queensland.

## SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

### Bells in Parliamentary Precinct

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, it has been brought to my attention that there has been some concern about the bells not working in the Annexe tower. That issue is being followed up and investigated, but I would advise members that at some stage a test may need to be performed. At that stage be alert, not alarmed.

## COMMITTEES

### Estimates Hearings

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (10.10 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

That—

1. in accordance with standing order 177(5), the dates for each portfolio committee's estimates hearing and the dates by which each committee is to report to the House as set out in the order circulated in my name be agreed to; and
2. standing order 189(4) be suspended for the consideration in detail of the 2018 appropriation bills.

#### 2018 ESTIMATES COMMITTEES—ORDER SETTING DATES FOR HEARING AND REPORTING

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

<b>Portfolio Committee</b>	<b>Speaker</b>	<b>Date of hearing</b>	<b>Date of Report</b>
Economics and Governance Committee	Speaker	Tuesday 24 July 2018	Friday 17 August 2018
<b>Portfolio Committee</b>	<b>Ministers</b>	<b>Date of hearings</b>	<b>Date of Report</b>
Economics and Governance Committee	Premier and Minister for Trade  Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships  Minister for Local Government, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs	Tuesday 24 July 2018	Friday 17 August 2018
State Development Natural Resources and Agricultural Industry Development Committee	Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning  Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy  Minister for Agricultural Industry Development and Fisheries	Wednesday 25 July 2018	Friday 17 August 2018
Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee	Attorney-General and Minister for Justice  Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services  Minister for Fire and Emergency Services	Thursday 26 July 2018	Friday 17 August 2018
Transport and Public Works Committee	Minister for Transport and Main Roads  Minister for Housing and Public Works, Minister for Digital Technology and Minister for Sport	Friday 27 July 2018	Friday 17 August 2018
Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee	Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services  Minister for Communities, and Minister for Disability Services and Seniors  Minister for Child Safety, Youth and Women and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence	Tuesday 31 July 2018	Friday 17 August 2018
Innovation, Tourism Development and Environment Committee	Minister for Innovation and Tourism Industry Development and Minister for the Commonwealth Games  Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef, Minister for Science and Minister for the Arts	Wednesday 1 August 2018	Friday 17 August 2018

Portfolio Committee	Ministers	Date of hearings	Date of Report
Education, Employment and Small Business Committee	Minister for Education and Minister for Industrial Relations  Minister for Employment and Small Business and Minister for Training and Skills Development	Thursday 2 August 2018	Friday 17 August 2018

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

## SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

 Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (10.11 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until 9.30 am on Tuesday, 12 June 2018.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

## PARLIAMENTARY CRIME AND CORRUPTION COMMITTEE

### Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Commissioner, Report

 Mr NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (10.11 am): I lay upon the table of the House the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Commissioner's report on the results of the inspection of the records of the Crime and Corruption Commission pursuant to section 362 of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act for April 2018. The Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee is required to table the report within 14 sitting days. The committee received the report on 20 April 2018.

*Tabled paper: Office of the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Commissioner: Report on the results of the inspection of the records of the Crime and Corruption Commission pursuant to section 362 of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000, April 2018* [\[706\]](#).

## LEGAL AFFAIRS AND COMMUNITY SAFETY COMMITTEE

### Report

 Mr RUSSO (Toohey—ALP) (10.12 am): As chair of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee, I lay upon the table of the House report No. 3 of the Office of the Information Commissioner titled *Compliance audit—Ipswich City Council: Ipswich City Council's compliance with the Right to Information Act 2009 (Qld) and the Information Privacy Act 2009* (Qld).

*Tabled paper: Office of the Information Commissioner: Report No. 3 of 2017-18—Compliance audit—Ipswich City Council: Ipswich City Council's compliance with the Right to Information Act 2009 (Qld) and the Information Privacy Act 2009 (Qld)* [\[707\]](#).

The committee chair is required to table the report under the Right to Information Act 2009 and the Information Privacy Act 2009. I commend the report to the House.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr SPEAKER: Question time will conclude at 11.12 am.

### Waste Levy

 Mrs FRECKLINGTON (10.12 am): My first question without notice is to the Premier. Now that Labor's Ipswich City Council has been shamed into again providing recycling services to its ratepayers and stopping the dumping of recycling material into landfill, will the Premier reverse her decision to fast-track Labor's waste tax which will see all Queenslanders pay more tax sooner?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. The answer to that question is no, because on this side of the House we do not want to see Queensland become the dumping capital of Australia, with New South Wales's rubbish coming across the border and being dumped in Queensland. On this side of the House we will ensure that that does not happen. The

question now for the Leader of the Opposition is: why will they not support Queensland over New South Wales? We have been very clear with the public about this. We waited for the report, we considered the report and cabinet took the action.

When we talk about recycling let us be very clear that China is now closing the gate when it comes to taking rubbish from other countries. As a state we need to be pro-active and ensure that we recycle our waste. I believe that what we will see in the future—and this has come from waste industry representatives I have met—is that the gates will also be closed in other countries, including Vietnam and Indonesia. As we create more industries here in Queensland to develop our waste, what does that do? It creates more jobs for Queenslanders. What do those opposite have against jobs for Queenslanders? I do not know. As I said in this House, and I will say it again, the last time I went to the US I was able to see—

**Mrs Frecklington:** Which trip was that?

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** Yes, it is about getting jobs for Queenslanders. As Minister for Trade and Premier of Queensland, I will travel to any country that I need to in order to get jobs for Queenslanders. That is what I will do. As I said, at the end of this month and early next month I will be accompanied by six regional mayors who want jobs for regional communities, including the head of the Local Government Association, Mark Jamieson, from the Sunshine Coast. At the end of the day we will stand up for Queensland. We will develop a recycling industry in this state that will provide thousands and thousands of jobs. We will ensure that happens and we will develop the jobs of the future that we need.

I also advise the House that I had a meeting with a company last week that wants to invest in major upgrades to some of their waste facilities in Queensland, knowing how important creating more jobs is to Queensland. I look forward to working with that company. I look forward to the Minister for Environment meeting with the task force—

*(Time expired)*

### **Waste Levy**

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** My next question without notice is to the Minister for Environment. Many charities end up dumping tonnes of surplus and unusable donations from well-meaning Queenslanders who give goods and bric-a-brac to the Salvos, Lifeline and others. Will the minister rule out slugging Queensland charities with your new waste tax?

**Mr SPEAKER:** The last part of that question was directed at the minister. I ask that you rephrase the last part of that question. I also remind all members that questions will be heard in silence. There were members to my right speaking during that question.

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** Will the minister rule out slugging Queensland charities with Labor's new waste tax?

**Ms ENOCH:** I thank the member for the question. There are a number of principles around being able to move forward with a comprehensive waste strategy in this state. One of those principles has been made very clear, and that is there will be no direct impact on residents and households. Let me also say that, in terms of charities, there will not be that impact. I can say that they will not be 'slugged' with, to use your words—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Direct your comments through the chair, Minister.

**Ms ENOCH:** To use the words of the member for Nanango, and that forms part of the principles; however, what we do need to understand is that we are behind the eight ball in Queensland. In 2012 when the former LNP government took away our ability to build industry in this state we saw an inability to build those industries here. We opened up the floodgates to other states to come and dump their rubbish in our state. We put pressure on councils right across Queensland in terms of the markets we were able to have relationships with in terms of being able to find a place for their products in terms of recycling. Every council across the state has now been put under pressure with regard to decisions that have been made by China.

It is more important than ever that we now invest in, and find ways to invest in, a comprehensive waste strategy going forward and that we look at the production of waste as a potential economic opportunity for this state. There are jobs in that. There is economic opportunity in all of that. We need to be able to do that.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Pause the clock. Members to my left, I am listening very carefully to the answer the minister is giving. The minister is being responsive. She is answering the question. I encourage you to listen to the answer to the question.

**Ms ENOCH:** We are working with stakeholders from across industry—the waste industry and the building industry—and other stakeholders to ensure we have the right mix with regard to the strategy going forward. I acknowledge the hard work of all of those people who have given up their time to be part of that stakeholder advisory group and provide that information to the government as we start to work more closely on this opportunity around a circular economy. We have seen some commitment now from the federal minister, after some calls from me and this government, to a national strategy that has circular economy principles. That is what we need at the federal level and that is what we are championing here in Queensland. We will continue to work hard to ensure we look for economic and job opportunities in Queensland because we on this side of the House are interested in creating the jobs of the future in Queensland.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Before calling the next questioner, I acknowledge the presence in the gallery of St Bernard's school at Upper Mount Gravatt in the electorate of Mansfield.

### Works for Queensland

**Mrs LAUGA:** My question is of the Premier and Minister for Trade. Will the Premier update the House on the government's Works for Queensland program and the jobs and new infrastructure it is delivering in regional Queensland?

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I thank the member for Keppel for that question. Works for Queensland is having a wonderful impact across regional communities right across our state. It is a signature program of my government—one we picked up after consulting with mayors across the state in terms of how we can get people into employment faster and grow jobs in local communities while also giving local communities the infrastructure they need.

Speaking of infrastructure, I know that the member for Keppel was very pleased to open the new lagoon at Yeppoon last weekend. It is great for the local community. I remember seeing it under construction. I know that the Deputy Premier was very much part of helping to get some of that resilience money needed to see that project delivered. I look forward to visiting the lagoon the next time I am in Keppel.

The first \$200 million spent under Works for Queensland saw some 8,443 local jobs supported across Queensland. That is 2,000 more than was originally estimated. The next \$200 million funding round is already rolling out, with 65 eligible councils. The latest job reports from councils show that from round 2, with almost \$20 million invested, 1,300 jobs have been created. I know that the Minister for Local Government is very enthusiastic about these results because even more jobs will be created across regional Queensland.

This is a government that backs jobs in regional Queensland. There are projects being delivered right across the state. I mention Morgan Park. The member for Gladstone has things happening in his area. There is the Tom Jeffrey Park in Agnes Water. In Cairns, \$750,000 is going towards the Cairns Regional Council Centenary Lakes Nature Play area. In Townsville there is \$2.5 million being spent. In Mackay—we are going to Mackay next week; I am looking forward to that—there is \$783,000 to fund a playground upgrade, shade structure, roadworks and landscaping at Queens Park. I look forward to speaking with the mayor about that when we are in Mackay next week.

Works for Queensland is a signature program. We will continue to roll it out because, at the end of the day, there is nothing more important than making sure we have infrastructure. Recently I was at Longreach, where I saw the play equipment that has been put in place by the council through Works for Queensland. When I travel up to the cape communities I see infrastructure being put in place there. Everywhere I go I see Works for Queensland signs. I pay tribute to the Deputy Premier for rolling out this program and making sure it was implemented when she was minister. The new Minister for Local Government knows the benefits of this program. It is about time those opposite got on board and supported Works for Queensland.

### Gold Coast Commonwealth Games, Security

**Mr MANDER:** My question is to the Minister for the Commonwealth Games. I table an email from Wilson Security to a Commonwealth Games security guard which states—

As time sheets were not managed consistently by Goldoc it has made it difficult for us to verify hours worked and make prompt payment.

*Tabled paper:* Email, dated 13 May 2018, regarding the Commonwealth Games [708].

Why has Goldoc's incompetence left workers underpaid and out of pocket? Will the minister say whether this is the kind of wage theft that the Premier railed against on Labour Day?

**Ms JONES:** Coming from a member of a cabinet that sacked more than 20,000 people, give me a break! This is a very serious matter.

**Ms Palaszczuk:** No wages were paid.

**Ms JONES:** Yes, no wages are paid when you are unemployed. You do not get a wage. You do not get an income. The member for Everton will never escape—

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order!

**Ms JONES:** I understand it was 14,000. I would like to correct the record. The member for Everton will never escape the record of when he was in cabinet, when he made the decision to do away with the wages of thousands of Queenslanders—constituents of his whom he would not meet with but who would come to my campaign office and cry on my shoulder because he sacked them.

This is a very serious matter and one about which I have spoken with the CEO of Goldoc. I have been informed that Goldoc is doing—

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Members to my left!

**Ms JONES:** I am heartened that they care about people's wages, for the first time in the 20 years I have been involved in politics. Goldoc is taking this very seriously. I understand that it is working with the security firms that were hired. As the honourable member is aware, this was one of the largest security operations in the history of Australia. I take this opportunity to thank the very strong security workforce who did a fantastic job during the games—a world-class effort. They deserve to be paid. I can inform the House, as the Premier did yesterday, that Goldoc is working with the security firms to ensure those security workers get paid as quickly as possible.

## Screen Industry

**Ms SCANLON:** My question without notice is of the Premier. Will the Premier please update the House on any initiatives in the federal budget for the screen industry in Queensland? Is the Premier aware of any alternative views?

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I thank the member for Gaven for that question. I know that she knows personally how important jobs in the screen industry are for the men, women and families living on the Gold Coast who work in that industry which contributes to the raising of their families.

I went back and did a count of how many times I have written to the federal government when it comes to issues about the screen incentive. I think at last count I had written around a dozen letters to the federal government talking about the need to increase the screen offset allowance. We did not hear those opposite say one word in support of my calls to increase the screen offset allowance. Lo and behold, in the federal budget we finally saw the screen offset allowance. It is not happening this year; it will happen next year. I thank Malcolm Turnbull for finally listening to me and finally listening to Queensland. We on this side of the House stand up for Queensland.

We cannot forget that those opposite were against *Dora the Explorer*. The Leader of the Opposition ridiculed it and thought it was a con. Who is laughing now? It sounds like they are now jumping on the Malcolm Turnbull bandwagon.

Next month when I travel to the United States I will be going back to the film studios in Los Angeles to book in the next blockbuster for next year, now that we know that we have the offset allowance from the federal government. For years we have been fighting for this. We got a no from the federal government. We got a no from the opposition. Finally they have seen sense.

At the end of the day this is about the men and women who work in a whole variety of aspects: it is not just those people who are actors but also the people behind the scenes and the people who build—

**Ms Bates** interjected.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** So you are against it, member for Mudgeeraba, are you?

**Mr SPEAKER:** Pause the clock. Member for Mudgeeraba, member for Warrego, member for Toowoomba South and member for Gympie: please cease your interjections or you will be warned under standing orders.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I also know some senior LNP ministers were in favour of the screen offset and were privately talking to me about how much they did support it. I am pleased now that finally we do have a cooperative arrangement to deliver those long-term, permanent secure jobs for Queenslanders who work in the—

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** Always whingeing.

**Honourable members** interjected.

*(Time expired)*

### **Independent Public Schools, Review**

**Mr BLEIJIE:** My question without notice is directed to the Premier. In the last sitting we exposed Labor's secret review into independent public schools after the government did not inform schools—

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Members to my right, the question will be heard in silence. The Premier will have an opportunity to respond. Member for Kawana, please start your question again.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** My question without notice is directed to the Premier. In the last sitting we exposed Labor's secret review into independent public schools after the government did not inform schools, their councils or parents about the process.

**Mr BAILEY:** I rise to a point of order. You have made previous rulings about questions not being littered with political argument. I would attest that this is a question that is—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member, please resume your seat. I will listen to the question. I will have the question heard in full before I determine whether there are any matters in the standing orders being offended.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** My question without notice is directed to the Premier. In the last sitting week we exposed Labor's secret review into independent public schools after the government did not inform schools, their councils or parents about the process. I now table another secret review conducted in 2015 into independent public schools by the former education minister, the member for Cooper.

*Tabled paper: Department of Education and Training, Evaluation of the Independent Public School Initiative in Queensland, June 2015* [\[709\]](#).

Will the Premier finally come clean on why the Teachers' Union gets yet another chance to wipe out independent public schools in Queensland?

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I thank the member for Kawana for the question because we did canvass this issue in the last parliament. Let me say very clearly that my understanding is that the review was conducted because the federal government cut the funding, so that was your mates in Canberra. My question is: where is the line item in the federal budget for independent public schools? Where is the federal government's ongoing funding? Where is it? I think you have got egg on your face today.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Premier, please direct your comments through the chair. Leader of the Opposition and Deputy Leader of the Opposition, some of your comments are seemingly a little unbecoming. I would ask you to consider your interjections before making them.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** My understanding was that the federal government had previously committed \$12.8 million that was then cut. What did my government do? We restored that funding, so the state government is picking up the cuts from the federal government. If the member for Kawana is so concerned about this matter, show me the letter that you have written to your federal counterparts—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Premier—

**Ms PALASZCZUK:**—asking for the money to be restored.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I rise to a point of order.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Premier—

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** Where is that letter?

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, you have made plenty of rulings in this place about addressing comments through the chair and I ask you—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Thank you, member, and I will continue to guide the House. I do not need your assistance on that matter.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** Where is the letter from the Leader of the Opposition to Malcolm Turnbull asking for the return of federal government funding to independent schools in Queensland? Where is the letter from the member for Everton as shadow Treasurer about this matter? It is my government that is picking up the federal government cuts when it comes to independent state schools in this state.

**Mr Nicholls** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Clayfield.

**Mr Nicholls** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Clayfield, I warn you under standing orders. I was actually calling your name to get your attention and you continued to interject.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I am always happy to have an interjection from the member for Clayfield because it gives me an opportunity to talk about when he was treasurer and what he did to this state—14,000 jobs—

**Mr Nicholls** interjected.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** Here he comes: 14,000 jobs, the list of the schools, cuts, cuts, cuts, cuts, cuts, cuts. Here he comes. Come in, spinner! Here he comes.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Clayfield, for your protection I would suggest you cease interjecting.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** The only former leader of the opposition who wore a State of Origin cap during the election campaign after the State of Origin. Yes, that is right. People could see right through that. People came up to me and said of the member for Clayfield, ‘Annastacia, did you know that he was the treasurer when Campbell Newman was the premier of this state?’ What a surprise that that came through loud and clear. No-one will forget that the current Leader of the Opposition—and I say ‘current’ Leader of the Opposition—sat around the CBRC table and made those cuts to Queensland families.

*(Time expired)*

**Mr SPEAKER:** I say to all ministers, if there are going to be personal comments or comments directed at particular members, those members are entitled to some recourse. However, for the benefit of the House, I would urge you to refrain from doing so.

## **Distribution of GST**

**Ms RICHARDS:** My question without notice is directed to the Deputy Premier. Will the Deputy Premier update the House about the Commonwealth government’s Productivity Commission review into the GST and the impacts for Queensland?

**Ms TRAD:** I thank the member for Redlands for the question. It is a very important question and one that we have been talking about a bit in this House but, as we deal with the fallout from the federal budget delivered only a matter of days ago, we know that there is an even larger crisis looming for Queensland, and that is in the determination of the federal government—the federal Turnbull LNP government—to change the methodology, to change the rules, around how the GST is distributed right across the country.

We know that the Productivity Commission handed down a draft report and the federal Treasurer, Scott Morrison, asked it to delay its final report until this month. I understand that the report has been finalised and the final report from the Productivity Commission into changes to the distribution of GST has actually been handed over to the federal Treasurer. I also understand that the federal finance minister, Mathias Cormann, has already said to Tasmania that it needs not worry because nothing is going to change in terms of its GST.

Scott Morrison was here this week. He could have given Queensland the same comfort, but he chose not to. I understand that Malcolm Turnbull, the Prime Minister, is in Queensland today, as the Premier said. I think he is visiting Longman. We are calling on the Prime Minister to give reassurance to Queensland that the federal Turnbull LNP government will not cut our GST further. We know that the worst-case scenario put forward by the Productivity Commission in its draft report was a \$1.6 billion cut to our share of GST each and every year. That means 5,000 fewer nurses, 5,000 fewer teachers, 3,000 fewer police officers and more than 1,000 fewer firefighters. Even Michael Wilcox, the secretary of the Grants Commission, said that Queensland will have to raise additional revenue or cut services if this option was implemented by the federal government.

We need to know from the Prime Minister, who today is in Queensland in the Longman electorate, if he is going to be the prime minister who rips off Queensland by \$1.6 billion each and every year from our fair share of the GST. Today, he needs to come clean. It is okay for the federal finance minister to give reassurances to Tasmania. The Prime Minister is in Queensland and he needs to confirm to Queensland that he is not going to rip us off. I call on those opposite to join with us and make sure that Queensland is not ripped off by Malcolm Turnbull.

*(Time expired)*

### Independent Public Schools, Review

**Mrs WILSON:** My question is to the Minister for Education. During the last sitting week the Minister for Education told the House that she was obliged to review the independent public schools, but she did not tell the House that the previous education minister has already held a review. Why did the minister not tell the House about the 2015 review into independent public schools? Will the minister now tell the House about the government's plan to curtail autonomy?

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member, there are two parts to that question. I will allow the question. However, I will give the minister latitude as to how she wishes to answer that question.

**Ms GRACE:** I thank the member for the question. The evaluation that occurred in 2015 was an internal review to just have a look at how it was going.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Ms GRACE:** The members opposite can laugh all they like. It was built in to see how it was going, how we could refine it. It is done all the time. The members opposite should ask the previous education minister, who is sitting there. Let me be very clear. This is an independent review that has gone through a tendering process. It is an independent review of the IPS, which is part of the framework.

In relation to this matter, I am really concerned about the misleading comments that keep coming from those opposite. I cannot be clearer: it has been clearly established that this evaluation would occur. It has been on the website for years. Once the quota of 250 independent public schools was established in 2017, this independent review was built into the framework. There are two ex-principals on this side who know exactly what is happening.

In relation to independent public schools, those opposite are being misleading. I have a letter from the Leader of the Opposition and the shadow minister for education saying that they have grave concerns that the independent public schools are going to be scrapped. There is no suggestion that that is the case. Last Friday, I wrote to the schools and the principals establishing that that is the case. The members opposite should not come in here with nonsense about scrapping independent public schools or misleading the House with statements that are not correct.

I suggest that the member for Pumicestone gets her story right, as well as the Leader of the Opposition and the shadow minister for industrial relations. I wrote to the principals. They are very well informed about what is happening with independent public schools. In my letter—in writing to them by email on Friday—I made the statement that there is no suggestion that this process will lead to the end of the initiative.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I rise to a point of order. I ask that the minister table the two letters that she is referring to: the letter that I sent to IPS and her response that she is reading from. If the minister could table both letters, that would be appreciated.

**Ms GRACE:** Mr Speaker, I determine whether or not I table copies, but I am happy to do it.

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 11 May 2018, from the Leader of the Opposition, Mrs Deb Frecklington MP, and shadow minister for education and shadow minister for industrial relations, Mr Jarrod Bleijie MP, to principals regarding independent public schools [710].

*Tabled paper:* Document titled 'Subject: A message from the Minister for Education: Independent Public School Review' [711].

The members opposite should know what their letters contain and they should apologise to the principals. Let me tell the shadow minister for education what the feedback is. It has not gone down very well. All I can say to him is to keep writing, because he is doing a really good job in getting those principals on side!

I can say to members what has been cut for sure and that is funding from the federal government. The federal government has walked away entirely. The members opposite should be saying—

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The minister said that it is up to her to table the documents. Did the minister advise whether she is tabling, in fact, the two documents? I have not seen her table them.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Kawana, you rose to a point of order and I heard your point of order. The minister is quite correct in that she is able to determine whether or not she tables a document unless compelled to do so. Then it is up to the minister to respond. I took your point of order. I heard your point of order. The minister has made her own decision. She has seven seconds left on the clock. I encourage the minister to use those seven seconds.

**Mr HART:** I rise to a point of order.

**Ms GRACE:** I have a point of order—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Minister, you need to resume your seat.

**Mr HART:** Mr Speaker, you have made many rulings about waving props around and members tabling them. I have been forced to table many—

**Mr SPEAKER:** There is no point of order.

**Ms GRACE:** The member should sit down and take it like a member of parliament, because he deserves it.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member, you are very close to a frivolous point of order. The minister is not waving any prop around that I can see. She appears to be reading from documents. If that is to be the new standard, then many members in this House would be offending the standing orders.

**Ms GRACE:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. There have been continual interruptions on frivolous points of order. I believe it is high time we set a standard in here. There is seven seconds left and we have had two frivolous points of order. I indicated that I would table those documents. That did not stop the member for Kawana from rising to a frivolous point of order, as well as the member for Burleigh Heads.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Minister, if you are going to make suggestions as to the way the House should operate, I suggest that they be suggestions and leave it at that. As Speaker, it is up to me to rule whether or not points of order are frivolous.

**Ms GRACE:** I end by saying that the federal government has walked away. Where is the letter to Malcolm Turnbull from those opposite? I bet there is not one.

### Planning System

**Mr O'ROURKE:** My question is to the Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning. Could the minister advise the House how the Palaszczuk government is working to improve planning in Queensland and are there alternative approaches?

**Mr DICK:** I thank the member for Rockhampton for his question and his interest in better planning not only for his community but also for Queensland. Today, I am pleased to announce a second round of the Queensland government's Innovation and Improvement Fund, which supports councils with innovation and planning. That means that Queensland councils that have a passion for innovation and planning can share in \$1.95 million of funding.

Previous rounds have been a great success, with funding of \$2.55 million approved for 33 projects benefiting 40 councils across the state. I would like to remind the member for Rockhampton—and all members—that this fund benefits councils across Queensland for a variety of innovative planning ideas. This fund is a great example of the Palaszczuk government working logically and working locally to build a better planning system.

It appears that not everyone can work logically or locally. Recently, I came across a copy of a newsletter from the member for Everton, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. It shows him standing lonely on the side of the road. In that newsletter the Deputy Leader of the Opposition says that he will be petitioning me as the planning minister about what he describes as overdevelopment in his community. I had a newsflash for the opposition members yesterday. It came as a surprise to them that unions have been involved in the Labor Party for 127 years. They were a bit shocked about that. Here is another newsflash: those overdevelopment decisions are made by the Brisbane City Council, which is controlled by the LNP. What a surprise for the member for Everton!

On the weekend the member for Everton was at the preselection with Councillor Julian Simmonds when they were working together to terminate the career of Jane Prentice. It is a pity that he did not take that opportunity to talk to the planning chair. He did not. He could have talked to Councillor Amanda Cooper, who is a former planning chair, but she does not talk to him because she is worried about her preselection. Of course, she could have raised the issue with other Brisbane City Council councillors. Just so that we do not get into a mindless interplay of points of order about tabling documents, I will table those documents.

*Tabled paper:* Document titled 'Tim Mander MP, Member for Everton: Everton News Autumn/Winter 2018' [712].

*Tabled paper:* Media release, dated 14 November 2012, from the then Minister for Local Government, Community Recovery and Resilience, Hon. David Crisafulli, titled 'Ipswich Mayor backs Council reform' [713].

There was another member who was interested in innovation and that was the member for Broadwater when he was the local government minister. He said there were a number of hoops that mayors and councillors had to jump through. He changed the law to make it easier for mayors. One of the mayors said that under the old legislation they could not ask their CEO to do something without keeping a record of that directive. How much red tape is that? That was Paul Pisasale. It does not matter whether the opposition is led either by the member for Everton, the member for Broadwater or, by some miracle, the member for Nanango, one cannot trust the LNP with local government and planning.

## Safe Schools Program

**Dr ROBINSON:** My question is to the Premier. I table media reports of federal Labor leader Bill Shorten refusing to rule out reintroducing the Safe Schools program into our schools.

*Tabled paper:* Article from the *Australian*, dated 15 May 2018, titled 'Bill Shorten refuses to rule out reintroducing Safe Schools program' [714].

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Members to my right, the question will be heard in silence. The Premier will have the opportunity to respond.

**Dr ROBINSON:** Will the Premier pick up the phone to her federal Labor leader and tell him that Queenslanders do not want our kids indoctrinated with Labor's radical gender theory and gender fluidity?

**Mrs D'ATH:** I rise to a point of order. We are continuing to have very lengthy questions. There are imputations in that question. I ask that it be ruled out of order.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Leader of the House, I did not detect that there were imputations against an individual. There may be a point of view, but I do not believe there to be imputations. However, I will listen very carefully to the Premier's answer relative to the question.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** That is not taught in Queensland schools, let me say that from the outset. Let me also say this: what I do want taught in our schools is respectful relationships. I want families to feel that their children are supported in the school environment. I think that is incredibly important. Through the work that we have been doing around the prevention of domestic and family violence we know how important it is to have respectful relationships taught in schools.

Through our bipartisan committee we are looking at cyberbullying. I think we need to set the standards when it comes to cyberbullying. I was quite concerned last week to see the shadow minister for education tweet in what I thought was a very unprofessional—not of a standard—way when in terms of comments made about myself, Minister Jones and the Deputy Premier. Perhaps those opposite should think about the way in which they conduct themselves on Twitter when it comes to setting a standard of respect for women and respect for people.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I will call it out when I see fit. This was from the shadow minister for education who then did a press conference trying to defend it. When we are talking about standards and respect let us start here in this House and call it out for what it is. How can we expect children not to be cyberbullying—

**Mr Nicholls:** What about Jurvetson?

**Ms Jones:** What happened to innocent until proven guilty?

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order, members!

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I think the standards need to be lifted everywhere.

### Innovation

**Mr POWER:** 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 start-ups in regional Queensland?

**Ms JONES:** I thank the honourable member for the question. Before I answer that question I acknowledge in the House here today the great work of the Brisbane City Council in lighting up the Story Bridge in rainbow colours. Member for Oodgeroo, you will be really excited about this, because today is the International Day Against Homophobia, Transphobia and Biphobia. I hope that you become as enlightened as the bridge of our city. Shame on you!

**Mr SPEAKER:** Minister, put your comments through the chair.

**Ms JONES:** Sorry, I am a bit emotional about this. I do not like homophobia.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** I will wait for silence, members. Minister, in future I would ask that you resume your seat if I am giving a ruling.

**Ms JONES:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. We are enlightened and innovative on this side of the House. I thank the honourable member for Logan for his question. I know how passionate he is about the future of children growing up in his local community. In actual fact, when I was education minister he lobbied me to have an independent public school in Logan. Under the LNP not one school in Logan was an independent public school. There are a lot in Ashgrove. In actual fact, the Ashgrove electorate had more independent public schools than any other electorate in Queensland. The record of those opposite is that there were none in Logan. The LNP did not want to put one in Logan.

The member for Logan also fought really hard to get a brand-new school in his local community. I mention this because all the new schools we have built, even the primary schools, are built with science labs because we want kids from the earliest years to understand the importance of STEM. In addition to that, through our Innovate program we are working with regional start-ups and regional start-up organisations right across this state. We know that this is creating jobs.

Recently it was reported in the *Courier-Mail* that under the Advance Queensland program up to 10,000 jobs have been created in our state. We are very excited about that. On this side of the House all of my colleagues have been out there talking about how important it is for jobs to support innovation.

Unsurprisingly, the shadow minister for innovation, the member for Burleigh, criticised the program and said governments should not be about picking winners or one idea over another. He should probably talk to his colleague, the member for Mermaid Beach. He appeared in his local chamber of commerce newsletter talking up a winner—the cable car at Springwood. Do you think he declared that he has a personal interest in that project? That he would actually get a financial benefit if we were to kick in dough towards that project? No! That is the kind of transparency we have come to expect from the LNP.

**Ms Bates** interjected.

**Ms JONES:** I take the interjection from the member for Mudgeeraba. She actually wrote to me asking me to help out a start-up in her local community. You have got to get to where you are. Pick a winner, get on the right page. We know you are divided.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Through the chair.

**Ms JONES:** You are divided on innovation, you are divided on your leaders and you are in deep, deep trouble. We know that women are the most in danger on your side.

*(Time expired)*

## Waste Levy

**Mr CRISAFULLI:** My question is to the Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef, Minister for Science and Minister for the Arts. It has been two months since Labor announced its waste tax and yet, with less than one month to go until the budget, Queenslanders still do not know how it will work, what will be taxed, or any of the details. Will the minister now concede she has bungled the implementation of Labor's new tax—

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Members to my right!

**Mr CRISAFULLI:**—and now adopt the LNP's position to rule it out?

**Ms ENOCH:** I thank the member for an actual question about the environment. It is fantastic. I know it is very difficult for those opposite to understand this concept, but consultation is something that you do when you have made some decisions about where you are going forward. We have been working with stakeholders.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The question came very close to having an inference. I will be listening to the minister's answer, but I will give her latitude to answer that. A reminder to members on my left that a question has been asked and there is not an opportunity to continually repeat and ask the same question via interjection.

**Ms ENOCH:** We have been consulting with people from across various industries to ensure that we get this right for Queensland. It is imperative that we get the right comprehensive waste strategy for our state. That will be underpinned by a levy and, of course, a thing called the budget will be coming up very shortly. I can tell the House that in the budget we will see some revelations about all of that.

**Ms Palaszczuk:** Not one question of the Treasurer about the budget. Chickens!

**Ms ENOCH:** I take that interjection from the Premier: there has not been one question to the Treasurer about the upcoming budget. What a surprise. I will be really clear: this is an incredibly important body of work that we need to be focusing on in this state. We have an incredible opportunity to really focus on the circular economy in this state and to create jobs for Queenslanders, which is what this side of the House is focused on.

I remind those opposite that it was actually the member for Broadwater, when he was the local government minister, who was part of a government that stripped out the provisions for a waste levy in the state, leaving us the only state on mainland Australia to not have a waste levy. That has not gone unnoticed at a national level or by their colleagues across the border. In fact, the New South Wales premier at the time and the New South Wales Minister for Environment have both advocated that Queensland should get on board and get a waste levy, which they have said would stop the trucks. Members of their own party in other states and territories support some harmonisation across the country and that there be a levy in place in Queensland. Of course, that levy would underpin a comprehensive strategy, which is being negotiated and worked through with stakeholders, because we believe in consultation and that is what we have been doing.

## Wage Theft

**Ms LINARD:** My question is of the Minister for Education and Minister for Industrial Relations. Will the minister inform the House how the Queensland government is responding to the issue of wage theft in Queensland?

**Ms GRACE:** I thank the member for Nudgee for the question. I know that she is concerned about this issue in her electorate and that she will do an excellent job chairing the committee that will look at the incidence of this throughout Queensland. When workers head off to work each day, we want them to return home safely and they expect to be paid fairly in accordance with industrial laws. Unfortunately, for too many workers that is not the reality.

During a period of historically low wages growth, there is an even bigger problem whereby employers are not paying workers according to their industrial responsibilities, whether that be through unpaid superannuation, unpaid penalty rates, unauthorised deductions from pay, unpaid work trials, the misuse of ABNs and sham contracting to deny workers their proper entitlements. An area that we really need to concentrate on is where young people are asked to provide an ABN when, quite clearly, they are being employed as a worker. That is becoming a national disgrace. I can talk about that from firsthand experience as my own daughter was placed in that position when she moved to Melbourne recently to take on a job.

**Ms Jones:** Lucky she had you as a mum.

**Ms GRACE:** Exactly; I take that interjection. She is a young person who was not conducting a business. She had just moved interstate. She was asked to provide an ABN in order to obtain a job. She was paid in accordance with that and denied her industrial entitlements. That has to stop. It is becoming a national disgrace and we want to know how far the issue is extending into Queensland.

We want a comprehensive inquiry in relation to this matter. Quite clearly, the federal government is underfunding its regulator, the ombudsman. I notice the federal budget provides extra resources for their ideological creation, the Registered Organisation Commission, and hasn't that backfired! They are investigating more employers' associations, but no unions yet. They also have extra money for the ABCC, but nothing for the Fair Work Ombudsman to combat the scourge of wage theft.

On Labour Day, I was proud to stand beside the Premier when we announced that a motion will be moved in parliament this week to conduct a comprehensive public inquiry into wage theft. I look forward to the findings of that inquiry. We want to shine a light on how far this is extending throughout Queensland and what can be done about it. We will be advocating with the federal government to put more resources into this area. When they hostilely took over Queensland's state industrial relations system, they needed to also put money into the regulation of this area. Quite clearly, they do not have enough responsibility.

**Ms Bates:** Cameron Dick handed it over.

**Ms GRACE:** I hear the interjection about giving it over. Those opposite have no idea about industrial relations, but we will get to the bottom of wage theft in this state.

### **First Home Owners' Grant**

**Mr DAMETTO:** My question is to the Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships. The government's first home buyers grant scheme, which applies to new homes, inadvertently discriminates against homebuyers in non-metropolitan areas where economies are flattening. New housing developments are few and far between in those regional areas. Will the minister commit to investigating amendments that will allow the grant of \$20,000 to be accessible to new home buyers of established homes in smaller regional centres?

**Ms TRAD:** I thank the member for Hinchinbrook for the first non-government question related to the budget. It says quite a bit about the quality of the Liberal National Party in Queensland when Katter's Australian Party beats them to the finish line in terms of tackling the issues that matter to Queenslanders, particularly Queenslanders living in regional Queensland. Therefore, I thank the member for Hinchinbrook and Katter's Australian Party for asking the first sensible non-government question in the chamber here today.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Deputy Premier, I draw you back to the question that was asked.

**Ms TRAD:** The Queensland First Home Owners' Grant is an important program that seeks to make housing affordable to first home buyers. I understand that it is replicated in many other jurisdictions right across Australia.

I give the member for Hinchinbrook an undertaking to have a look at some of the metrics around the distribution of the Queensland First Home Owners' Grant, to see at how they are geographically allocated across the state. He makes a very good point in terms of the First Home Owners' Grant because, of course, it was also used as an economic measurement or a lever to ensure that construction activity continued in key areas across the state, so that we had workers engaged in construction as well as first home buyers engaged in purchasing their first home. The member for Hinchinbrook has raised a relatively important issue. I commit to looking at the geographical dispersion of the First Home Owners' Grant and have a conversation with him going forward.

I thank the member for Hinchinbrook for the question. It is the first sensible non-government question we have received in the chamber today.

### **Queensland Health, Flu Season**

**Mr WHITING:** My question is to the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services. Will the minister inform the House what the Queensland government is doing to help Queensland public hospitals keep up with demand this winter in Brisbane's northern suburbs and across the state?

**Dr MILES:** I thank the member for Bancroft for his ongoing interest in the delivery of health services, particularly in Brisbane's northern and outer northern suburbs. Last flu season, public hospitals in the south-east, that is, West Moreton, Gold Coast, Children's Health Queensland, Metro South and, of course, Metro North, which includes Caboolture Hospital, saw 215,000 confirmed cases of the flu. That record level of flu presentations put enormous pressure on Queensland's emergency departments, the Queensland Ambulance Service and, indeed, the entire health system.

I would like to take a minute to recognise the efforts of the staff across our health services who really did an incredible job of dealing with those hundreds of thousands of Queenslanders sick with the flu as well as the Queenslanders in our hospitals with many other ailments. Already this year we are seeing concerning signs that it may be another record flu season. We have already had 4,000 confirmed cases and the peak of the season is well in front of us.

Today I am pleased to announce that the Palaszczuk government will invest \$10 million in a winter beds strategy for 2018. This \$10 million will deliver 90 additional beds across hospital services where they are needed to deal with that demand. This will support the work of the Ambulance Service and our emergency department doctors and nurses. All of the hardworking professionals across the health service will be supported with these additional funds and these additional beds, including at the Caboolture Hospital, which I know the member for Bancroft and the member for Morayfield are particularly concerned about.

For both of those members I can provide some exciting news. There is a special visitor in their neighbourhood today. The member for Nanango's hero, the man who can do no wrong, Malcolm Turnbull, is in Caboolture today. While he is there perhaps he could take the chance to explain to Longman voters why he has not paid the \$128 million he owes the Metro North Hospital and Health Service for services from 2016-17. Perhaps he could explain why his cuts to Medicare are driving people into our emergency departments. More than a third of the people presenting at the Caboolture emergency department would have been better off visiting a general practitioner but they cannot because they are inaccessible and unaffordable because of the cuts made by the federal LNP government. Those are the questions that voters in Longman will be asking Malcolm Turnbull today.

### **M1, Speed Limit**

**Mr HART:** My question without notice is to the Premier. In the next two weeks the government will decide whether to permanently reduce the speed limit on the M1 following a farcical trial period during the Commonwealth Games. Will the Premier now rule out permanently reducing the speed limit on the M1 to 100 kilometres an hour?

**Mr SPEAKER:** Premier, you have one minute to answer that question.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I thank the member for Burleigh for the question. My understanding is that there was a review that was committed to being—

**Mr Bailey** interjected.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** On the Tuesday after the games it was back to normal, was it not? It was back to normal.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order!

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** Actually, Mr Speaker—

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr Boothman** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Theodore, I was calling the House to order. I caution you about your interjections. I take this opportunity to mention that the former member for Pumicestone, Mr Rick Williams, is in the gallery observing proceedings today.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr Perrett** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Gympie, you are warned under the standing orders. I was calling the House to order and you continued to interject.

**SPEAKER'S STATEMENT****Bells in Parliamentary Precinct**

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Members, as I mentioned earlier, there will need to be a test of the bell system to ensure that it is working in case of a real political emergency later. With your indulgence, we will ring the bells for one minute to ensure that the problem has been located and remedied.

*The bells having been rung—*

It appears the problem has been remedied. I thank you again for your indulgence.

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT (COUNCILLOR COMPLAINTS) AND OTHER  
LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL****LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTORAL (IMPLEMENTING STAGE 1 OF  
BELCARRA) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL****Allocation of Time Limit Order**

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (11.14 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

1. That so much of the standing and sessional orders be suspended to allow all remaining stages of the Local Government (Councillor Complaints) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the Local Government Electoral (Implementing Stage 1 of Belcarra) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill to be completed by 5 pm on this day's sitting including:
  - (a) consideration in detail on the bills to be completed by 4.55 pm
  - (b) questions on third readings to be put by 4.57 pm
  - (c) questions on long titles to be put by 4.59 pm
2. At the time so specified, Mr Speaker shall put all remaining questions necessary to complete consideration of the bills, including clauses en bloc and any amendments to be moved by the minister in charge of the bill en bloc, without further amendment or debate.

This motion is being moved because what we have seen in the last two sitting weeks of this parliament is a deliberate strategy of those opposite to delay the business of this House.

**Mrs Frecklington:** Why don't you support democracy?

**Mrs D'ATH:** I take the interjection of the Leader of the Opposition—'Why don't you support democracy'?

**Mr SPEAKER:** Speak through the chair, Attorney-General.

**Mrs D'ATH:** It is hard to accept that there is any sincerity in those comments when those opposite claim that the delays in bills being considered in this House are as a consequence of the change of sitting hours. We heard that in the debate last sitting week and this week

**Mrs Frecklington** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Leader of the Opposition, you will have an opportunity to respond, if you so wish. Until then I will hear the Leader of the House.

**Mrs D'ATH:** I take those interjections. The Leader of the Opposition would like everyone outside this parliament to believe that what has been happening over the last two weeks is the normal processes of this chamber every sitting week. We know that that is not true. Even in the last parliament with a minority government and very serious bills before the House we did not see that strategy from the opposition. They did not have every single member speak during consideration in detail.

**Mr Hunt** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Nicklin.

**Mrs D'ATH:** We are not talking about genuine questions being asked or genuine points of clarification being sought from the minister in consideration in detail. We are talking about rehashing the same points that members, including the shadow minister, made during the second reading stage. We saw sheets with speaking points being circulated last night. Some members struggled to understand what they were reading out and to explain what they were saying.

**Mr McArdle** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Caloundra.

**Mrs D'ATH:** I come back to the lack of sincerity of those on the other side of the House when they talk about democracy and the sitting hours of this House. Can I remind those opposite—the LNP—that when we introduced these new sitting hours we proposed that there be 26 hours of sittings each sitting week and, of that, 16½ hours be set aside for government business. Those on the other side might remember that they moved an amendment putting forward their own sessional orders. I remind all those members on the other side who have been carrying on about the new sitting hours of this House and how they somehow infringe their rights to be heard that the LNP's version meant that we would be sitting for 24½ hours each week with 15½ hours of government business. That is fewer sitting hours and fewer hours for government business.

The Leader of the Opposition and the Manager of Opposition Business should not come in here and claim that the changes to the sitting hours are somehow to blame for the fact that they are dragging consideration in detail out for hours so that they can try to embarrass the government into not passing a bill. Are we about good policy or good politics in this chamber?

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mrs D'ATH:** What you are doing is not good politics. The LNP would like people to believe that it is somehow going to leave egg on the face of the government if we do not get this bill through.

**Mr Molhoek:** It is not about egg on faces; it is about terrible legislation.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Southport.

**Mrs D'ATH:** I take that interjection from the member for Southport, claiming that it is terrible legislation, except they are seeking to support a large proportion of this legislation and amend and expand it. My question is: does the LNP believe that it is appropriate to drag this out so that potentially this legislation does not pass until June, the next sitting week—

**Mr Molhoek** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Southport. Leader of the House, I want to make sure that you do not stray into discussing the bills before the House in your contribution.

**Mrs D'ATH:**—leaving serious questions in doubt about the public's confidence in local government? We need to resolve these issues. It is important legislation. Every member of this House has had the opportunity to speak in the second reading debate, if they sought to do so. There is no validity to the arguments on that side about democracy. Democracy is putting proper debate before the House, arguing the points and passing or considering legislation.

**Mr Lister** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Southern Downs. I will repeat my warning to members. If you wish to rise to your feet to speak in this debate, you may have an opportunity to do so. Until then, cease your interjections.

**Mrs D'ATH:** Again, those on the other side would have the public believe that this is just the normal process of this parliament, but this is a deliberate act.

**Mrs Frecklington:** No, it's not.

**Mrs D'ATH:** I take that interjection—'No, it's not.' I welcome those on the other side to do a bit of research and come back to this House and tell us how many occasions in the last parliament every single speaker on the opposition side spoke in consideration in detail. They should put it out there, if they want to claim that this is not deliberate.

**Mr Molhoek** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Southport, you are warned under standing orders. This is the third time I have had to speak to you. This is not a conversation; this is a house of debate.

**Mr MOLHOEK:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The Attorney-General is making a direct attack on those of us on this side of the House. I am a former councillor.

**Mr SPEAKER:** No. Member, there has been no personal reflection on you. The member is entitled to make a contribution and be heard.

**Mrs D'ATH:** Again, for those who claim that their rights are being infringed in some way and that democracy is being harmed by these new sitting hours, there was approximately 15 hours of debate on the vegetation management bill. This parliament has an obligation to the people of Queensland. Every elected member of parliament has an obligation to the people of Queensland—that is, to properly consider but not abuse the rights of this parliament.

Those opposite who say, 'It is about our constituents; we have a right,' should explain why they did not feel like they needed to exercise the same right on the serious and organised crime legislation or tackling alcohol fuelled violence or even on compulsory preferential voting. They did not feel the need to speak on behalf of their constituents on every single occasion and have every single member speak. It is an absolute furphy. It is a load of rubbish. This parliament is not going to be held to ransom by the LNP and their cheap politics in this House. We will get on with business.

As Leader of the House, I would like to work with the opposition and the Committee of the Legislative Assembly, like other parliaments do, and sensibly sit down and implement the full model that was considered in the past in relation to the Victorian practices—that is, not just sensible working hours but fixed times for setting of bills so that it is transparent and everyone knows at the start of the week how bills are going to be debated. If the opposition does not want to work with the government to achieve sensible practices then we will make sure sensible practices are implemented in this House.

I really hope some common sense starts to prevail on the other side because we have a job to do. People are sick of this cheap, petty politics. We need to lift above this and we need to get our job done. We can have sensible debate. Those opposite are not going to hold this parliament to ransom. They are not going to hold Queensland to ransom in not letting legislation be properly considered and voted on by the House.

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (11.25 am): What we are increasingly seeing now with the Palaszczuk Labor government is a dictatorship in this House. They say everyone has the right to speak, but then they want to choose who speaks and how long they speak for. That is not a democratic institution. This is a failing of the Leader of the House and the government. They came in here weeks ago with this guise of family-friendly hours and we have now had three weeks in a row of guillotined debate. It is not because they have so much work to do. The reality is that they cannot manage the time. Not once this week has the Leader of the House come to me and said, 'How many speakers do you have? This is the time frame we are looking at—not once. This is now Thursday of a three-day sitting week and we have a new guillotine debate.

We only have to remind members in this House how many times the Labor Party waltzed in here over the years and whinged and whinged and whinged about one or two guillotine debates. We are seeing weekly, if not daily, guillotining by this Labor government. As I said yesterday, it shows the arrogance of the Premier that she does not have to abide by what she did in opposition when in government. No, she is above the standards that she set or wanted to set in opposition! She is above all of that now because she has a majority, and when she has a majority she will dictate who speaks, how long they speak for and what they speak about. It will not be long before the Premier comes to this side of the House and hands us her speaking points, saying, 'You're only allowed to speak on this if you use the Labor Party speaking points.' This is disgusting. Weeks and weeks ago when the government had no bills to discuss and then when the committees were getting bills through, we warned the government that they would not have sufficient time with the new hours—

**Mrs D'Ath:** Why did you suggest fewer hours?

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take that interjection. We debated a guillotine motion last week. We stayed here till 10 o'clock. Remember what the Leader of the House said? It was so that everyone could go home and regional members could book their airfares and so forth. She does not want to make the same mistake she did last week by moving that motion at 20 minutes to six. Now we are moving that motion in the morning so that people have time to adjust flights and get home.

The reality is that the Leader of the House cannot manage the time in this place. In her contribution the Leader of the House talked about consideration in detail. It is called consideration in detail for a reason. It is not called 'consideration in not-so-much detail'. How does one consider something in detail if one is being guillotined—

**Mr Minnikin:** Hasn't been to a committee.

**Mr BLEIJIE:**—and the amendments have not been to a committee? How is one able to consider clauses in detail when one is cut off, when one is told by the Leader of the House who shall speak and who shall not speak on this debate?

Two weeks ago the Leader of the House said, ‘The opposition has to pick who it wants to speak on these matters,’ and I said no. If an opposition member in this House wants to talk about the undue influence the trade union has on the Labor government, then let them I say.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Kawana, I issue you with the same warning I issued to the Leader of the House. I ask that you do not stray into talking about bills before the House.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. It happens from time to time, and this is the whole point of debate in democracy. A Labor member may get up and say something which triggers an opinion or a view—an opposing or a supporting view—from another member of parliament. That member of parliament may not have considered that they wanted to speak on a clause or a particular part of the legislation, but this is the people’s house of debate and one would expect that we would have debate.

The Labor Party can no longer hold the line that they have the moral integrity, accountability and high standards that they wanted to set in opposition, because I have no doubt that we are going to see this time and time again. I would say that the Leader of the House ought to be embarrassed that we have not even voted on one bill this week, and that is despite the fact that we have cognated two bills. Imagine if the government did not cognate the two bills. We would not have even got through one of the bills.

**Mr Mander:** They would have guillotined it earlier.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take the interjection from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. They would have guillotined it earlier. If we look at the comments and contributions—

**Mr Minnikin** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Pause the clock. Member for Chatsworth, you are a repeat offender in terms of not using members’ appropriate titles in this House. You are warned under the standing orders. I really do not want to keep repeating myself to you on so many occasions.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I can recall between 2009 and 2012 when the member for Woodridge was in this place. He took a holiday in 2012.

**Mr Mander:** He was the member for Greenslopes.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** That is right; then he went to Woodridge. I can remember the comments that he would make about guillotining debates. He basically said that it was corruption; it was a dictatorship. The member for Woodridge would say all these sorts of things. Hasn’t it changed now that he is back on the ministerial leather in this place? Guillotining debates, I am sorry to say, is the norm now unfortunately. It appears to be the norm. I take the hand signal interjection from the member for Scenic Rim. Good luck to Hansard on putting that in there! What the member was trying to say with his two digits was that there have been two debates on the guillotine. I say to the honourable member for Scenic Rim that there have been a lot more.

Not only have we had debate guillotined; we have had motions to debate those particular guillotines guillotined. We have had people cut short midsentence. I am waiting for the member for Woodridge to jump up and move the motion that I no longer be heard, as the Minister for Tourism did to the member for Coomera, who was halfway through his contribution. We were having a debate about members having an opportunity to debate in this House, and halfway through the honourable member’s contribution he was cut short without any further debate just because the Minister for Tourism, the member for Cooper, did not like what she was hearing.

I look across the chamber and I see the former leader of the House, the member for Sandgate. He would never have done this. Those in this place will know that when it comes to complimenting the Labor Party I do not dish compliments out often. It is rare.

**Mrs Frecklington:** I have never heard you do one.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I am sure I have done one or two, but I will pay tribute to the former leader of the House because I do believe that he had respect for this place and for this institution.

**Mr Mander:** That is why they dumped him.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take that interjection. Perhaps he had too much respect for the institution—not Labor's current disrespect for the institution—that he no longer serves as Leader of the House. I heard the member for Sandgate say, 'Just you wait,' so I suspect he is going to speak and tell us how important it is to guillotine this debate. He has changed his moral fibre and his view. Perhaps he has changed his view on all these things.

**Mr Mander:** You will have to withdraw the compliment.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I will if that is the case. The reality is this: there are 93 members in this place. The Premier got up this week and talked about young Elizabeth, the five millionth Queenslander to be born. Elizabeth deserves a voice in this place. The five million Queenslanders deserve a voice in this place. I say: let young Elizabeth be heard in this place. If they want to come in here and say how great it is that we have five million Queenslanders and use this place of debate, this House of democracy, then let it show. They are guillotining debate and stopping healthy debate on important legislation. This is very important legislation.

I would say to the Leader of the House it is important because I believe everyone should be heard. This House should not rise until every member who wants to speak has had an opportunity to speak in this place. That is why they are elected. If that is not the view of the government, then why do we sit? Why do 93 members of parliament come to this place? Is it just because the Labor Party say, 'We want you to speak from nine to five?' The community has changed. People work longer than nine to five. Just because we have a lazy Labor government does not mean every other member in this place should be subjected to the same laziness and arrogance that we have seen from the Labor Party.

**Mr SPEAKER:** To all three members, you rose to your feet trying to seek my attention before the member's contribution or time had expired. I caution all of you on doing that. I recognise the Minister for State Development.

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning) (11.36 am): In beginning my contribution to this debate, in my strong support of the Leader of the House's motion, I say in response to the member for Kawana that when it comes to someone who chronically, shamelessly and routinely wastes parliament's time with irrelevant and meandering contributions, I present exhibit A: the member for Kawana.

One of the great errors that members of parliament often make in this House—and it is a mistake that is made day in, day out by the member for Kawana—is the belief that it is their house. Members of this House think this House belongs to them; that this chamber belongs to them; and that the processes and procedures undertaken exist for their benefit. That is the kind of self-regarding self-importance—and don't we see that all the time from the member for Kawana—that is usually the product of ignorance or hubris—

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Members to my left, I listened to the member for Kawana's contribution and I did not detect the same degree of interjections that we are currently hearing, but I do appreciate the minister may be somewhat provocative towards a particular member.

**Mr DICK:** It is the kind of self-regarding self-importance that we hear from members opposite all the time, led by the member for Kawana, that is usually the product of ignorance or hubris and sometimes, as we have seen in the last two sitting weeks from members of the opposition, both. This is the people's house, and those of us who have the privilege to serve here and who have been elected by the people should never forget the responsibility that we have to serve their interests.

We accept that we operate in an adversarial system and that the contest of ideas in a robust democracy should be the subject of rigorous debate. However, when the contest of ideas dissolves into the mindless futility of filibustering for its own sake, when the business of meaningful debate is reduced to a strategy of pointless delay, when fresh contributions are conflated into endless repetition, then the parliament has the responsibility to bring important questions to resolution. That is what the people of Queensland expect of us. They expect us to deal appropriately with legislation. They expect us to deliver reform. Debate is imperative but it must be relevant.

One of the greatest responsibilities we have in this House is to ensure that the contributions we make are not repetitious, are not from speaking points but are directly relevant to the point in issue before the House. All Australian parliaments, all of them, have and use the mechanism to bring a bill to a vote, including the parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia. If this is such a travesty of

democracy, then I would urge members opposite to urge not just the members of the House of Representatives representing the state of Queensland but also candidates like Julian Simmonds to take this campaign to Canberra and change the standing orders of the Commonwealth parliament, which operates in exactly the fashion the Leader of the House has put before the parliament today. Why should we be any different to any other parliament? Why should the people of Queensland not have their members of this House focused on matters of issue with relevant contributions? We are here to deliver outcomes for our communities.

The last two sitting weeks of this House, that is, this week and the previous week, have exposed an opposition full of tactics—and that may be misleading but bear with me, Mr Speaker—but completely bereft of ideas and completely bereft of leadership. They are bereft of leadership and those members opposite know it. They have no vision, no alternative plans and no useful suggestions on amendments, just a relentless commitment to grinding down, manifested through a repetitious litany of whingeing and whining complaints.

Last sitting week when the vegetation management bill was considered in detail, there were more than 100 speeches made by members of the opposition—or, as I remember them, two speeches made 50 times each. They wasted the time of the parliament for no other purpose than to try to display failure in the mechanism of this House, when they have a responsibility to uphold the mechanisms of this House.

This week they have been at it again, rolling up one after another, droning on, drearily in uniform, each contributor adding progressively less to the debate until they can add nothing at all. We heard that in the 10-minute contribution of the member for Kawana because he always takes the maximum time. Regardless of relevance, he always takes the maximum time. That is what the member for Kawana does. He wastes the parliament's time, personally attacking people, whether it is relevant or irrelevant. What did we get this week? My service in Tuvalu as an Australian volunteer abroad more than 20 years ago was raised in this House. That is what I got in this debate. That was not particularly relevant, can I say, Mr Speaker, to—

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Members to my left, the minister is not taking your interjections. I am finding them to be causing disruption.

**Mr DICK:** That was not relevant to the bills before the House. It was a personal attack on me, being an Australian volunteer. When you have on your own backbench men and women who have served in the Australian Defence Force or in the Police Service—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Through the chair, minister.

**Mr DICK:** If you agree to volunteer for your country, you are somewhat less, but that is what we got—

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr DICK:** They are still going on. I will take the interjection. They are calling out about Tuvalu. That is what we get in debates on local government reform.

In conclusion, having witnessed the absolutely appalling manner in which the Newman government trampled over the conventions of this parliament and the ruthless and unconscionable way they used their record majority to demean the processes of this parliament—led by people like the member for Everton, the member for Nanango and the member for Kawana—this government has been mindful to respect the institutions of the House and to ensure that all members get a fair go, the fair go that they routinely denied us when they were in government. The fact is this parliament has ample time under the standing and sessional orders to consider matters before the House if members use that time wisely and relevantly. The motion should be supported by all members of the House.

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (11.44 am): I rise to speak against the motion. The member who just spoke before me is right to the extent that he says this is the people's house. That is right; that is correct. This is the people's house and the people have elected each and every one of us to do what they think is right on legislation. When there is a major change in the legislation, each and every member of this House has the right to contribute. That is the people's right. We are the people's voice. For the new members in this chamber and the schoolchildren who are quite often here, the reason—

An honourable member interjected.

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** No, they are not here at the moment, but I have just met with students from King's Christian College, in the member for Mudgeeraba's electorate. They sat up there and listened to this debate when a minister of the Crown in Queensland spoke about this being the people's house but then, hang on a minute, we are not allowed to speak. If we disagree with the government of the day, if we disagree with the minister, our contribution is called a waste of time. How does that work?

We are working with a government that is so arrogant that the Premier walked into this House two mornings ago and announced to the House that this bill will pass. When the Premier was pulled up on that, she doubled down and continued. She said, 'The bill will pass.' She ignored the Speaker's ruling and continued to talk over the top of this legislation. That is the arrogance that we are seeing from those opposite. They believe that, if we disagree with them, it is just a waste of time.

I am pleased I jumped to my feet before the member for Cooper rushed back into this House, because we know from last week that the executioner has arrived. She will jump up in her contribution and she will again guillotine the motion. The executioner came flying in here, but it was very nice that she actually allowed me to speak before she guillotined the debate that we are having now on the motion. I am looking forward to more contributions in relation to this motion. People who have a difference of opinion to those opposite need to have their voices heard because that is what we were elected to do and that is what we do on behalf of our constituents each and every day.

**Ms Fentiman** interjected.

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** I will take that interjection from the minister who is now on the backbench because we are not—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Leader of the Opposition, before you take that, I ask you, Minister, and remind you to ensure you use correct titles.

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** Like I said, this is the people's house and we all have the right to debate. I look forward to that minister over there having a contribution because I am not sure what her contribution has been to this parliament. We know what her contribution was last parliament; it was the debacle that was the child safety sector. She had to be moved sideways down the list because she obviously was not able to manage the crisis that was the child safety department.

We are debating important issues right here in this House today. The minister before was talking about the fact that we are just going on and on over the same topic. Let me remind those opposite that the amendments that have been brought into this House by the honourable Minister for Local Government have not been through the committee process. We are the ones now trying to debate the reasonableness of those amendments.

**Mrs D'Ath** interjected.

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** I take that point from the Leader of the House. That is absolutely right; we are looking forward to debating our amendments. However, the Minister for Local Government has already brought in his amendments, and those amendments have not gone through the committee process. Where is the rigour? That is what we are here to do: to have that debate because it has not gone through the committee process. I see the minister over there giggling away, laughing at that, thinking she is so clever. I cannot wait for her contribution because—

**Mr Mander:** She is not allowed to.

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** I will take that interjection. She is not allowed to make a contribution because she does not yet have the notes written up for her by a ministerial staffer. I say to the minister: they are coming. She has five minutes; she can jump up. Get the notes; they are coming up the stairs; they are running up the back stairs. She can have the printed notes. They will look slightly different to the notes from the honourable Minister for State Development.

Again I say we are here on behalf of our electorates. We are here on behalf of the people of Queensland, and that is why this arrogant government has to stop guillotining debates. They have to start listening to the people of Queensland. Let the people of Queensland be heard.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Before calling the member for Everton, I say to those members who intend to speak on this motion that I have been listening to the contributions. We have had two speakers from each side. I am looking at the motion; it is a procedural motion. I believe that some of the contributions

are beginning to stray quite some way from the procedural motion. I caution members in terms of their contributions to be wary of that. I am listening. When I feel that there has been enough debate on this motion, I will consider putting the question.

 **Mr MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11.51 am): Mr Speaker, thank you for your guidance. This motion that has been moved by the government does go to the core of our democracy. As the Leader of the Opposition has said, this is all about making sure that this is not just the people's house by name but also the people's house by action. Every member in this chamber has the right to stand up and represent their constituents on every matter that is discussed in this chamber. The issues that we have been talking about today and throughout this week are significant issues. It is significant legislation that is being looked at. That means that every member of this chamber has the right to make a contribution to this debate.

It is hard to understand why the Labor government is uneasy about that proposition. I can only put it down to arrogance. A government that is afraid to be asked questions, is afraid to be accountable, is afraid to be pressed back—one can only think that it comes down to arrogance—

**Dr Rowan:** And hubris.

**Mr MANDER:**—and hubris; I take that interjection from the member for Moggill. It is amazing what a few positive polls do to a government when they start getting an inflated ego. We have a Premier who thinks that she is untouchable, and that sentiment, that vibe, starts filtering down to the other members of the government—that arrogance—to say that they are untouchable. They believe they are so popular with the Queensland public that they can get away with anything. These are the things that bring governments down. This arrogance and hubris is what brings governments down. This attack on the democracy of our state, on the rights of every person in this chamber to have their say, is totally unacceptable.

Again, it does not surprise us that the members on the opposite side of the House seem to have something against sitting late into the evening or into the early hours of the morning and staying in the chamber and working hard until these things have been fully debated. Again we wonder why. I suppose we should not be surprised when every person on the other side of the House has a strong union background or was a strong union delegate. Working past seven o'clock without receiving penalty rates is something that they would not be used to. It is something that, again, goes against the history of this place, of this chamber, when we will stay here for as long as it takes. We will tell the people of Queensland and show them that we are willing to work as hard as we need to in order to ensure there is a forensic examination of the legislation before the House. The opposition leader has already mentioned that there are 40 pages of amendments that the minister is proposing that have not been through the committee process.

**Mr Krause:** This is the committee process.

**Mr MANDER:** This is the committee process; I take that interjection from the member for Scenic Rim, and I am congratulating myself on remembering that electorate. He makes a very valid point that this is the committee system when legislation does not go through the committee process. Each member in this House has an opportunity to comment and to ask questions about incredibly serious issues.

The Leader of the House has said that they want this bill passed by the end of the day. The end of the day for them is five o'clock. The end of the day for other hardworking small business people is whenever the work is done, when they are finished. They do not just clock off at five o'clock when something else has to be done; they stay there and work harder. Guess what? All those small business people get paid nothing extra for that, unlike the union delegates on the other side, who demand penalty rates and extra meal allowances if they work for a minimum amount of time past knock-off time.

There is no reason at all that we cannot stay in this House, continue this debate and make sure that every part of the legislation is discussed. I see the member for Cooper. She is just champing at the bit to get up to stop this debate now, as she has done previously. Again, this is an example of the hubris of the House. It is an example of the arrogance of this Premier that is just trickling down right through every member of the government, who think they are untouchable, who think that they can do whatever they want at a whim.

I take on board the comments that the Manager of Opposition Business made previously about this Premier, whose arrogance is such that she thinks she is part of the royal court and that people wait on her. She expects kids at airports to have posies for her and chucked an absolute wobbly because she did not receive an invitation to the royal wedding. I am sure there will be a letter of protest about that as well. This is the height of arrogance and hubris—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Everton, I draw you back to the motion. I have made a statement prior to you speaking, which goes for all—

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Members, I am giving a ruling. You will hear the ruling. Member, I gave you guidance as well as other members of the House about straying too far from the procedural motion before the House. I draw you back to that motion. Please heed that warning or I will sit you down.

**Mr MANDER:** Thank you for that direction, Mr Speaker. Let me say one more time that we have a Westminster style of government. We believe that the people who sit in this House represent around 35,000 voters each and that those 35,000 voters have every right to have their local member get up and represent their views. They have the right to read *Hansard* to see what we did say in this chamber, to see what our contribution was.

**Mr Crisafulli:** They hang on every word.

**Mr MANDER:** I take that interjection from the member for Broadwater. I know that the constituents in my electorate do hang on every word that I say in this place.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order, members. Member, you brought that on yourself.

**Mr MANDER:** I accept that. I did not say they agree with every word; I just said they hang on every word. We will be voting against this motion because it goes against the very core of democracy.

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Cooper—ALP) (Minister for Innovation and Tourism Industry Development and Minister for the Commonwealth Games) (11.59 am): During the debate on this motion the Leader of the Opposition said that this is the people's house, and it absolutely is the people's house. When you look around this House you have to question how representative we are of the population of Queensland. When you walk in here the first thing that strikes you is the over-representation of Anglo-Saxons, the overrepresentation of men and the underrepresentation of minorities in Queensland. Quite frankly, I want to be part of a story which changes the image of Queensland.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Minister, I draw you back to the motion before the House.

**Ms JONES:** I promise I will not talk about the royal wedding. With regard to representation in parliament, which is very relevant to the hours that we sit, I quote one of Queensland's senators, who said—

I have lost count of how many people I have tried to encourage to go into politics, but the time away from home and demands on their families drive them away from running.

I think for probably the first time ever I entirely agree with Senator Canavan. I refer to an article in the *Australian* on 2 April this year, where Gary Spence is quoted as saying that the LNP federally are currently seeking family-friendly working hours like the Queensland parliament, and his arguments are very valid. They are not just about—

**Ms Simpson** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order, member for Maroochydore! The minister is not taking your interjections. Members, the longer this debate goes on, the more acutely I will listen to the contributions. This is a procedural motion; it is not about previous sessional orders which have already been debated. That applies to all members. I call the minister.

**Ms JONES:** I will only be one minute more, Mr Speaker. For more than half an hour those opposite made a significant contribution. Gary Spence talked about the fact that this is about representing our communities. One of the arguments Senator Canavan raised is that by having more sensible hours we get more time in our electorates talking to people—

**Ms SIMPSON:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order with regard to relevance. The minister is not addressing the guillotine motion.

**Mr SPEAKER:** I have made myself clear about my interpretation. As I said, I have the option of putting this question to the House to consider if I think there have been enough contributions from both sides in the debate. I am listening closely to that. Thank you for your point of order.

**Ms JONES:** The point I want to make is the federal LNP understand that the workings of the parliament and the decisions we make—like the motion we are debating right now—have a direct impact on who puts their hand up to run for parliament. I have to say that, having grown up in Queensland during a time when we saw terrible decisions made in this parliament in collusion with others, I do not think that the future of the Queensland parliament means that we have to sit longer than every other parliament in Australia. Why can't we be modern like the federal parliament, the New South Wales parliament and the Victorian parliament? Why is it that we cannot lift the quality—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Members, I think I have heard three speakers from each side during the debate of this procedural motion. I have listened very closely to the contributions, and I find that those contributions are becoming quite repetitive and are not addressing the core elements of this motion. It is my contention that this question be put. The minister still has the call.

**Ms JONES:** In conclusion, I do think it is important that whilst we are debating a procedural motion the opposition have used this opportunity to call us lazy because we want to support family-friendly hours. They have called us union thugs and union hacks because we support sensible working hours. In conclusion, I ask all Queenslanders to see through the base political arguments of the LNP. I call on everyone in Queensland who wants to attract a more diverse and broad section of our community to this parliament to put their hand up so we can have a higher quality of debate than what I have had to sit through all of my career.

 **Mr WATTS** (Toowoomba North—LNP) (12.04 pm): We are talking about the management of the House, and there is a simple way to manage the business of the House. We have a committee structure. The committee structure is bipartisan. It was put together so we could avoid lengthy and unnecessary debate in this chamber. I put it to the House that if the bill was drafted correctly in the first place, it could go through the committee process. That would then cause a lot less debate when it comes to the chamber because we would have heard the points. The points would have been made, evidence would have been heard and there would have been public consultation with the communities we are all elected to represent. That is the point of the committee structure.

The committee structure can then make recommendations, and then it is up to the House to debate those recommendations and decide whether it will accept the voice of that committee and its recommendations. That would truncate the debate. What does not truncate the debate is bringing in legislation that does not at its core have a centre of bipartisanship, although sometimes they do but there are simple little things missing. My constituents want their voices heard. If they cannot be heard through the committee process because the legislation was poorly drafted and late amendments come in and then are put before the House with no discussion and no consultation, that causes lengthy debate. First and foremost, I would say that the committee structure is the place where a lot of this debate could be avoided.

The second point is that we need to agree on the things we can agree on, so we should bring bills to this place that we know are going to serve the whole of Queensland well. When people bring bills into this place containing things that are wholly unacceptable to large parts of our community, we will—as 93 representative members—be forced to stand up and represent those communities who have not been listened to in the drafting of the bill. Whether it be the bill before the House and the undue influence of other segments of the community or whether it be about people's property rights to deal with vegetation management, if that has not been dealt with through the committee system and if the bill itself does not have enough bipartisan support, then there will be a vigorous debate. It is not for this chamber to truncate that debate. It is not for this chamber to have people gagged and silenced so that they cannot have their voices heard.

We live in a democracy. This House represents that democracy. It is very important that everyone from the community of Queensland has the ability to be heard in this place when it directly affects their lives. Whether it is their property rights or whether it is their ability to hear a voice at an election because somebody has a big bank balance and somebody has a small one, these issues fundamentally affect

our democracy and its function, and to truncate that debate would be completely disingenuous to our community. There can be nothing of a higher order to our community than to have our democracy and people's property rights protected by the rule of law in this place. To have a dictatorship that says how this House will vote by the end of the week is complete and utter anathema to our democracy. Our democracy deserves better than to be told how the duly elected members of our representative democracy will vote at the end of the week.

I put it to the House that we would not be in this situation if we had legislation that was far more bipartisan; if we had a better consultation process; and if we in fact used the committee process as it was originally designed. The government is desperately trying to manage the business of this House to guillotine debate, to deny voices and to change the course of our democracy. How long we can speak for, who can be paid, how it can happen—this is not representative government. It is not a representative democracy. It is arrogant; it is a union dictatorship. I put it to this House that we should be able to stay here and debate the fundamental cornerstones of our democracy.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, earlier I inadvertently said that I would put the question. I meant to say that if a motion were put I would agree that there had been sufficient debate. My apologies to the House. I jumped the gun.

 **Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (Minister for Local Government, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (12.09 pm): At the time it was moved, the motion by the Leader of the House provided ample time for the further consideration of the bills before the House that are very important to many people across this state. There is great expectation about the conclusion of deliberation on those bills and the opportunities that then provides for the government and the community. I will not canvass any of those, but I reiterate that there are high expectations in the community that this matter is dealt with.

It is not unusual to see the parliament as a whole making decisions to deal with matters in a timely way. The assertion that it is the absolutely unmitigated right of every single member to speak on every single matter at any time they wish is unfounded. There is always the ability—

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I withdraw all of the good things I said earlier about the member for Sandgate.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Kawana, that is a frivolous point of order. You should know better than that. You are also already on a warning. I ask you to leave the chamber for 10 minutes.

*Where upon the honourable member for Kawana withdrew from the chamber at 12.11 pm.*

**Mr HINCHLIFFE:** That is the best provocation I have ever done!

**Mr SPEAKER:** I do not need any commentary from you, Minister.

**Mr HINCHLIFFE:** It has always been the case that the parliament has to make decisions about the management of itself. How it manages its business is always a matter for the parliament. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition spoke of his great admiration and regard for the Westminster system and remarked that this is a Westminster parliament that draws on those fine traditions of the houses of parliament at Westminster. This action, which seeks to manage the timing of debate, is a common practice in Westminster, not to mention in the other Australian jurisdictions taking that form.

The reality is that our sessional orders very much draw on how things work in the Victorian state parliament. That includes a requirement for business management. That is something the member for Mermaid Beach is very aware of. That is something the member for Surfers Paradise, who travelled to Victoria with me when I was leader of the House, is very aware of. These are the best ways to manage our business as a House.

It is an utter pretence for members opposite to say that this motion before the House is not proper. The carry-on we have seen, which actually reduces the available time to deal with the matter at hand, demonstrates that those opposite are not genuinely seeking outcomes and considering the matters before the House. It is all a pretence to undermine the government's, and therefore the people's, agenda. In accordance with standing order 88, I move—

That the question be now put.

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

*In division—*

**Mr SPEAKER:** I acknowledge that we have had in the gallery today the Hemmant Flexible Learning Centre in the electorate of Lytton and another group from St Bernard's Catholic School at Upper Mount Gravatt in the electorate of Mansfield.

While there is only one standing order under which a member can be asked to leave the chamber for 10 minutes, when I ordered the withdrawal of the member for Kawana I did not provide the standing order. That does not preclude that being the ruling. The member for Kawana had been asked to remove himself from the chamber for 10 minutes under standing order 253A. Hence he is absent from this division.

**AYES, 52:**

**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.

**KAP, 2**—Dametto, Knuth.

**PHON, 1**—Andrew.

**Ind, 1**—Bolton.

**NOES, 36:**

**LNP, 36**—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Boothman, Boyce, Costigan, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, 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.

Resolved in the affirmative.

**Mr SPEAKER:** The question now is that the motion be agreed to. There having been no intervening debate, the bells will be rung for one minute.

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

**AYES, 52:**

**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.

**KAP, 2**—Dametto, Knuth.

**PHON, 1**—Andrew.

**Ind, 1**—Bolton.

**NOES, 37:**

**LNP, 37**—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Costigan, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, 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.

Resolved in the affirmative.

## LOCAL GOVERNMENT (COUNCILLOR COMPLAINTS) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

## LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTORAL (IMPLEMENTING STAGE 1 OF BELCARRA) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

### Consideration in Detail (Cognate Debate)

#### Local Government Electoral (Implementing Stage 1 of Belcarra) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill

Resumed from 16 May (see p. 1276).

Resumed on clause 13, to which Mr Janetzki had moved amendments—

 **Mr MINNIKIN** (12.23 pm), continuing: It is quite clear that this government is a government that is really well and truly owned by the unions but, as the member for South Brisbane is often fond of doing, let us run the tape and look at some of the field evidence. It was overtly supporting campaigns about penalty rate decisions in the federal IR jurisdiction when the powers were referred in 2009 under the former Bligh Labor government when the former member for Greenslopes and now member for Woodridge was the IR minister. It scrapped right-of-entry protections against militant unions like the CFMEU. Labor withdrew from the Federal Police task force looking at union corruption despite the fact that the task force was funded by the federal government. Then, of course, there were emails to the Minister for Transport and Main Roads to his personal email account from the ETU regarding government policy and board appointments. I could go on and on, but time defeats me.

**Mr HINCHLIFFE:** I want to respond specifically to a matter that the member for Chatsworth raised in his contribution last evening where he was seeking to clarify matters in relation to a prohibition on developer donations. Again, this is not where this matter should be debated but it seems it is, so I trust that will mean some efficiency later on. However, I want to clarify for him now with regard to his question about whether he could pay for his own campaign. Yes, he can because it is not a gift.

**Mr Minnikin:** Thank you.

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

**AYES, 39:**

**LNP, 37**—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Costigan, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, 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.

**PHON, 1**—Andrew.

**Ind, 1**—Bolton.

**NOES, 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.

**KAP, 2**—Dametto, Knuth.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendments (Mr Janetzki) negated.

Division: Question put—That clause 13, as read, stand part of the bill.

**AYES, 51:**

**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.

**KAP, 2**—Dametto, Knuth.

**Ind, 1**—Bolton.

**NOES, 38:**

**LNP, 37**—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Costigan, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, 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.

**PHON, 1**—Andrew.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 13, as read, agreed to.

Clause 14, as read, agreed to.

Clause 15—

**Mr JANETZKI** (12.33 pm): The opposition will be supporting this clause but, given the severity of the penalties and offences it provides, I want to make some comments. Mr Potts of the Queensland Law Society in his appearance at the public hearing called on, as I recall, some Gilbert and Sullivan—to let the punishment fit the crime. There is a question of proportionality as to the penalties and offences contained in this clause.

New section 307A imposes a \$50,000 penalty, or two years imprisonment. New clause 307B imposes a \$190,000 fine and up to 10 years imprisonment. I think both of those penalties are harsh. I accept that they are grave offences, but they are very severe penalties. Mr Potts from the QLS went on to say in his contribution to the public hearing that, given the severity of these offence penalty provisions, it would be incumbent on the department—and I would say the ECQ—to get in touch with communities and with donors as soon as possible.

There is a question that people may not be aware of the severity of the penalties and, indeed, in some cases the existence of these laws. Just yesterday I received an email from the former shadow attorney-general, Ian Walker, about communications that have been sent out from the Property Council and the UDIA to their membership. I think it is important to note that there will be property developers—there will be many people—who will be caught by these laws who are not part of the UDIA, or the Property Council.

We are very aware of the vagueness of the definition of 'property developer', the broad nature of the definition of 'property developer' and the lack of certainty that creates. Today, we found out that the member for Chatsworth received some clarity in respect of his personal circumstances. There will be many other scenarios for which this definition will provide no clarity for some time. The ECQ has already asked for up to six months to get its ducks in a row in determining definitions.

I think it is incumbent on the department and the ECQ to get in touch with potential donors and somehow develop a strong public communication program so that the public is aware of these new provisions. I also note that the QLS thought that these provisions were tough and, given their severity and that they are retrospective, the need for a communication program is even more important. Because of that, I think the department and the ECQ should undertake a strong communication program across Queensland. In that regard, I welcome the minister's comments.

**Mr HINCHLIFFE:** I acknowledge the concerns raised by the member for Toowoomba South. I assure him that the provisions of the bill will be communicated very broadly. I also assure him that the department will work with the ECQ. In my reply to the second reading debate I gave the assurance that the department will work very closely with the ECQ in the implementation of these provisions.

It is very important to note that we have very strong penalties for those people who might develop or involve themselves in schemes to circumvent the prohibition on particular political donations. That matter was raised in a critique of these proposals by the president of the LGAQ, Councillor Mark Jamieson, a person with whom I have been working with very closely and for whom I have great respect. He made some comments publicly and said that these provisions would drive this practice underground. Therefore, we have very tough processes to make it clear that anything that goes underground—as it might be put—is also illegal and that there are very clear and strong penalties in relation to that. That is why I agree it is important to make sure that these matters are communicated broadly in the community. I acknowledge the concerns that were put by the member for Toowoomba South.

Clause 15, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 16 to 19, as read, agreed to.

Clause 20—

**Mr JANETZKI** (12.38 pm): I want to make some comments about retrospectivity. I alluded to retrospectivity in my previous comments about the severity of the penalties. It is quite an extraordinary situation that we have retrospectivity of the nature that is provided in this bill. Yesterday, during the debate, there were plenty of contributions made by members of the opposition in respect of the, frankly, cynical way in which this bill was introduced to the House—two weeks before the state election was called last year with the clear intention that that could create a freeze on donations to, in particular, the opposition.

In my opinion, it was a cynical misuse of power. We have retrospective provisions now in force. I note that Mr Potts from the Queensland Law Society had a number of things to say about that. At the public hearing he said, 'Do not go down that path if you can avoid it.' Yet here we are. The minister, and in particular the Attorney-General, should be aware that this is a clear breach of fundamental legislative principles. At the last sitting, during debate on the vegetation management laws, there was much debate about breaches of fundamental legislative principles. Here we are again this week debating retrospective legislation that breaches fundamental legislative principles. I am not sure what the Attorney-General is contributing in cabinet, but I would have hoped that the Attorney-General of Queensland would have at least voiced some concerns as to the continuing breaches of fundamental legislative principles in this state.

The Queensland Law Society made strong recommendations and representations in the committee hearing. I think that it is appropriate that the Attorney-General and the minister give some regard to this advice from the legal profession across Queensland. It was not heeded in respect of vegetation management. It has not been heeded in respect of this bill. I personally do not think it is good enough.

I note that the minister in his second reading speech confirmed that the ECQ would be given more time to develop policies, procedures and processes by which these laws will be guided. I would ask that they be given the most expeditious treatment as possible.

**Mr WATTS:** I rise to talk about the retrospectivity in this clause. I struggle with the concept that in Queensland someone can be acting in a certain way in accordance with the law of the land, conducting their business in a normal manner, abiding by all laws that exist, and then, for something they did that they now cannot change because they did it in the past, they will be guilty for that behaviour. I firmly believe that retrospectivity as a concept is not something that should be used, except for in the most extreme circumstances.

In this particular case those extreme circumstances were a couple of weeks before an election is called and to the disadvantage of one side of politics. I do not want to appear cynical about the retrospectivity in this bill. It is accepted that retrospectivity is not a good way to make laws. Most lawyers will tell you that. The Queensland Law Society discussed that in this specific instance but also as a general principle. When it is done to cynically ensure a political outcome it starts to shake the foundations of our democracy.

On this occasion I put it to the House that this particular clause was used to ensure that anybody who was conducting their business quite legitimately under the laws of the land, at some time in the future, depending on the outcome of the election, may find themselves in breach of a piece of legislation—not when they commit the act, but depending on the outcome of the election, depending on the reintroduction of the legislation, depending on the debate in this House, depending on the numbers in this House, they might be guilty of something they did previously. That is bad law. I think the minister knows it is bad law, but he will stand up and defend it. It is a political fix and it should be seen as nothing else.

**Mr HART:** I rise to speak against the retrospectivity of this bill. It is clear that this breaches fundamental legislative principles. When one looks at the Queensland Legislation website, in the *Fundamental Legislative Principles Notebook* on retrospectivity it states under Summary—

Consider whether legislation operates in relation to facts or events that happened before the Bill is given assent. Retrospective legislation may interfere with the rights and liberties of an individual under section 4(3)(g) of the Legislative Standards Act 1992

This legislation does exactly that. When a law is made retrospective it impinges on the rights of someone to decide, in this case, whether they want to donate to a particular political party or not. I think it is pretty clear that this is impinging on those rights. There is absolutely no doubt about that. When it is done, as the member for Toowoomba North said, in a cynical way two weeks before an election and now we are here six months later retrospectively approving it back to that date, it is quite clear that it will have a detrimental effect on those people who wanted to express their view on one side of the government or the other.

There is no doubt that when this relates to donations from developers it has far more of an effect on this side of the House than it does on the Labor side. The figures are proof. I am not sure what the figures are, but around \$1.7 million for the LNP and \$400,000 for the Labor Party. It is a vast difference. The rights of developers have been impinged on for six months when they could have been offering input on the government that they want to see elected.

At the end of the day this is about like-mindedness. On this side of the House we promote business. We want to see Queensland expand. We want to see houses built. We want to see development take place. The developing industry knows that and that is why they support this side of the House as against the other side, which has been unduly influenced by having to seek Greens preferences all the time so they are anti just about everything.

**Mr KRAUSE:** I echo the comments of the member for Toowoomba South about this clause and the effect of retrospectivity. I make the comment that the government has form in this regard. This would be at least the third time since the return of Labor in 2015 that it has introduced retrospective legislation of this type. The first was the retrospective implementation of a \$1,000 cap on donations immediately after the 2015 election, which was foreshadowed before the election. The passage of that legislation in some cases made unlawful or changed the obligations of people who had made contributions to political parties that were perfectly lawful before the passage of that legislation. We also saw it with the vegetation management bill that was introduced in 2016 that sought to backdate the obligations of landholders in relation to vegetation management.

The point that I want to reiterate is: how will donors know whether they are in breach of the prohibited donation legislation when the definition is so broad in relation to who is a property developer? The ECQ has been tasked with determining who is or is not. The department has said there had been no guidelines or policy documents put out about how broad that definition is.

How long will that take? Under this retrospective provision, a prohibited donation has to be repaid within 30 days. If those guidelines are not available, what is to become of people who do not know that they are caught by this law within that 30-day period? Are they being criminalised? Will they be charged for an offence that they did not even know they were committing, because the government has not done the hard work to finalise the definition and get this legislation right?

The former president of the Queensland Law Society Bill Potts said that we should not go down this path if we can avoid it. He also said that there needed to be much more rigour put in to the definition of 'property developer'. The government has not done that. What is going to happen to a prohibited donor caught within the 30-day retrospective period who did not know they were caught because the guidelines are going to be formulated sometime in the future? The minister needs to answer that question.

**Ms SIMPSON:** I want to address the issue of retrospectivity. What have we come to in this state when, before an election, a premier can say, 'We're going to have legislation and it will apply from this date,' but that legislation has not been through the parliament? A few minutes ago we had a debate in the House about our concerns about guillotining debates and the government wanting to push things through without giving members an opportunity to appropriately scrutinise amendments that have not been through a committee. We have already raised our concerns about the attempt by this government to make this House not a house of review and scrutiny but a house of rubber stamp. Now we have a situation where the government is saying, 'Well, it's enough for us to announce at an election that something will be retrospective, but still not have the legislation pass through the parliament.'

Fundamentally, we have to fight against this because not only is it unfair but also it is an abuse of power by this government. Labor's gerrymander of the electoral system is unconscionable. They are treating the parliament with contempt. I repeat: they are treating the parliament with contempt.

For the Premier to go out there and make a statement about retrospective legislation but not show respect for this parliament by putting the legislation through and allowing people to engage in that process is something about which we will not be silent. I know that the government wants people to be silent, because this bill is about nobbling parliament, making it irrelevant and making it the government's rubber stamp. It is not good enough. Earlier I heard debate about the time that is available for debate in other jurisdictions, but those parliaments have upper houses—

**Mr HINCHLIFFE:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I would love to be enlightened as to where this is contained in the clause.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart):** Member for Maroochydore, I beg you to come back to the amendments being debated. I encourage you to do so.

**Ms SIMPSON:** What is pertinent to this debate is the opportunity to scrutinise clauses such as this. Other parliaments have upper houses. We have a committee system, but it has been bypassed in regard to a number of amendments that the government is trying to put through.

On the issue of the definition of 'developer', very valid concerns have been raised in that not only is it vague but also the guidelines have not even been developed and will not be developed under the scrutiny of the parliament. They are with the ECQ and, goodness, has it not covered itself with glory in recent times! This parliament should be able to scrutinise appropriately not only definitions but also the guidelines. It should be public, it should be transparent and it should be a part of legislation, not a retrospective grab for power by a Labor government that does not want to be accountable to this parliament.

**Mr HINCHLIFFE:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The matters that the member for Maroochydore is canvassing are not contained within clause 20, either.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Maroochydore, before I invite you to continue, we are debating clause 20, which is about retrospectivity.

**Ms SIMPSON:** In regard to this clause, the retrospectivity means that all of these issues that I am addressing have been wiped out from the proper scrutiny of the parliament because of the way the Premier announced these things. Retrospectivity is really an anathema to our democratic system when it is about a Labor government—

*(Time expired)*

**Mr SORENSEN:** I rise to speak to the retrospectivity contained within clause 20. This is unbelievable. I thought that in this society you are innocent until proven guilty. It is ridiculous to bring in some law down the track and say, 'Because of retrospectivity, you are now a criminal.' Even the Law Society said not to do it, but you do not care. You are trying to make criminals out of the farmers—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Through the chair, please, member.

**Mr SORENSEN:** The minister does not even know what the definition of 'developer' is. Down the track, are we going to make someone who is an architect or a town-planner a criminal?

**Mr Krause:** They don't know.

**Mr SORENSEN:** They do not know. This is stupid law. What union was it that said people should not obey stupid laws?

**Mr KRAUSE:** It was the union chief, Sally McManus.

**Mr SORENSEN:** Yes, it was; I take that interjection.

**Mr Krause:** She doesn't care about the rule of the law.

**Mr SORENSEN:** She does not care about the law when it is a stupid law. This is a stupid law. This is left wing lunacy.

**Government members:** Oh!

**Mr SORENSEN:** It is. It is stupidity to have retrospective laws brought into the parliament so that somebody can be charged—

**An honourable member:** You're wasted up the back, Ted; you're wasted.

**Mr SORENSEN:** I take that interjection. It is stupid. I do not know where we are going in this state with this type of rubbish.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SORENSEN:** Yes, most probably.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, members on my right!

**An opposition member:** They're just showing their arrogance, Ted.

**Mr SORENSEN:** It is arrogance and it has got out of control. Just because you have the majority in this House, you think you can do anything.

**Ms Grace:** You'd know all about that.

**Mr SORENSEN:** I do.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Through the chair, member for Hervey Bay.

**Mr SORENSEN:** I certainly know about that, because of the Bligh government. I have been in this place since the Bligh government. I remember the hardships that we had to put up with and some of the stupidity in the Bligh government.

**Mr Krause:** She started the rot.

**Mr SORENSEN:** You started the rot—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Through the chair, member for Hervey Bay.

**Mr SORENSEN:** This type of legislation just goes to show how arrogant this government is going to become and it is going to get worse. Believe you me, it will get worse. Retrospectivity should be avoided. Take notice of what the professionals have told us.

**An opposition member:** The Law Society.

**Mr SORENSEN:** Yes, the Law Society.

**Mr MINNIKIN:** I rise to also make a brief contribution in relation to clause 20, specifically in relation to retrospectivity. Many members in this chamber from both sides have been to university and done an introduction to law subject or a full law degree. They would know that one of the cardinal rules in relation to good legislation is to avoid, at all costs, the notion of retrospectivity. That very much applies to clause 20, and specifically new section 427(1) which states—

This section applies if—

(a) a donation was made to a person (the recipient) on or after 12 October 2017 and before the commencement ...

The bottom line is this: why does it state '12 October 2017'? I will tell the House why. Obviously, in this game there is the cut and thrust of the world of politics and you try to make sure that you maximise things to your own advantage. It is as simple as this: in the lead-up to the November election last year, like many other members on this side of the chamber, I had functions for fundraising. Knowing that potentially, if things did not go our way, when we came back to this august chamber, potentially this would be one of the first bills that would be debated in the House. Therefore, I was duty bound to inform donors that we could not accept their donation and they should take it back. In fact, we did that. We did that to do what potentially needed to be done.

Why was it that I had to do that and yet, in the lead-up to November, there was no retrospectivity applied to my political opponents when it came to a prepoll? They were able to resource it using resources from the Transport Workers Union, flown up expressly from Victoria. I faced the situation we see in relation to clause 20 and retrospectivity.

**Ms Pease** interjected.

**Mr MINNIKIN:** I would normally take the interjection of a worthwhile member on the other side of the chamber, but the contribution that I have heard so far from the member for Lytton, in any legislation, is not even worth replying to.

**Ms PEASE:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take offence at the member for Chatworth's comments and I ask him to withdraw.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Chatsworth, will you withdraw?

**Mr MINNIKIN:** I withdraw.

**Ms Pease** interjected.

**Mr MINNIKIN:** Mr Deputy Speaker, may I be heard over the continuous interjections from the member for Lytton, who is now obviously fired up? It is good to see some passion finally rising in her belly. Along with many people on this side of the chamber, I look forward to the erudite and intellectual contribution that she will no doubt make to not only this debate at some stage—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Chatsworth, I bring you back to clause 20, dealing with retrospectivity.

**Mr MINNIKIN:** Certainly. Like many members on this side of the chamber, I rise to speak against clause 20, and specifically new sections 427(1) and 427(2). I believe it is very poor legislative drafting.

Debate, on motion of Mr Minnikin, adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 1.01 pm to 2.00 pm.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

### M1, Upgrade

 **Ms BATES** (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (2.00 pm): I rise to speak about the traffic jam that is the M1. The M1 in my electorate runs from exit 73 at Carrara all the way to exit 85 at Reedy Creek. As governments have come and gone, I have continued to deliver upgrades in my electorate, usually by shaming the Labor government or previously having the do-nothing Labor member run to Paul Lucas begging for an announcement so she would not lose the seat. They can keep telling fibs about the M1 funding and construction as much as they like but no-one on the coast will believe them.

Labor had the money to eight-lane the M1 from Nerang to Tugun and did nothing for years. The LNP built the M1 in 18 months and the LNP upgraded the stretch from exit 75 to exit 82. Do members know how I know that? I know that because I officially opened it and there is a plaque on the M1 at exit 75 that has my name on it.

I know whose names it does not have on it. It does not have Mark Bailey's because he was either a councillor in Brisbane or I think he ran off to do some acting classes.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Stewart): Member for Mudgeeraba, refer to members by their correct titles.

**Ms BATES:** It does not have the member for Miller's name on it because he was either a councillor in Brisbane or he had run off to do some acting classes. I am not quite sure about that. It does not have the member for Gaven's name on it because she was still in primary school when I began the fight to upgrade the M1. Gaven residents are not stupid, but keep taking photos of yourselves with a shovel, because all you are doing is digging yourself a hole.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Direct your comments through the chair, member for Mudgeeraba.

**Ms BATES:** How could I forget the chipmunk on helium, Senator Murray Watt, the oncer from Everton in the Bligh government, who pretends he spends his time on the Gold Coast but has never delivered anything on the M1 either federally or statewide. Locals shake their heads asking, 'Who are these people kidding?' Labor's magnificent seven of the class of 2004 were all voted out because they did not do anything on the M1 even when they were in government because Beattie, Bligh and now Palaszczuk do not care about the Gold Coast.

Just weeks ago, the federal coalition government put \$1 billion on the table to fix the M1 to the border. What are Labor members going to do now that Bill Shorten, their Labor mate, has matched the \$1 billion funding fifty-fifty? Are we going to see it in Labor's budget next month?

Whilst I am talking about the M1, what a ridiculous comment from the minister that accidents have lessened on the M1 because of reducing the speed limit. People cannot even get up to 100 kilometres an hour at the best of times. This is combined with the fact that they scared everyone off the M1 during the Commonwealth Games. No-one was on it. No wonder accidents decreased. It sure as hell was not anything they did that made the difference.

If the government wants to see road rage, it should reduce the speed limit on the M1, and we on the Gold Coast will make sure motorists direct all their rage at the Labor Party and the member for Gaven. I call on the Premier and the Minister for Main Roads to stop the political pointscoring and get on and fix the M1 and plan for a second M1.

### Federal Budget

 **Mr POWER** (Logan—ALP) (2.03 pm): We have had the unusual admission from the member for Mudgeeraba that the last time her name was put on a plaque—a dusty, worn-out brass plaque—the Minister for Main Roads was still in nappies. It was that long ago that the LNP made any commitment to the M1.

The member for Mudgeeraba and others on the Gold Coast must be desperately disappointed with the federal government, which is not delivering for Queensland. I will turn to the M1 since it has been raised. There has been much hype, but we know that any new funding for the M1 will not happen within the four-year cycle. They have delayed, delayed and delayed that funding. This is vapourware when it comes to putting investment into the M1.

I want to speak about the M1 in my electorate of Logan at Logan West. Fundamentally, the federal budget is desperately unfair for the people of Logan. Logan is missing out. They say that they have invested \$2.5 billion in Queensland infrastructure, but we have heard that much of the funding is past the four-year cycle. That is as much as they are spending on a single new rail line in Melbourne.

In terms of that rail line, there is no alignment and there is no business plan. It is just an idea for a rail line and yet they say they are ready to commit funding to it. Cross River Rail is ready to go, has a business case and has an alignment. It is ready to deliver improved transport across the rail network to serve the city of Logan.

I am not sure that all members know this, but this project is vital to the construction of the Salisbury to Flagstone rail line, which is essential for that growing area. We need to get Cross River Rail built first, but we have zero backing for this crucial urban project from the federal government. They are ignoring Queensland. The federal government is raking in huge revenue from Queensland. What do they want to do with it? Fundamentally, they want to help out big business and especially their mates in the big banks. They want to give big corporate tax cuts to larger businesses.

That means that they cannot deliver on the things that are important like the infrastructure that Queensland needs, especially in growing areas. They are not delivering skills funding. We are missing out on skills funding. We have learnt that the \$40 million cut to Queensland training funding last year will grow to approximately \$50 million.

We have seen a severe impact on our local TAFEs. We need to back them, not cut them. In our growing areas we need investment in education. Again, we are not seeing a commitment to that. When a federal government fails to take responsibility a growing area like southern Logan suffers the most because it needs new infrastructure and new investment. It is the same with health. Logan Hospital needs investment. It is missing out on that in the federal government budget.

### Glass House Electorate

 **Mr POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (2.06 pm): I would like to acknowledge in the gallery students from the Ananda Marga River School in Maleny—g'day kids, welcome to Parliament House. I look forward to reciprocating the visit in a couple of weeks time when I visit their classroom. I hope they are getting their questions ready for that. I always look forward to them.

On 4 April I was privileged to attend the launch of a wonderful new book titled *The National Heritage Listed Glass House Mountains*. It has been written by local legend Ivon Northage and presented to the community by Celebrate Glasshouse Country. I want to acknowledge the funding provided by my federal colleagues, particularly by the federal Department of the Environment and Energy under the Community Heritage and Icon Grants program.

Ivon is a passionate individual, particularly when it comes to the Glass House Mountains. He has done a sterling job of compiling the story of the mountains, their origin, their geology, the legend, how they were named, exploration of the mountains and, importantly, their heritage listing. That heritage listing occurred thanks to the tireless efforts of local researcher Beth Hodge. It was performed by then prime minister John Howard on 3 August 2006.

It is a great book. Unfortunately, I cannot table this copy as I have already donated it to the Queensland Parliamentary Library. I encourage all members to grab a copy of this book and have a read of it and be educated about the fantastic Glass House Mountains.

Ivon has now turned his attention to two other projects. Firstly, he is correcting errors and replacing damaged signs at Glass House Mountains Lookout. Back in July 2016 we had a promise from then environment minister Miles that it would potentially happen but they were short the \$100,000 that was required. In November 2017 the government promised that that would happen and it was confirmed in an answer to a question on notice I received from Minister Enoch. However, I have to say that the cost seems ridiculous for what has to be done—\$100,000. Ivon has gone to the trouble of getting a quote for two information signs from a local graphic designer and that quote was \$884. I am not quite sure where the \$100,000 comes from. We are also working on trying to get proper acknowledgement of Matthew Flinders and the role he played in exploring Beerburrum. We have a meeting on the site on 4 June.

Speaking of Beerburrum, I want to acknowledge the Beerburrum State School centenary, which was held on Sunday, 22 April. The school commenced back in 1918. I want to acknowledge Shirley Francis, Debbie Roberts, Tina Davidson, Helen Manson, Lorraine Shaw, Kirsty Levis, Trudy Long, Gwenda Kill, Raquel Manson, David Gower, Justin Evans and Susan Grealy who put on a fantastic centenary. They also put together a fantastic publication, *Beerburrum State School Centenary 1918 to 2018*. The school pledge is as follows—

I love my country and its people. I obey the law and encourage others to do so. I work to bring honour to my home, to my school and to myself. I respect the flag.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Stewart): Order! Before I call the member for Keppel, I too acknowledge the Ananda Marga River School students in the gallery today from the electorate of Glass House.

### Keppel Electorate, Indigenous Place Names

 **Mrs LAUGA** (Keppel—ALP) (2.10 pm): 'Gudamulli' means hello in Darumbal language. I acknowledge the Darumbal people as the traditional owners and native title holders of the land, winds and water which I represent in this place, and I acknowledge the Darumbal people as the carers and protectors of that land for over 50,000 years. I also respectfully acknowledge the Woppaburra people as the traditional owners of the Keppel islands, land which I also represent in this place.

I am so incredibly pleased that from tomorrow two iconic landmarks in Keppel will officially be renamed to their traditional rightful names, their Aboriginal names. From tomorrow Mount Wheeler will be known as Gai-i and Mount Jim Crow will be known as Baga. The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultures are the two longest ongoing cultures in the world. Renaming official places which were named after colonisation back to their traditional names—their Aboriginal names—is, in my opinion, the right thing to do and a step in the right direction towards reconciliation. I am proud to have worked side by side with our local Darumbal elders to help have these landmarks renamed. I spoke with Darumbal elder Aunty Sally Vea Vea on Tuesday afternoon. I congratulated her and all of the traditional owners—the Darumbal people—for this great achievement. She told me that she now feels at rest.

I climbed Gai-i with local elders and celebrated NAIDOC Week with the Darumbal people at the base of Gai-i in 2015. It was a life-changing experience for me. Gai-i and its surrounding area, named Gawula, is a very culturally sensitive and important place for many reasons. It holds Dreamtime stories, it was an important meeting place and a place of prime fishing and hunting, but it is also the place of sorry business. Hundreds, possibly thousands—we do not know exactly how many because no-one counted how many were slain—of Aboriginal people were massacred at Gawula and around the district in the 1800s. Gawula, Gai-i and Baga are sacred places for the Darumbal people.

I grieved for the Aboriginal people who were murdered there and I felt ashamed that our community does not speak more about the atrocities that occurred. For that, I am deeply sorry. To truly reach reconciliation we must be honest about our past—about our sad history—but I was also so incredibly proud to stand side by side with our Aboriginal brothers and sisters at Gawula, and I continue to stand side by side with them because our Indigenous cultural heritage is something both Indigenous and non-Indigenous Queenslanders should be proud of.

I want our local Indigenous community to be proud of these iconic and beautiful natural places as opposed to being constantly reminded about sorry business. There was racist backlash when calls were made to give Indigenous people the right to vote. There was racist backlash when there were calls made for a national apology, but it did not stop Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders and community leaders from fighting for what is right. I am proud that these two beautiful and important landmarks will be known from now on as Baga and Gai-i.

### Water Infrastructure

 **Mr KNUTH** (Hill—KAP) (2.13 pm): SunWater has just announced \$24 million to upgrade the Mareeba-Dimbulah irrigation uplift, and I understand that this is partially federal government funding. However, it is not enough to just maintain infrastructure to deliver water. We need to build infrastructure to manage the flow of water in a region with the highest rainfall in the nation.

The Mareeba-Dimbulah Water Supply Scheme provides over 1,000 irrigation, industrial and urban customers with a total of 204,000 megalitres in water entitlements. This places incredible pressure on Tinaroo Dam to supply those customers as well as those who have entitlements from the Barron River catchment area, its subsidiaries and Tinaroo itself. To help support Lake Tinaroo with extra water, the North Johnstone transfer scheme is a relatively small-scale project that would flood harvest the North Johnstone River to divert floodwaters into Lake Tinaroo. This achieves two outcomes: it minimises flood damage on the coast and replenishes Tinaroo by maximising intake during flood events.

A second project that has been approved is the Tully-Millstream hydro-electric scheme, which would serve a dual purpose of generating clean energy for the region as well as increasing Far North Queensland's water storage capacity and mitigating coastal flooding. The environmental argument against this project is unsubstantiated. Most of the project is on the western side of the range and a

good portion has already been cleared for cattle grazing. It will also save up to \$600 million of transport losses and help resolve the issues of high electricity prices in the north. Construction of the Tully hydro would have the environmental benefit of taking millions of tonnes of harmful emissions out of the atmosphere through the production of clean energy. These projects and other similar projects like the Burdekin, Lakeland and Hell's Gate dams are critical to the economic growth and prosperity of North Queensland. Not only that, controlled flows and hydro-electric capabilities means that these projects can mitigate run-off and create clean energy solutions.

The 2031 Far North Queensland Regional Plan is due for review. I propose that these projects be seriously considered in the new FNQ Regional Plan and that some of them, like the Tully-Millstream, which has already had the groundwork completed, simply get built and completed. I call on this government to have the courage to produce a lasting legacy of economic prosperity for Far North Queensland and construct these projects which will help reduce electricity prices and provide water and infrastructure.

### **Haycroft, Mr G**

 **Mr KELLY** (Greenslopes—ALP) (2.16 pm): LNP member Graeme Haycroft is the founder of the Nurses Professional Association of Queensland. Businessmen Haycroft claims to speak for nurses and midwives, but the NPAQ is the puppet through which Haycroft pushes his prejudiced views. He has no credibility in speaking on behalf of nurses or midwives.

The NPAQ was founded at a time when the Queensland Nurses' Union, as it was then called, was campaigning against the massive LNP job cuts. The NPAQ spruiked themselves as an alternative to the Queensland Nurses and Midwives' Union. They are not a union. They do not have the democracy of a union and they do not have the strength of a union. As a proud member of the QNMU, I am outraged at Haycroft and his attempted hijacking of the voices of nurses and midwives. He does not speak for me. He is an LNP linked businessman out to exploit fears and push his dog-whistle agenda, not the interests of nurses and midwives. He is in it to make a buck. That is what his business model is. Unlike Haycroft's NPAQ, the QNMU is run by nurses and midwives for nurses, midwives and our patients. Haycroft cares only about healthy profits. The QNMU members' focus is on healthy people.

Recent misinformation in the media from the NPAQ regarding the new codes of conduct is appalling, containing gross misrepresentation and lies around cultural safety and white privilege. Haycroft has been quoted as saying that the new codes are an insidious form of racism and that we will end up with a form of apartheid in our health system. This claim is completely false. Cultural safety means providing care that takes into account Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander people's needs. This is vital for the health care of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. It is vital for the health of all people. Like all nurses and midwives, my practice takes into account the cultural needs of people whether they be based on people's ethnicity, gender, age, sexuality, political views, religious views or other factors. It is what we do. We assess the person in front of us and we deliver care that is appropriate to that person.

Haycroft would not know anything about that because he has never been a nurse or a midwife. In my career I have changed my practices for children, elderly Catholic women, Chinese families, young athletes and the list goes on. Haycroft has said that the codes require nurses and midwives to acknowledge or announce their white privilege before treating patients. This is false and inflammatory, serving to sensationalise issues about race and racism. It is the worst dog-whistle device of politics.

The QNMU has always fought for health care for all and the rights of nurses and midwives. The same cannot be said of Mr Haycroft's mouthpiece, the NPAQ. We nurses and midwives are natural collective beings and we know that by working together much more can be achieved for nurses, for midwives and, most importantly, for the patients that we care for and for the health of the entire community.

### **Pumicestone Electorate, Beachmere Road**

 **Mrs WILSON** (Pumicestone—LNP) (2.19 pm): It is concerning that this government has not kept pace with the necessary road upgrades in the Pumicestone electorate and, as a result, motorists' safety is being put at risk. Beachmere Road is a prime example of this. As a frequent user of this road, I am familiar with the problems that motorists encounter. As people go about their daily business on this road, they have to contend with very narrow driving lanes, long sections of the road having no shoulders and a road surface with bumpy patches of pothole repairs—which all increases the danger to motorists. The count of near misses on Beachmere Road is racking up every day.

I recently asked the Premier if she would commit funds to this upgrade of Beachmere Road. The response I received may as well have read, 'Sorry, not on our radar.' This is why hundreds of people to date have signed my petition calling on the government to fund an upgrade to make this road safer. This government must listen to residents. One local told me he takes a longer alternative route to the Bruce, adding 20 minutes to his drive, because Beachmere Road is too dangerous. Another told me about her near miss when a car veered out of its narrow lane into her path, barely missing her vehicle. To avoid being hit, Kim had to run off the road onto the grass as there was no sealed shoulder. Thankfully, for Kim and the children she had on board, she was able to recover, regain control and get safely back on to the road.

Sections of Beachmere Road have only 2.7 metre wide driving lanes. Austroads have reported that narrow lanes around the 2.5 metre mark have crash rates around 50 per cent higher than wider lanes. Roads with shoulders of less than half a metre increase the risk of casualty crashes by 1.7 times over roads with wider sealed shoulders. I table these pictures of Beachmere Road, which clearly show the poor condition of the road and the fact that there are no adequate shoulders in long sections of the road.

*Tabled paper: Bundle of photographs depicting roads in the Pumicestone electorate. [715]*

I urge the Minister for Transport and Main Roads to drive along Beachmere Road for himself or watch my Facebook video so that he can understand why an upgrade is so urgently needed.

**Mr Costigan** interjected.

**Mrs WILSON:** I will take that interjection. This is a road safety matter, in that many lives may be saved if action by this government is taken to allocate the necessary funding to make Beachmere Road safe for all motorists. We in Pumicestone electorate say, 'Delay. No way.'

### Redlands, Federal Budget

 **Mr BROWN** (Capalaba—ALP) (2.22 pm): Wasn't the federal budget a poor budget for the people of Redlands? We have had 14 years of Andrew Laming in Bowman not delivering for his constituents, but he did deliver something. He delivered a doozy—400 houses shuffled into the small suburb of Birkdale to be achieved by selling off Birkdale's valuable bushland.

After he had heard about this, he hurried to his computer the next day and typed up a rushed document and put it up on Facebook as a response. He replied back to the media and said that the budget papers were clumsy. The assistant minister then came up to Redlands and backed him up. He said that the budget papers were sloppy, and he went further and said that 'clumsy's a very polite way to put it'.

The people of Redlands have no faith and no trust in this federal government. What is in the budget papers is their policy. We heard that at the end of November last year, that surplus Commonwealth land was going to be sold off for houses. That is why I have campaigned long and hard to protect this valuable part of bushland in the north of Redlands. There were 1,500 signatures last year which called on the government to keep this area outside the urban footprint. At the time, this was campaigned against by the federal member for Bowman and we now know why. He wanted to put residential development on it. It is in their budget papers and they want to continue on with it.

I thank the Deputy Premier, who was the planning minister at the time, and I also thank Cameron Dick, who is the current planning minister, for backing in that and keeping it outside the urban footprint. That is the only measure that is keeping this valuable bushland from becoming residential housing. We have seen that the council wants to buy the land. However, they have said that they need to apply to the Queensland Treasury for a loan to purchase this valuable land. I say to the council, 'Give us a plan for this. Give us a plan about what you want to see on this land. Is it for a university? Is it for sporting grounds?'

I want to also ask the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Oodgeroo some questions about this. Do they support their federal colleague putting this land into the urban footprint? Do they support the federal government's budget papers? The federal government would put a suburb in with 400 houses but no extra infrastructure, no public transport infrastructure and no roads. This is a disgraceful outcome, and I will be fighting it all the way.

### Whitsunday Electorate

 **Mr COSTIGAN** (Whitsunday—LNP) (2.24 pm): As most honourable members of the House will be aware, the Palaszczuk Labor government is governing from the regions next week, but what are they doing for the regions?

**Opposition members:** Nothing!

**Mr COSTIGAN:** I take the interjections from my colleagues on the backbench, and rightly so. The government is doing nothing. I proudly represent Mackay and the Whitsundays. They are home to the biggest regional economy of the north. The red army will roll into Mackay, Proserpine and Airlie Beach. We will have red subs off the coast of Cape Gloucester and I say, 'Bring it on, baby. Bring it on.' I cannot wait because this time last year in the lead-up to the state budget we were waiting with bated breath, great anticipation, thinking that we would see some tender loving care from the government given what had happened with category 4 Cyclone Debbie. There were so many people who were hurting and there were mental health issues. I would like to see plenty of funding for that, needless to say, in the budget on the next sitting day on 12 June.

We have been waiting and waiting to see some flood mitigation works on Hamilton Plains on state controlled Shute Harbour Road. This has been going on and on. Do members remember that song *Don't Pay the Ferryman*? I am not going to pay him next wet season. I am sick of catching the ferry. I am sick of going through the water there. I know we say, 'If it's flooded, forget it,' but we are not going to forget it. We are going to keep fighting and fighting and fighting. I know a lot of key tourism stakeholders have had enough of the government. We waited for the business case late last year, but what did we get? A big fat zero.

I say this to the Minister for Transport and Main Roads: put a rocket up your colleagues in the department. If it is the case that that is not necessary, then resource them properly. I dare say, the truth be known, that they are doing the best they can but they need the resourcing to do the design work and get the construction underway.

The same goes for Goorganga Plains. I know it is on the Bruce Highway, but it is an 80-20 traditional funding split. I have written to the Deputy Prime Minister this week. I have had a bit to say about what is going on there. It needs a serious look at both levels of government to get what I think is the most flood-prone section left on the Bruce Highway finally underway. Vaughan Johnson fired a few shots in this place many years ago. We have to go back to the time of the former member for Gregory for when we last saw bitumen go down on the Mount Ossa Seaforth Road. This is nine kilometres of road that is unsealed and it affects locals in Seaforth and Cape Hillsborough. Cape Hillsborough is famous for its kangaroos and wallabies, and in fact the tours start there next Monday. We are trying to grow tourism but we have a goat track going to Cape Hillsborough off the Bruce Highway.

There are health issues as well. One mother of two has been waiting 500 days to see a specialist. She said, 'I've had enough and I'll pay for it,' and she went to Townsville. There are a lot of issues in my electorate. We are looking to see some love from the Palaszczuk Labor government on 12 June, but I am not holding my breath.

**Mareeba Hospital**

 **Ms LUI (Cook—ALP) (2.27 pm):** I rise to speak of the wonderful things that are happening in my electorate. On 24 April I attended a sod-turning ceremony for staff accommodation at the Mareeba Hospital, along with the chair of the Cairns and Hinterland Hospital and Health Service, Mr Clive Skarrot, CEO Ms Clare Douglas, the wonderful Mareeba Hospital staff and local members of the community. In October 2017 the Palaszczuk government committed \$1.5 million to building new staff accommodation in Mareeba. In December 2017 the Minister for Health, Minister Miles, visited Mareeba Hospital and met with health executives, health staff and community groups to discuss the Palaszczuk government's commitment and support to the local community through building much needed infrastructure.

As the member for Cook, it was an honour and privilege to take part in this special ceremony to witness the beginning of an important investment of infrastructure into the community. As someone who has given many years to working in the health sector in a remote community in the Torres Strait, I understand how important it is to support health services in regional and remote communities because, without the right support in place to retain staff, we will continue to lose staff to better opportunities in other areas.

The recently developed rural and remote workforce strategy for Queensland identified staff accommodation as one of the critical aspects in the recruitment and retention of a workforce in rural and remote areas. The provision of appropriate staff accommodation in rural and remote areas is a vital part of delivering local health services, and this \$1.5 million investment will assist in attracting and retaining staff to Mareeba Hospital into the future. I fully support the construction of new staff accommodation because of the opportunities it will create. This construction will begin in just two short

months. I look forward to seeing three new staff houses that will be suitable for either families or single staff.

The Palaszczuk government continues to invest in Mareeba Hospital and in the Mareeba community. Since 2015 funding to Mareeba Hospital has increased by 14 per cent and staffing has increased by 10 per cent, to 186 full-time-equivalent staff. The number of doctors at Mareeba Hospital has almost doubled since 2014. Mareeba is a growing and vibrant community with a lot of potential for future growth and development. It is equally important that we put the right infrastructure in place to support future growth in the region.

### Buderim Electorate, Education

 **Mr MICELBERG** (Buderim—LNP) (2.30 pm): I rise today to address the issue of school funding across the Buderim electorate. During my maiden speech I spoke of the excellent primary and secondary schools that sit within the electorate. Buderim is a hub of education and many families move into the Buderim electorate specifically so that their children can attend the high-quality public and private schools in Buderim, Sippy Downs, Mountain Creek and Brightwater. I am concerned, however, that without additional investment in schools across the Buderim electorate the significant growth in student numbers which has been experienced to date and is expected to continue for the foreseeable future will result in worse student outcomes and impacts on the community more broadly.

I welcome the commitment to invest \$22 million to build a new three-storey senior learning centre at Mountain Creek State High School that I recently received from the Minister for Education. This investment will see capacity at the school increase from 2,580 to 3,269. I congratulate the minister for recognising this population growth and the increasing pressures and demand on local schools, many of which, like Mountain Creek, are bursting at the seams.

The rapidly expanding population in the Palmview area will require new schools to be built in order to ease pressure on the existing school networks across the Buderim electorate. With an additional 16,000 people expected to move into the Palmview area in coming years, now is the time for the government to commit to funding a new primary and secondary school. The government needs to commit to this funding to ensure that the influx of new residents does not cause overcrowding in the first place.

Chancellor State College is one of the best performing state schools in Queensland. However, this high performance will be under threat if the current growth in student numbers is not supported with additional investment. Issues like traffic congestion on Scholars Drive mean that parents are unable to pick up their children within an acceptable time frame. While Scholars Drive is a council road, congestion there is only due to the construction of Chancellor State College's primary campus on that road, so the state definitely has a role in helping to solve this problem. Further to my question on notice to the Premier on 6 April 2018, I again call on the government to stop abrogating its responsibilities in this area and to work in concert with the council to solve this longstanding problem of congestion around Chancellor State College's primary campus.

Like those schools I have already mentioned, Brightwater State School has also experienced significant growth in recent years. This growth has been due to the excellent educational outcomes being delivered by teachers at Brightwater State School and also to the expansion of the Sunshine Coast University Hospital. In order to support the growth in student numbers from 1,028 to 1,200, investment is required to build additional permanent classrooms. Currently, shared spaces in the school library are used for lessons due to excess student numbers. This is unacceptable and I call on the government to support the growth in student numbers at Brightwater State School through additional funding.

Public schools across the Buderim electorate currently deliver excellent educational outcomes. However, further investment is required in order to support future growth.

### Ipswich West Electorate, Education

 **Mr MADDEN** (Ipswich West—ALP) (2.33 pm): Mr Speaker, as you know, the Palaszczuk government is committed to providing world-class facilities to all Queensland school students. On 10 May, I was pleased to represent the Minister for Education, Grace Grace, at the sod-turning ceremony for the \$9.9 million Ipswich State High School performing arts centre. Ipswich State High School, located in my electorate of Ipswich West, is a great school with a suite of programs that puts it in a class of its

own. I speak of programs like the dance academy of excellence, the Rugby League Academy, the trade school as well as specific programs for Indigenous, Polynesian, special needs, young mothers and mature age students.

The Ipswich State High School's catchment takes in all of the northern suburbs of Ipswich and currently has an enrolment of about 1,560 students. This is anticipated to rise to about 1,900 students by 2020. The school's alumni includes my colleague and good friend Corrine McMillan, former principal of Cavendish Road State High School and state member for Mansfield. This performing arts centre will be a real asset both to Ipswich State High School and the local community. The two-storey building will comprise a 450-seat auditorium, ticketing and refreshment facilities on the ground floor, and specialist rooms on the second floor. The school's dance academy of excellence will be based at the centre where students will be learning, performing and honing their creative skills. The stand-out feature of the building is a soundproof teaching and rehearsal space. As well, the centre will feature multimedia recording and editing suites. Most importantly, the new performing arts centre will allow Ipswich State High School to grow. It will accommodate the school's growing population by freeing up the current performing arts and music rooms for other purposes.

I congratulate Intrec Management on being the successful tenderer for the project. Based at Milton in Brisbane, Intrec would have benefited from the Palaszczuk government's *Procurement Strategy 2017: backing Queensland jobs* program that gives priority to contractors located within 125 kilometres of the project site. Trainees and apprentices will also benefit from the project because of the state government's 10 per cent training policy. I have fought for this project since I was first elected to the state parliament in 2015. It would be remiss of me if I did not thank principal Simon Riley and his staff as well as the current Minister for Education, Grace Grace, and the former minister, Kate Jones, for their hard work in bringing this project to fruition.

**A government member** interjected.

**Mr MADDEN:** I take that interjection. It was a great team effort for the students and staff of Ipswich State High School.

### Phillips, Ms J

 **Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (2.36 pm): I rise as the Liberal-National Party shadow minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships and the state member for Moggill to acknowledge an inspiring and active constituent in my electorate of Moggill. Over the past three years my office staff and I have formed a close professional relationship with Aboriginal Christian leader Aunty Jean Phillips, who works through the Anglican Church across Queensland, specifically in a number of areas of western and southern Brisbane. Aunty Jean has great insights into the range of issues that face our Indigenous communities both here in Queensland and also across Australia.

I was honoured to be asked by Aunty Jean Phillips to say a few words in relation to my shadow ministerial portfolio of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships at the 2018 Australia Day reconciliation service at Surfers Paradise in January this year followed by supper where I met with a number of Indigenous members of the church community. It was terrific to also attend this event with the shadow minister for multicultural affairs and shadow minister for the Commonwealth Games, the member for Surfers Paradise, John-Paul Langbroek MP.

Aunty Jean is an advocate for Common Grace, an established independent worldwide movement made up of thousands of Christians who together believe that things can be different and who are committed to seeking social justice for all through good Christian practice. In Australia, where their membership has reached some 30,000 Christians, the work of Common Grace involves many diverse Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities. Common Grace's vision is to see true reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. The founding director, Jarrod McKenna, has undertaken to work through Aboriginal Christian leaders such as Aunty Jean to deal with many issues of concern including domestic violence. The ongoing work of Common Grace relies on different traditions to enable them to comprehend and assist with what they have to say about justice before they are able to engage more broadly with local communities.

Members of Common Grace utilise resources and tools to help them act for justice without neglecting the responsibilities they have to their own families, friends, work colleagues and church communities. Until now, Common Grace has relied heavily on donations from private individuals and church sources with supplementation by small grants. However, more sources of funding are needed to enable them to continue the work. The various Australia Day reconciliation services are some of the

events that Common Grace have organised this year and more such functions are planned in an endeavour to spread the word throughout Queensland and Australia.

Another area Common Grace is involved in is assisting people from other countries seeking asylum in Australia where their Christian religious faith has put them at risk of harm or persecution. They are working to build a greater media profile to get their message out to the broader community. I certainly know there is more that various governments can do to assist them.

There is a lot of work still to be done by all of us to address these issues. I am certainly prepared to do what I can to bring about change and to offer my full support to Aunty Jean and the work that she and many others do for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous Queenslanders and Australians.

### Bancroft Electorate, Federal Budget

 **Mr WHITING** (Bancroft—ALP) (2.39 pm): I rise to speak about the impact of the federal government's budget on the lack of infrastructure in my electorate of Bancroft. We heard the promise of \$5.2 billion in infrastructure projects for Queensland and we heard the Leader of the Opposition crow about it, but the reality is that there is nothing of substance here. There is nothing new to improve the lives of the people of Bancroft over the next 12 months. As we have heard, of the \$5.2 billion promised, only \$4.6 billion will appear in about four years time. There is nothing for the Bruce Highway for at least four years. Queensland receives nothing from the \$1 billion urban infrastructure fund this year and only \$40 million over the forward estimates, as we previously heard from the member for Pine Rivers.

There is nothing for Cross River Rail, and this is vital for our area. I calculate that it would save about an hour and a half in commuting time for each commuter going to the city each week. In peak hours that is a train every five minutes in my area, and that means thousands of extra seats on those trains for people going in and out of the city for work. As the RACQ said, this federal budget is all smoke and mirrors. The federal government has underfunded and underdelivered on Queensland infrastructure. An analysis by Infrastructure Partnerships Australia revealed that infrastructure funding has been cut by about \$2 billion over the forward estimates.

It is not unusual to see this from the LNP. They have a record of talking up road infrastructure but skipping out on funding deals for those roads. During the election campaign the LNP candidates in my area called for new roads and bridges to take commuters to Brisbane. I have not heard anything since from them on this particular matter. The member for Pine Rivers said that the announcement about the Dohles Rocks on ramps was a reannouncement of a reannouncement from 2016, and I look forward to that being reannounced again when the federal election is called.

I appreciate the 80-20 funding for the Deception Bay Road overpass and Boundary Road, but the federal government keeps slipping back into the trick of trying to get us to do fifty-fifty funding for those federally listed projects. They have a record of walking away from funding agreements. They did it with the Rothwell intersection in my area, which was supposed to a 60-30-10 per cent split between all three levels of government as part of the new rail link. We had to make sure that the shortfall was catered for, so we ended up putting in about \$24 million out of the \$35 million project. It just goes to show that there is one side that my area can rely on to deliver infrastructure, and that is the Labor Party. Due to the population expansion in our area I really want to see the federal government get on board and deliver some funding for infrastructure.

### Western Queensland, Drought

 **Mr MILLAR** (Gregory—LNP) (2.42 pm): I rise this afternoon to place on the public record my concern for Western Queensland communities who have missed out on yet another wet season. Just over two months ago I stood in this place talking about the drought. At that time a little over 400 millimetres of patchy rain had fallen over parts of Western Queensland. People were hopeful and for a short moment they were relieved; however, it did not take long before the hot and dry conditions soaked up what was left of those fleeting storms. Now the westerlies have set in, the temperatures have dropped and the hope of a late season has faded.

This year marks seven failed wet seasons for communities across the central west. As I travel around Gregory I hear veterans and the old-timers of the rural industry talk about the severity of this drought. They have never seen it this bad before. They are comparing it to the 10-year drought of the sixties. After seven failed wet seasons, and with no income and no end in sight, people are at their wit's end. They are strung out financially, physically, emotionally and mentally. To add insult to injury for graziers, for the first time in many years beef and wool prices are holding strong. This comes at a time when the majority of graziers are destocked or feeding what few breeders they have left. Few have the

financial capacity to restock, and many are not willing to roll the dice without the promise of any decent rain.

This is the cruel reality for primary producers throughout my electorate. Families, small businesses and graziers are all struggling. Without a doubt, seven years of unrelenting drought conditions have taken their toll not only on graziers but also small businesses and the community in general. Facing seven years of this drought is like a natural disaster but it is a slow, creeping natural disaster. Right now we are facing seven years without a proper wet season. Our economy was built on the back of agriculture. It is now our state's second largest export industry. Without family farming and grazing businesses our agricultural industry will simply not survive.

I call on those opposite, the Labor Party, to understand the severity of the situation not only in my electorate of Gregory but across Warrego, Burdekin and Traeger. The drought has sadly become a hallmark of shires from the McKinlay right through to shires on the border in the south. As elected representatives, we need to do what we can to support our rural communities and the agricultural industry during what is, quite simply, one of our darkest hours. The drought is continuing. We have to wait for a wet season in another eight months. We need people to survive.

### **Gladstone Electorate, Federal Budget**

 **Mr BUTCHER** (Gladstone—ALP) (2.45 pm): I rise today to speak about how disappointing it is that yet again Central Queensland has been forgotten by the federal government and the members for Flynn and Capricornia. Last week the federal government handed down an unfair budget that delivered big multinational businesses an \$80 billion tax handout while delivering nothing tangible for Central Queenslanders, particularly in my electorate of Gladstone.

There was no increased investment in health, no increased investment in our kids' education and nowhere near enough for our ageing population. Forget about our young ones, because a \$60 million cut to the training budget means that in Central Queensland up to 636 training places are now at risk. It is disappointing to see hopeful young people kicked in the guts by their federal representatives. While the federal coalition government continues to abandon its responsibilities to the people of Queensland, it will again be left to the Palaszczuk government to provide the vision required to help school leavers and other young people get the skills they need to find work.

The people of Gladstone and Central Queensland deserve better. If you live in Gladstone or the surrounding regions, then I guess your health needs do not matter to the member for Flynn either. There has been no Medicare funded MRI service in our region since the mobile service was decommissioned in 2013. I previously raised this issue with the federal health minister and the member for Flynn, yet this year's budget did nothing to address it. The member for Flynn's logo says, 'Ken O'Dowd is delivering for Gladstone, supporting businesses and bringing more doctors to CQ'. What a crock! The response seems to be that, in an area with a regional population in excess of 70,000, it is acceptable for residents to be forced to pay the full cost of their health imagery needs or wear the cost and inconvenience of travelling up the road to Rockhampton—some hour and a half's drive away—to access a bulk-billed service. For some patients this is a regular occurrence. Quite simply, it is just one more stress they do not need at a very anxious time.

I had hoped that this federal budget might support the Palaszczuk government's investment in much needed infrastructure upgrades at the Gladstone Hospital. Alas, access to quality medical services and facilities is not high on the agenda for the coalition and the member for Flynn. There is no getting around it: this coalition government wants the people of Gladstone to work longer; to pay out of their own pocket for supported residential places; to pay for their own MRIs; to pay for their own health care; and to pay for their own education and training needs. But do not worry, Mr Speaker: if you are a multinational business paying no tax, the coalition government in Australia has your back.

### **Central Queensland Coal Network, Aurizon**

 **Mr LAST** (Burdekin—LNP) (2.48 pm): I rise today on an issue that has the potential to undermine our resource sector and put a black hole in Queensland's royalty revenue. The decision by Aurizon to change its maintenance program—which by its own admission will deny the capacity to move 20 million tonnes of coal to be exported every year from the Central Queensland coal network for the next four years—is already hurting Queensland's resource sector. This 20-million tonne reduction in coal exports will cost Queensland more than \$4 billion, with a \$500 million black hole in royalties paid to the state government.

The Queensland Competition Authority, tasked with overseeing and regulating the Central Queensland coal network and therefore the standards of operation for Aurizon, has been missing in action on this issue. With the final QCA determination not due until the end of the year, Aurizon is now acting in contravention of the QCA's ruling. What is the Treasurer, who has direct responsibility for the QCA and a responsibility for tracking state revenue, doing to resolve this issue?

Since January 2018 Aurizon has increased unplanned rail closures, made maintenance possessions absolute rather than working around train paths, been unwilling to provide reliable information on scheduling and network availability and continually changed the times of planned possessions. For what would be an extra \$25 million in maintenance, Aurizon has been prepared to cost their customers 160 times that amount in export revenue and cost the state of Queensland 20 times that revenue in lost royalties.

Whilst all of this may sound like technicalities around train and line maintenance, it does have real-world implications, in particular for the resource companies, their workers, the rural and regional communities they support and the state government's bottom line. A \$500 million cut to royalties is a \$100 cut for every man, woman and child living in Queensland in the next state budget. Aurizon's maintenance practices have forced some coal producers to start considering the viability of Queensland jobs, many of which are in my electorate of Burdekin.

I am calling on the Treasurer to look into this mess and deliver some certainty to Queensland's vitally important \$5.1 billion resource sector. What measures is the Treasurer looking at implementing in her preparations for the budget to factor in this \$500 million hit to state revenue? As Minister for Trade, can the Premier explain what impact this projected decrease in coal exports and cost efficiencies is having on our trading partners?

It is time for this government to show some leadership and step in to resolve this issue. The status quo cannot be allowed to continue as it is directly hurting Queensland jobs, revenue and our state's international reputation as a reliable and affordable exporter of resources.

### Cairns Electorate, Small Business

 **Mr HEALY** (Cairns—ALP) (2.51 pm): With Queensland's Small Business Week fast approaching, I rise to speak of the small businesses in my city and my region to make people aware of the support the Palaszczuk Labor government is providing for them, particularly in the pursuit of jobs. We know how important jobs are, particularly in regional areas.

The Queensland government recognises that small businesses are the engine room of the state's economy. My area has a population of 170,000 people and there are approximately 10,000 small businesses in and around Cairns. The number of small businesses within the region as a whole mirrors quite closely the small business economy which dominates the Queensland economy. Recent census results indicate that retail trade is the largest employing industry in the Tropical North, with over 12,000 people, or 12 per cent of the workforce, employed in that area. The next largest is industries such as accommodation, cafes and restaurants, then a multitude of tourism businesses.

There are many small businesses that will enjoy the benefits of the investment being made in our city and region, in particular the Palaszczuk government's \$176 million investment in the Cairns Convention Centre, which currently generates \$80 million a year into our economy. It would be fair to say that once this expansion and upgrade have been completed that number will grow considerably. There is \$120 million being spent on our port expansion and \$46 million available for aviation growth and development. These and other state initiatives will see further economic opportunities for small businesses in and around Cairns.

From a jobs perspective—it is vitally important—we have the Back to Work program. Support payments of up to \$10,000 are available for eligible employers hiring unemployed people; \$15,000 for hiring long-term unemployed people—that is, those unemployed for 52 weeks; \$20,000 under the Youth Boost for hiring young jobseekers between the ages of 15 and 24; and \$20,000 under the mature aged boost for hiring jobseekers over the age of 55. There is a Business Growth Fund Program of \$2.3 million to support Queensland companies to grow and create jobs; the Trade Skills Assessment and Gap Training Program, which provides funding of up to \$4,700 per trainee; Skilling Queenslanders for Work, which provides \$80 million to provide skills training and jobs to a minimum of 10,000 disadvantaged Queenslanders; the Small Business Digital Grants Program; and the Small Business Entrepreneur Grants Program, which provides up to \$5,000 to engage consultants, advisers or a business coach for up to three months to help establish the business. There is a range of opportunities available for small businesses. I encourage people in my area to seek advice from the department of state development, which can assist with their inquiries in these important areas.

### Currumbin Creek Road, Cyclist Safety; Youth Music Venture

 **Mrs STUCKEY** (Currumbin—LNP) (2.54 pm): I have been voicing my concerns about cyclist safety in the Currumbin electorate for many months now. I am calling on transport and main roads minister Mark Bailey to take cyclist safety more seriously and make road improvements on Currumbin Creek Road, where Commonwealth Games events took place. Ongoing fears from residents about cyclist safety on this dangerous section of road have prompted me to write to the government three times since October last year requesting a number of measures to better protect cyclists and other road users along narrow parts of Currumbin Creek Road. These measures include an education campaign on cyclist safety, additional cyclist warning signage and a dedicated cycle lane. The recent installation of additional cyclist warning signage on the road is a good start, but much more is needed.

Cyclists are dicing with death by riding along sections of Currumbin Creek Road that are so narrow there are no protections for them. They are competing with vehicles for limited space and it is an accident waiting to happen. Cyclists must be warned of the dangers of riding along this road, and all road users should be reminded of their responsibilities when sharing this road. By including this already dangerous section of road in the Commonwealth Games cycling road race events, Goldoc organisers and the Palaszczuk government have encouraged cyclists to use it. The challenge to ride the games course has become a bucket list item for cyclists, but more cyclists on this already unsuitable, compromised road means that motorists are growing increasingly frustrated.

After requests from local residents for the establishment of a bike lane at this location, I asked the minister to consider one that would provide vehicles with safe room to pass and give cyclists peace of mind and a safer route to cycle. Last month Minister Bailey wrote to me saying that it is not possible to add a cycle lane to that section of road without undertaking major widening works. The minister cannot be serious about cyclist safety when on the one hand he promotes cycling but on the other he refuses to provide a safer cycling environment. I am calling on him to lift his game in the name of cycling safety. He was happy to swan around at events during the Commonwealth Games; however, if there had been a cycling accident on this section of road in the lead-up to the games he would have had some explaining to do and I bet we would have seen some action pretty swiftly then.

I just do not want to see anyone get hurt. That is why I am inviting the minister to come and cycle on this section of Currumbin Creek Road and then tell the Currumbin community that a dedicated cycle lane and education campaign are not needed urgently.

I would like to take a moment to commend the community groups in Currumbin, in particular the Youth Music Venture, who were chosen to play during some events at the games. It is a wonderful initiative. I commend the president, Ian Grace, for his drive and enthusiasm. To see our young people, who only recently formed bands, perform in this manner was a joy to behold.

### Heatley, School Security; Thurston, Mr J

 **Mr HARPER** (Thuringowa—ALP) (2.57 pm): At the November 2017 state election the suburb of Heatley became part of the electorate of Thuringowa. As a former student of Heatley high school, I am very proud to be representing both Heatley Secondary College and Heatley State School. My initial interactions with these schools followed on from the very good work of the member for Mundingburra, Minister Coralee O'Rourke, who formerly represented the suburb of Heatley.

It was my intent to continue to strongly lobby for funding for school infrastructure in Heatley including security fences for both schools. During the election campaign I had direct conversations with many residents, the broader school community, P&Cs, staff and students. I am grateful for their support, as they have assisted me with my petition, which has been supported by 555 petitioners. I now table a nonconforming petition which calls for support for Heatley Secondary College and Heatley State School to secure fully funded security fencing.

*Tabled paper: Nonconforming petition, titled 'Petition to secure funding for Heatley Secondary College security fencing and improved facilities' [716].*

The petition reads—

We the undersigned support our State Member, Aaron Harper MP in seeking Funding for a Security Fence for both Heatley Secondary College & Heatley State Primary School. Both schools are less than 2 Klm away from each other and have had continual issues with vandalism & damage to resources causing financial & emotional stress on the schools community.

2018 is a special year. It marks the celebration of Heatley high school's 50th anniversary. I look forward to joining former students and staff during those significant celebrations, to be held later this year.

I sincerely thank those people for signing my petition, a copy of which I have given to the Minister for Education, Grace Grace, to whom I have made representations regarding funding for security fences. I want to acknowledge principals Steve Miskin and Louise Wilkinson, the P&Cs, staff and their respective unions—United Voice, Together and Queensland Teachers' Union—for advocating so strongly for improved facilities. I cannot wait to see these fences come to fruition and create local jobs over our term of government.

While I am on my feet talking about the success of petitions, I want to share with other members of the House that the members for Mundingburra, Townsville and I will be starting a petition to call for Johnathan Thurston to have a bronze statue erected in front of the \$250 million North Queensland Stadium. We know the important contribution that JT has made to the Cowboys, we know the important contribution he has made off the field and I know the three of us can rally the troops of North Queensland, particularly Townsville, to support us to ensure that North Queensland has its own bronze statue. They can have one down here in front of Suncorp Stadium, and we will call on the sports minister, Mick de Brenni, to help us out as well. The people of Townsville need to put JT up on a pedestal. We can do this.

**Mr Power:** What about Riverway Drive?

**Mr HARPER:** Riverway Drive is a great place.

## **LOCAL GOVERNMENT (COUNCILLOR COMPLAINTS) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL**

## **LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTORAL (IMPLEMENTING STAGE 1 OF BELCARRA) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL**

### **Consideration in Detail (Cognate Debate)**

#### **Local Government Electoral (Implementing Stage 1 of Belcarra) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill**

Resumed from p. 1324.

Resumed on clause 20—

 **Mr MOLHOEK** (3.01 pm): I rise to speak to clause 20. I also want to express concerns around the retrospectivity that is being proposed in this bill. There are certain standards and conventions that I have come to understand are the norm, both in parliament and from my time as a local councillor, and it is very rare indeed that we would pass a local law or create legislation that ignores all decent conventions and introduces retrospectivity which really goes to the heart of our concerns around this bill. It is simply a bill that has been designed to punish councillors and developers and businesspeople.

As we identified yesterday, and I spoke about it here in the House last night, it is a conspiracy to simply make the unions stronger. Those opposite are doing everything they can to weaken the opposition. The LNP historically has been the party that is about small business. It is the party that stands up for the farmers and the graziers of this great state. It is the party that stands up for business and entrepreneurialism. It is the party that stands up for the mining industry. I find it incredibly sad that the Labor Party, that was once known as the party of a fair go and a job for everyone, is becoming more and more entrenched with its belief that it is all about better benefits for union members and greater control for the unions.

I was particularly disappointed with the Attorney-General's comments earlier this afternoon when she dared to suggest that some of us were just filibustering on this bill. I found those comments offensive. I have been waiting for 12 years to have my say about the disgraceful behaviour and practices of those on the other side of the House—the government—and the way that they have treated councils in the past with so much contempt. This is the government's third attempt at trying to undermine councils. It is its third attempt at trying to introduce new codes of conduct and standards for councils. It is its third rally against the development industry and big business in this state, but those opposite forget that business underpins the economy. Business underpins the economy and it equally deserves a fair go in this House and having its voice heard in this House. I wish I had half an hour or an hour to go into

further detail on this—and I know I am out of time—but I am very disappointed that the Attorney-General would seek to deprive us of our right to speak, which is a fundamental right in this great democracy of ours.

*(Time expired)*

**Mr HINCHLIFFE:** In relation to clause 20 I want to respond to the issues that members have raised in relation to retrospectivity. There have been a number of issues that members have raised. I will come to the detail of the transitional provisions that relate to this matter and how I think they are just and fair and appropriate, but before I do so I want to express some surprise that we have had a long list—and I am not going to go through them all because that is going to eat up time and stop people contributing to this debate in the time that we have available to us, so I am not going to do that—of members of the LNP who have protested at great length about not wanting to impose legislation that would have a retrospective effect, that is, measures in this bill that would have an impact of being retrospective.

Indeed, clearly we would think most logically a retrospectivity element with no warning whatsoever would be the absolute worst thing that people could do. That was what people have said.

**Mr Molhoek** interjected.

**Mr HINCHLIFFE:** Yes, absolutely and I see nods opposite telling me that that is absolutely right and that that is absolutely disgraceful. That is why I find it astonishing that those same people who protested about this earlier today voted in favour of an amendment moved by the member for Toowoomba South that did just that—attempted to implement a retrospective penalty on people who had no notice whatsoever. That is why we took the right decision and voted against that, but we will take the right decision and vote for this measure because there are appropriate transitional provisions. As I stated—

The transitional provisions—

for the property developer donations prohibition—

apply from the date of introduction of the Local Government Electoral (Implementing Belcarra) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2017—that is, 12 October 2017.

Clear notice was given at that point. We heard evidence from members opposite who made it clear that they took into account that notice in their dealings with, and management of, these sorts of issues in the lead-up to the state election last year. Accordingly—

Any payments that would be unlawful under the property developer donation prohibition made on or after 12 October 2017 will, on commencement, need to be repaid to the donor within 30 days after commencement. No offence is committed in respect of donations made or received between 12 October—

2017—

and commencement.

Unlike what we have heard from those opposite about us supposedly seeking to criminalise people for their actions past, we are making it clear that there is no offence committed as long as we have the repayment, but a failure to repay the amount of the donation would constitute an offence.

If the bill is passed, lead-in time between the passage and the commencement date will not only ensure that the Electoral Commission of Queensland will have any necessary administrative arrangements in place but also that any person or entity potentially affected by the provisions, including the obligation to repay, can obtain any necessary advice. The lead-in time of three to six months will ensure that ECQ guidelines are in place. It also provides donors and candidates with time to review the act and seek, as I say, the necessary advice from the ECQ and others. In fact, the fact that it commences by proclamation ensures that these issues will be resolved.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Clause 20 deals with the retrospective nature of this legislation. This is not only bizarre in that this clause does not deal with the legislation's retrospective nature; rather, this legislation was originally introduced in the former parliament. Not only did the government then dissolve the parliament when it called the election; it then said, 'We are going to introduce the same legislation and make it retrospective.' In fact, since October or November last year we have had legislation being enforced without any proper legal authority. There was no bill. There was no legislation in force. With regard to the last bill that the government introduced when the House was dissolved, the bill fell off the table. There was no law in the land in terms of banning developer donations in October, November, December, January and February.

When the government reintroduced this legislation, it said, 'We are going to backdate it until October 2017.'

**Mr Hart:** His own argument.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** It is the minister's own argument. This clause is not only retrospective but also retrospective to a time when there was an election. There was no sitting of parliament. There was no opportunity to debate the laws. The clause is effectively saying that any Premier on any side of the House can say, 'In five years time, I think I may introduce legislation to ban XYZ. We may make illegal what is legal to do now and, by the way, we may make it retrospective.' During October, November, December and January property developers, who ordinarily would be able to donate to an election campaign, were not able to do so for fear that the Labor government would be re-elected and then possibly introduce legislation in relation to those donations.

Ultimately, the Labor government was re-elected and it introduced this legislation. When Labor was in opposition, there were cries of foul play when legislation that was retrospective in nature was debated. My God, I thought I would never see the day when Labor members, based on what they have said, their history, and their precedents, would introduce retrospective legislation. This bill is not just retrospective; it is legislating for a period during which parliament was not even sitting. At that time there were no laws in place that dealt with making such donations. During that period, it was completely legal for developers to make donations but there was the fear of an arrogant Premier saying, 'I will introduce legislation in the future.' On that basis, this legislation, including this clause, should be opposed. It sets a terrible, dangerous precedent, and today it is none other than this arrogant Labor government that has set that precedent.

**Mr McARDLE:** The comments made by the member for Kawana are absolutely correct. This bill first came to the House in October 2017, at which point it was made quite clear that it would be retrospective. If a bill were to be retrospective, it is important that debate on it in this chamber is not delayed so that everybody has a clear understanding of what the law is going to be at a certain point. The problem is that the government did not engage the ECQ, or, to my knowledge, any other expert to look at the definitions contained in the bill or offer assistance so that the bill could be given clarity before the House was prorogued.

The member for Kawana is correct: when parliament was prorogued, that bill no longer existed. The right thing to do would be to bring the bill back into this House and then move urgently to line up all the ducks to ensure that people have a clear understanding of its provisions. The previous bill did not continue because that parliament was prorogued. The bill was dead. People acted—and could have acted—in accordance with the law at that time. It is wrong for this government to now say that, although the parliament was prorogued, it is going to make this bill retrospective back to 2017. That is inequitable and unjust. For the sake of equity, this chamber should vote down this clause. Back in October 2017 the government did not do what it should have done urgently. It is now putting people at risk for what they did at a time when what they could do was, in fact, legal.

**Mr POWER:** As the chair of the committee that considered the bill, I want to say that this matter was considered by the committee. All the members of the committee had the opportunity to ask questions about this provision. The member for Southport demonstrated the LNP's attitude towards this legislation. He seemed to insinuate that there is no problem at all with developer donations at the local government level. To extrapolate his argument, therefore, there is no problem with developer donations at the state government level. I do not think anybody in Queensland believes that.

The previous bill was introduced on 12 October 2017 and the provision was confirmed when the bill was read a first time. During the election campaign, it was further confirmed that this bill would come before the parliament. Queenslanders were told repeatedly that Labor regarded what is in this bill as setting an important standard. The counterfactual argument is that Labor saw a problem with developer donations but instead told Queenslanders that it was fine to continue the practice. That would have created a real problem.

The LNP members are not really standing up for the rights of developers. Clause 20 of this bill refers very clearly to the recipient. It does not refer to developers having to take action. Instead, it refers to the recipients of such donations having to take action. I make it absolutely clear that any member who votes against clause 20 is not standing up for any developer who gave a donation in good faith; they are standing up for a party, or a candidate, who received the money. Specifically, all of those

members opposite who are going to vote against this clause are voting to stand up for the LNP machine and their donations, because those members are the only ones who will be required to give back the money within 30 days.

Division: Question put—That clause 20, 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, 43:**

**LNP, 38**—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.

**Ind, 1**—Bolton.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 20, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new heading—

 **Mr HINCHLIFFE** (3.21 pm): I move the following amendment—

**10 Before clause 21**

Page 32, after line 11—

*insert—*

**Division 1 Preliminary**

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 21, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clauses—

**Mr HINCHLIFFE** (3.22 pm): I move the following amendment—

**11 After clause 21**

Page 32, after line 13—

*insert—*

**Division 2 Amendments commencing on assent**

**21A Amendment of s 122 (Removing a councillor)**

(1) Section 122(1)—

*insert—*

(d) the Minister reasonably believes it is otherwise in the public interest that a councillor be suspended or dismissed.

(2) Section 122(2)(c), before ‘—suspend’—

*insert—*

or dissolve the local government

**21B Amendment of s 123 (Dissolving a local government)**

(1) Section 123, heading, ‘Dissolving’—

*omit, insert—*

**Suspending or dissolving**

- (2) Section 123(1)—  
*insert—*
  - (d) the Minister reasonably believes it is otherwise in the public interest that every councillor be suspended or dismissed.
- (3) Section 123—  
*insert—*
  - (1A) If the proposal in the Minister's notice under section 120 was to suspend every councillor for a stated period, the Minister may recommend that the Governor in Council—
    - (a) suspend every councillor for a period that is no longer than the stated period; and
    - (b) appoint an interim administrator to act in place of the councillors until the stated period ends.
- (4) Section 123(2), 'The'—  
*omit, insert—*
  - Also, the
- (5) Section 123(4), 'The regulation'—  
*omit, insert—*
  - A regulation dissolving a local government
- (6) Section 123(1A) to (5)—  
*renumber as section 123(2) to (6).*

This amendment inserts new clauses 21A and 21B to insert a new section 122(1)(d) and 123(1)(d) to provide that if the minister reasonably believes that in the public interest a councillor or every councillor of a local government be suspended or dismissed, the minister may recommend that the Governor in Council suspend or dismiss the councillor or councillors. The amendment provides greater powers to swiftly deal with the councillors who are not living up to community expectations.

Amendment 11 also provides that in the case where every councillor of a local government is suspended for a stated time, the minister may recommend that the Governor in council appoint an interim administrator to act in place of the councillors until the stated period ends. That provides a range of tools that could be best used to respond to circumstances that face local government in this state or at some future time.

I acknowledge that these clauses are very serious in nature and I have flagged that this amendment is something that would be subject to a government review within the next two years. That has been a commitment that I have made to the Local Government Association of Queensland and to other stakeholders.

**Ms LEAHY:** The minister is right when he says that these are quite extraordinary powers. They possibly give this Minister for Local Government the greatest powers that any local government minister in Australia would have. Going through the explanatory notes in relation to this clause, these particular amendments were not put into the bill and they did not go to the parliamentary committee. Reading from the explanatory notes, the policy objective is achieved by amending the threshold. That is important. The minister has used the threshold in the case of the Fraser Coast Regional Council. It is not as if the minister cannot take action. He has taken action even without this legislation.

The term 'public interest' is not defined. I can only imagine what would have happened if this had gone to a parliamentary committee. The explanatory notes state that this is intentional to permit the phrase to evolve over time to reflect community expectations over time. I thought the whole purpose of having legislation was so that it was not subjective, so that one could see exactly what the bar was in the legislation. We do not see in the legislation a definition of 'public interest', but we do have some interesting relevant factors, one of which is 'acting reasonably'. Another one is 'community confidence in local government and/or its councillors'. I think we need to be very careful because the minister might find that the floodgates open. If somebody did not vote for a councillor or for a particular team in council they might all say they do not have community confidence in local government or its councillors.

This is a broad, wideranging power that has been given to the Minister for Local Government. We know that there is only a small number of people in local government who do the wrong thing. The vast majority do the right thing all the time. I question why we need such a broad power. We have already had some of those powers utilised in the case of the Fraser Coast Regional Council and that

was sufficient at the time. The reason that threshold is high is because those in local government are elected every four years. The public make the decision as to whether they have done a good job or not. The public are the check and balance on those people.

**Mr CRISAFULLI:** I start by saying that that was an excellent contribution from the shadow minister. I too believe that this is true overreach. I do not doubt that the minister's intentions are pure, but there are no checks or balances. For the minister to say that we are having a review in two years is a great initiative, but that does not change the fact that within that period there will be decisions that he will have to make. This puts undue pressure on the way councils have to deal with the minister and his office and puts undue pressure on the minister and the members in this place.

We have heard during this debate members make contributions about whether or not they like their local councillor. That is not what this is about. When there is the ability to act on matters as broad as 'acting reasonably' or 'community confidence', that gives the minister too much remit. That is too broad a power.

I respect that this is a time where we want to put in place legislation in this House to make sure that the level of government that is closest to the people, that reacts to their everyday needs, is accountable, open and transparent. So we should. That is fit and proper. That is why as an opposition we have been responsible and mature and backed many of the sensible amendments, but this is not one of them. Centralising power in the minister's office is not akin to good governance. Saying that you will review something in two years that has not been discussed by a committee that has had the opportunity to delve down and look at what could have been a midway point, a point that you found well—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Whiting): If the member could speak through the chair it would help the debate.

**Mr CRISAFULLI:** A far greater contribution could have achieved all the objectives that the minister wanted without the overreach we see here. Whether there are five, 15 or 27 councillors, when those councillors walk into a chamber people want to know that they are able to represent their interests freely and fairly. However, to put a level of power in the Minister's hands that enables him to dismiss them because he believes they are not acting reasonably or that the community no longer has confidence in them, in my mind, takes away democratic actions.

**Mr HART:** During my second reading contribution, I flagged that it really concerned me that this public interest amendment had not been to a committee and had not been put through the usual scrutiny of this place. As I said then, the term 'public interest' is not defined. It really concerns me that the minister has given us a list of things that may be part of a public interest debate, but in the explanatory notes he has also said that these things may be included but are 'not limited to'. When you say something like 'not limited to' you leave the door wide open to different interpretations of 'public interest'. At the end of the day, that is the real issue here. At this point I could say a lot of stupid things about the colour of someone's hair and so on, which the minister could take exception to. I realise and fully accept that the minister would never do something like that. However, we do not know who will come after this minister and, as I said during my contribution to the second reading debate, I am not so sure about some of the other people in this place.

The contribution that the member for Maryborough gave yesterday has been played out on the front page of the *Fraser Coast Chronicle* this morning. He took exception to issues that were happening in his electorate and that led to a change of mayor. They now have a mayor whom he likes. It is quite obvious to everybody that that mayor is Labor aligned. Political interference may, in fact, have occurred there, as per the front page of the today's paper.

When you look at those sorts of things, as the member for Broadwater said, we need to look at whether people have been acting reasonably. What does 'acting reasonably' mean? I do not know how to define that. Unfortunately, it is not defined in the papers that are before us. It has not been scrutinised. People have not looked at it and argued to and fro, which is what we do in this place. We put up arguments. We try to convince somebody that we are right or we put thoughts in their head that they may expand upon further, but that has not happened in this case. It is simply being pushed through. How can the community have confidence in this process? This is wide open to abuse. The minister is giving himself way too much power. I certainly I do not support the clause.

**Mr WATTS:** I am concerned about the centralisation of power over a democratically elected council. In my area when council amalgamations were going on, Crows Nest and Toowoomba went through a Size, Shape and Sustainability process, which was the process to work out how to amalgamate properly. They were then bullied into a different position by this chamber. It concerns me that, at the start of such a discussion, this power would mean that the minister could walk in and get rid of everybody. That is of great concern.

These people have been democratically elected. I do not know how wide 'not acting reasonably' can be drawn. Does 'not acting reasonably' mean speaking out against a proposal by the local government minister? I am concerned that the local government minister has the option to bully councillors. I am not at all suggesting that about the current local government minister. I have no issue there. My issue is that we cannot create legislation in this chamber that has unforeseen ramifications down the track. I think it is an overreach to suggest that the public interest is one reason to sack a council. I suggest that it is not in the public interest at all to bring this to the House. I am concerned about the situation this creates for the future. If a local government minister makes a suggestion to a council that the council does not, the minister has the opportunity to bully the council and potentially have closed-door conversations with councillors, outlining the direct powers that that local government minister has over their ability to carry on serving their community.

For me, this is overreach. We could come up with something that involves a CCC investigation or make recommendations to put in a better process after which the minister could act. However, to jump straight to acting, if it is seen that a council is not acting reasonably or in the public interest, is a concern going forward. We can do better than that with legislation from this chamber.

**Mr HINCHLIFFE:** I note the members' comments in relation to this amendment. I share some of the concerns around the serious nature of what we are dealing with. However, let us understand that the genesis of this process was, in part, a response to the Leader of the Opposition who, a couple of weeks ago, speaking out in relation to a particular matter, said that certain actions should happen. In looking forward to the action that I could take, I had to consider the capability of the provisions in the Local Government Act. I have to be clear: I found shortcomings. That is why this provision was put forward, in negotiation with key stakeholders. The phrasing of 'public interest' was identified as being the best phrasing to use for this circumstance. Public interest is the best phrasing to be used in this circumstance, because public interest is well understood in the law. I understand that 177 acts passed by this parliament use a public interest test. It is well understood, as a consequence of things being tested using those experiences, including High Court rulings that relate to the public interest. That is why this was identified as being the best course.

Let me assuage some of the concerns alluded to that there is no recourse in relation to these issues. In the same way that the current provisions of the act operate, any action that a local government minister would need to take in relation to using this additional power requires a show-cause notice and anyone impacted by it has the opportunity to seek a judicial review. All of those things remain in place as part of the protections for people who would be affected by these provisions.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** The minister is correct: we have had debates in this place about public interest tests and there is legal precedent for public interest tests. The last time we debated a public interest test in this House, the minister opposed it. That was when we were applying a public interest test to keep paedophiles behind bars. The Labor government at the time asked, 'What minister should have the right to have such power to keep a paedophile behind bars?' Now we are dealing with local councils and if, in his or her view, the minister deems it in the public interest to sack a council, a mayor or a councillor, that is okay. The minister can sack a councillor if he or she forms the view that it is in the public interest.

The explanatory notes to this particular clause when it comes to the definition of public interest that the minister would have to satisfy is blank. It has been intentionally left out. That means anything or whatever the minister wants to take into consideration.

When the minister was in opposition and this House dealt with the public interest test for keeping paedophiles behind bars, we not only had the public interest test but also had that it had to go through the Governor-in-Council on the recommendation of the minister at the time. Why is it okay for this Labor government to apply a public interest test when they want to sack a council, but it is not okay to apply a public interest test to keep a dangerous sex offender paedophile behind bars?

Yes, Minister, there is legal precedent. There is legislative precedent on public interest tests, but there is not much precedent for not having a qualified public interest test or what a minister ought to tick off in terms of the minister satisfying himself or herself that there is a public interest test. There are usually items the minister has to satisfy himself or herself of before they issue the order to sack the council or mayor.

I find it ironic that the Labor Party would, only a few years ago, strongly oppose a minister having this power. They were saying that this it is back in the Joh days and what would Tony Fitzgerald say about the minister having the power of a public interest test. Now this minister is giving himself the very same power.

As we have discovered in this place, what Labor say in opposition is one thing. What they do in government is a completely different story. When we have the arrogance of the Premier, as we do in this state, and it trickles down we see this sort of thing. I have grave concerns about the public interest test because ultimately there is no public interest test, it is what the minister thinks. If it is a bunch of complaints from a different political source in the community that could be enough to justify the minister sacking a council. I think that is another dangerous precedent.

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, 42:**

**LNP, 38**—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.

Insertion of new clause—

 **Ms LEAHY** (3.47 pm): I move the following amendment—

1 **Before clause 22**

Page 32, before line 14—

*insert*—

**21AA Insertion of new ch 5, pt 1, div 4**

Chapter 5, part 1—

*insert*—

#### **Division 4      Review of particular matters**

#### **124A      Review of automatic suspensions and public interest dismissals and dissolutions**

- (1) The Minister must review and prepare a report about the operation of this Act relating to—
  - (a) the dismissal of councillors on the ground mentioned in section 122(1)(d); and
  - (b) the dissolution of local governments on the ground mentioned in section 123(1)(d); and
  - (c) the automatic suspension of councillors under chapter 6, part 2, division 8.
- (2) The Minister must table the report in the Legislative Assembly no later than 1 July 2020.

I table the explanatory notes to my amendments.

*Tabled paper: Local Government Electoral (Implementing Stage 1 of Belcarra) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018, explanatory notes to Ms Ann Leahy's amendments [717].*

It is disappointing that the government did not see sense in what we proposed in terms of the previous clause. Now we actually have to move forward with this amendment. This amendment seeks to insert into the bill a two-year review clause relating to the government's very powerful new provisions that were not actually put through the committee process. If those amendments do not go through the committee process, are not scrutinised by stakeholders and members of the public do not see what stakeholders had to say about those amendments then it makes sense to actually review them at a point in time in the future. We are recommending that that be no later than 1 July 2020.

The amendment provides a review of the provisions in relation to automatic suspensions and public interest dismissals and dissolutions. It makes it very clear that the minister must report to the Legislative Assembly and it ensures that the minister's two-year review commitment is enshrined in legislation. I acknowledge that the minister has given that commitment in his second reading speech. However, it is important to make sure that with these very powerful amendments that make the minister basically the judge and jury over a lot of things in relation to elected officials that there be set in stone a two-year review. That gives not only elected officials but also stakeholders the opportunity to comment.

We know the Local Government Association was consulted and we know the Queensland Law Society was consulted, but we have not seen what they said in relation to automatic suspensions or public interest dismissals and dissolutions. The Queensland public has not seen that because these amendments were not put through the committee process. It would have saved a lot of the parliament's time if they had been put through the committee process in the first instance. There are 40 pages of amendments.

They are wideranging powers. It is important that we make sure they are reviewed. That is why we are proposing these amendments. It is important that if these powers are used they are used responsibly. No minister is above the assembly. Reporting back to the assembly provides scrutiny of what is going on in relation to these wideranging powers. That is particularly important for our democracy. The assembly can make that judgement.

**Mr JANETZKI:** I rise to support the amendment moved by the shadow minister, the member for Warrego. I, too, would register my disappointment that the minister has progressed the public interest test, as was just agreed to. I think they are extraordinary powers to dissolve or suspend. Because of the significance of these powers, the amendment of the honourable member for Warrego is important.

The public interest test has been articulately put by the member for Kawana. It is a broad power. It was not that long ago that the government of the day was opposing this in respect of the some of the most heinous criminals we face. I note in regard to this public interest test that the minister must have a reasonable belief. We know from the reasonable person test that the person on the top of the Clapham omnibus was a reasonable person. That could be any person.

Because it is such a broad power, there are concerns that if there was political influence, a particular bias or a particular predisposition in respect of a particular council these powers could be used in the wrong hands for the wrong purpose. Because of the broadness of the power, I think it is important that every two years the minister submit a report to the House—no later than 1 July 2020, I note—to explain the reasons for the decision and to justify the need for a dissolution or a suspension. Because of the broadness of these powers and the importance of an ability for the public interest test to be challenged, I believe this amendment as moved by the member for Warrego should be supported.

**Mr KRAUSE:** I support the amendment moved by the member for Warrego. If these provisions have not been reviewed in the committee process before introduction, they surely should be reviewed after introduction. The amendment would achieve that through a legislative means. It is a significant power that has been given. A lot of concerns have been raised, some of which have been acknowledged by the minister, about those powers which have just been agreed to in the previous clause.

I said in the second reading debate that this issue could have been dealt with in a different way. This provision, as far as I am aware, and from what has been circulated in the public domain as far as I am aware, will not need to be utilised immediately because the councillors who are under clouds at the moment will be automatically stood down. The public interest provisions could have been separated from this bill, sent through the committee process and had a proper analysis. That is not going to happen now. Although I support the amendment moved by the member for Warrego, I acknowledge the

commitment given by the minister to review the provisions. The minister could also stand up this afternoon and refer this matter to a parliamentary committee immediately for investigation if they are not inclined to support this amendment from the member for Warrego.

Give a committee a job to do to look at these provisions and report back to the House after having undertaken a submissions process and a proper review process which will include feedback from all relevant stakeholders. As I said, it was disappointing that it was not dealt with in a different manner—that is, to have this dealt with in a separate bill. The next best option is to enshrine in the legislation this review process moved by the member for Warrego. We should all be supporting that in the interests of making good legislation and good policy.

**Mr BENNETT:** I have not been randomly standing up all afternoon or over the last couple of weeks, but some of these strong clauses need support and they do need to be articulated in the House. We have moved an amendment for a mandatory review period. This legislation has caused considerable debate. There is concern, particularly from those on this side of the House, and the shadow minister is doing her very best to get some strong reforms to some of these clauses. A two-year review on something that gives the minister such broad-ranging and far-reaching powers I think is only fair and reasonable. I think we all should be supporting the shadow minister. I think it is good public policy to support the amendment to frame this within the legislation.

We have seen public interest tests and others matters talked about. I spoke last night about the perception this legislation will have for Queenslanders and their trust in this place and us as legislators to make sure we enshrine good legislation and good public policy into the Queensland environment. All the way through I think this has been something that we have all considered. It needed a review. It did need some support, particularly when dealing with issues at a local government level. This law has not gone through a committee. It has not gone through a review process. It has been introduced as an amendment—such a critical amendment—and it has not had a true and proper process.

The only opportunity we have is three minutes each to articulate what we believe. All members in this House should agree to having a safeguard: that in July 2020 there will be a review that will allow ministers, the government and the opposition to look at this legislation in its completeness. I think that is what we should do and what we should do for Queenslanders.

**Mr HART:** This is a sensible amendment moved by the shadow minister. I realise that the minister has said that he intends to review this, but the proper place for this is in black and white in the legislation. We will then all have a clear idea that in two years time this is absolutely going to happen. If it does not, we can say to the minister, 'It is in the legislation. You have not done it. How about getting it done?'

Quite a few parts of this legislation have been left wide open to interpretation. We just had a debate on the public interest test. Obviously the Labor government has more votes than this side of the House so it is winning this debate. Those things have now been ticked off. We do not get a chance to re prosecute that. We do not like where we have ended up, but we have ended up there because they have won the vote. The best thing we can do from here on in is to put this two-year review into the legislation so that we all know that is absolutely going to happen.

If the minister wants to be fair dinkum about this from here on in, then he should appreciate that we are coming at this from a good point of view. We understand where we are, but we want to see this review in the bill. We do not need to just vote along party lines. We need to have a sensible debate at the end of the day. I am really hoping that some members on the other side support this. In fact, I hope that the minister may support this view because it makes common sense.

**Mr McARDLE:** I support the amendment moved by the shadow minister. It has been said many times that some of these amendments have not gone to a committee to determine their validity or determine exactly how they are viewed by stakeholders, but I do note that the minister commented in a preceding debate that he had some sort of relationship with stakeholders to ascertain whether or not the public interest component would be suitable. I would be keen to understand more about who those people were and what they said.

The shadow minister commented in an earlier debate that the powers given to the minister in this case were, in my words, extraordinary. They are very wide. If I recall correctly, she said that they were some of the widest she can recall seeing in any bill. If that is the case, there is even more need for a review to be undertaken by the government.

The other point is that the minister, from my understanding, has made an oral commitment to have a review within two years. That would give credence to the shadow minister's statement that these are very exceptional powers and that even from the government's perspective they do need to be reviewed. What I do not fathom though is that the minister will say in the House that the government will do a review but he will not commit to a clause that actually enshrines that in legislation. We do not know what the terms of reference of the review will be. We do not know whether we will have any input into what those terms of reference will be. This amendment puts in place exactly what should be reviewed within two years. The minister has given an oral commitment to put in place a review within two years, so the next simple logical step would be to put that in writing in a bill before the House.

If I recall correctly, the minister also highlighted that there are exceptional powers in these amendments, so why will he not commit today to a clause similar to what is being proposed by the shadow minister? If he will not do that, he should put forward an amendment himself that we can debate. I do not think we are debating the fact that a review will take place. What we are saying is that it should be put in the bill. Put it in the bill now so that we on this side of the chamber can understand exactly when it will take place, when a report will be prepared and tabled and more, importantly, what that review will take into account and what will be in that report.

**Dr ROWAN:** I rise to support the amendment moved by the shadow minister, the member for Warrego. We certainly do need a review period enshrined in the legislation. This is a very sensible amendment. There have been concerns raised by a number of speakers that parts of the legislation are very wide and open to interpretation. This would really give us good governance and oversight and actually enshrine this in the legislation so we know that there will be a defined review period. There are still concerns that the sweeping ministerial powers, the exceptional powers, that have been outlined are really an overreach from a ministerial perspective and that there will not be the most appropriate checks and balances in place. Having a review period defined in the legislation would give people some confidence that it will occur.

As previous speakers have said, some people think having a review after two years is still too long away because there are many things that could happen within that period which are not necessarily in the public's interest. The member for Broadwater said that the minister has good intentions—and I am sure the Minister for Local Government, the member for Sandgate, does have good intentions by doing this—but having it in the legislation really means we can have confidence that there is good governance and good oversight. There needs to be clarity around what the test of reasonableness is, so I would also reflect that back to the minister.

I would borrow a phrase from the former US defence secretary, Donald Rumsfeld: there are the known knowns, there are the known unknowns and then there are the unknown unknowns. Moving forward in relation to this legislation, we do not know what is going to happen in the future, but we can put that review period into the legislation that is before us today. That would give everyone confidence that there will be appropriate governance arrangements in place and appropriate oversight and scrutiny and that a review will take place within that time frame of two years.

**Mr CRISAFULLI:** I also rise to support the shadow minister's amendment. Through you, Mr Deputy Speaker, I would say to the minister that all the shadow minister is seeking through this amendment is for you to legislate what it is you are intending to do. I think the member for Caloundra said it best—that is, we are just asking for your intentions—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Dr Robinson): If the member could speak through the chair, that would help the debate.

**Mr CRISAFULLI:** We are just asking for the minister's intentions to be put in place. The minister, in good faith, wants to take this back for review. I am certain of that—he has made that clear to industry and we respect and admire that—but, Minister, you may not be the minister in two years time. You may be the transport minister again. You never know.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr CRISAFULLI:** He could be anything. He could be the Leader of the House again. We do not know. All we are seeking are the exact intentions of the minister in black and white so that this minister or any future minister will be bound by good law. Minister, I ask you to seriously consider this. This is an opposition being responsible; it is an opposition being willing to work with you.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Through the chair, please.

**Mr CRISAFULLI:** Mr Deputy Speaker, that is why I support wholeheartedly this sensible amendment put forward by the shadow minister.

**Mr SORENSEN:** I speak on the public interest test. I support the amendment moved by the shadow minister. What is public interest really? If I have a fight with the mayor, can I come along to the minister and say, 'I think in the public interest you should sack him'? Is that going to happen? Will that type of thing happen? It could happen, couldn't it? I think it could.

There are 40 pages of amendments being brought into this House that never went through the committee. This bill has been around for a long time. It was in the last parliament and now it has come to this parliament. How can there be 40 pages of amendments when it comes to the parliament? Members should have a think about that. This has not gone to the committee. It has not gone out there for public consultation or anything like that. I guarantee there would be a lot of people in the public who would like to know what the public interest test will be for their local councillors who they actually voted in. They elected these people to represent them on the council. We are going to have a minister with this sort of power which will mean he could just say, 'Off you go, boys.' There really needs to be a review. In two years, I expect a review to come back on what is happening.

This gives complete power to the minister. Like I said before, this is starting to become left wing lunacy. The minister will be given the power to walk in and sack a council for no reason at all. I know some councillors do not like each other and they make complaints against each other and all the rest of it, but this is just not on. It really is not. It is ridiculous to say that these people get elected by the community but a minister can just trot along and sack them. I just do not understand it. We really need to review it. It needs to be reviewed. This is a sensible amendment to support.

**Mr WATTS:** My dear old dad used to say that the road to hell is paved with good intentions. I do not doubt the minister's good intentions in reviewing this legislation. However, it is good actions that will lead to good legislation. If the action that is incorporated into this bill is the suggestion put forward by the member for Warrego, the shadow minister, that we simply put the intention in writing, that is a positive action that has no real ramification on anything that has been said here. What it does do is bind this government and its cabinet—any future minister—to ensuring that this review is done.

We understand that this legislation is here for many reasons not least of which is that some serious issues are facing a level of government in Queensland—a Labor council, I might add. There are serious problems that need to be addressed. This legislation gives some control to this democratically elected chamber to be able to take actions. Some of those, as have been previously discussed, are quite draconian and very authoritarian, and I do not agree with those. However, that is not the point of this amendment.

The point of this amendment is simply to make sure that in a couple of years a process is gone through and we have a good look at what has happened and how this has played out for the people of Queensland and we bring that back and present it. It may come back in glowing terms; it may say, 'This is absolutely fantastic—the best thing since sliced bread.' I am not sure that that is what will happen, but it may be what happens. However, if it comes back with other recommendations or other learnings, would we not want that? Do we not want the legislation from this chamber to be the very best legislation that we can put forward? We can all learn from mistakes of the past. I would suggest that this minister needs to take a serious look at this suggestion and adopt it because it is a good suggestion. It will confirm the minister's good intentions to make sure that this legislation is reviewed. I see no reason this should be opposed. I think it would make a good addition to the bill.

**Ms SIMPSON:** In rising to speak to this amendment, I note the contributions of my colleagues, who have very eloquently addressed some of the integrity requirements that we believe should be added to ensure that we are not just relying upon the minister's good intentions. The parliament really should have the opportunity of putting those measures into legislation. Part of that is, as has been outlined by my colleague the shadow minister, the requirement for a review. There are extraordinary powers that go beyond what we have seen in most of the jurisdictions that are being put into this legislation. For that reason it is appropriate that we do not allow these things to drift on, dependent only on the good intentions and the word of a minister, but that they are tied to legislation.

We have already been critical of the bypassing of parliament with regard to other aspects of legislation such as where sometimes the definitions in legislation are outsourced to other statutory bodies but are not subjected to the scrutiny of the parliament. In this particular case, we are saying that

it is not enough for us to outsource the good intentions of the minister; we want to see these things tied in legislation and brought back to this House for the appropriate scrutiny required for such extraordinary powers. Checks and balances equal integrity measures. That is why part of this is about processes that give the parliament the opportunity to not only monitor but also scrutinise and have the debate about how those integrity measures are addressed—that is, tied to a review that is tied down in legislation. I speak in support of the shadow minister's amendment.

**Mr HINCHLIFFE:** I reiterate and put on the record—and that will be important in a moment—again that I am committed to a review of the operation of these amendments within two years, in fact, prior to the end of the quadrennial term, which is slightly less than two years. I have said that earlier in the debate; I have said that in the second reading speech and in response to matters that have arisen in consideration in detail.

I give an alert to all of those opposite who, like me, are bush lawyers—and some of them are supposedly more qualified than that—that is part of the black letter law. The second reading speech of the minister and the remarks the minister makes during the consideration in detail are part of the black letter law. There is no need to add this little bit of black letter in the bill or in the act. The remarks I make during this debate in this place are part of the black letter law.

There they have it; that is part of what they wanted. They have been saying they want that; we have heard that from all those speakers for the last few minutes. They have that already; they do not need to do this. We can move on to deal with the other matters that they complain we do not have enough time to deal with.

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

**AYES, 44:**

**LNP, 38**—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.

**Grn, 1**—Berkman.

**KAP, 3**—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

**PHON, 1**—Andrew.

**Ind, 1**—Bolton.

**NOES, 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.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Ms Leahy) negated.

Clause 22—

 **Mr HINCHLIFFE** (4.21 pm): I move the following amendment—  
12 Clause 22 (Amendment of s 153 (Disqualification for certain offences))

Page 32, lines 16 to 18—

*omit, insert—*

(1) Section 153(1)(c), 'bribery'—

*omit, insert—*

serious integrity

(2) Section 153(4) and (5)—

*omit, insert—*

(4) A **serious integrity offence** is an offence against—

(a) a provision of a law mentioned in schedule 1, part 1 if, for a circumstance stated for the offence (if any), the stated circumstance applies to the offence; or

(b) a provision of a law of another State or the Commonwealth that corresponds to a provision mentioned in paragraph (a).

(5) An **integrity offence** is an offence against a provision of a law mentioned in schedule 1, part 2 if, for a circumstance stated for the offence (if any), the stated circumstance applies to the offence.

- (3) Section 153(6), after 'convicted of'—  
*insert*—  
 any of the following offences (each a **disqualifying offence**)
- (4) Section 153(6)(c)—  
*omit, insert*—  
 (c) a serious integrity offence; or

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 22, as amended, agreed to.

Insertion of new clauses—

**Mr HINCHLIFFE** (4.21 pm): I move the following amendment—

**13 After clause 22**

Page 32, after line 18—

*insert*—

**22A Amendment of s 158 (Acting as councillor without authority)**

Section 158—

*insert*—

- (c) the person is suspended as a councillor.

**22B Insertion of new s 158A**

Chapter 6, part 2, division 1—

*insert*—

**158A Councillor must give notice of disqualification**

- (1) This section applies if a councillor becomes aware the councillor is not qualified to be a councillor under this division.
- (2) The councillor must immediately give a notice that complies with subsection (3) to each of the following, unless the councillor has a reasonable excuse—
  - (a) the Minister;
  - (b) if the councillor is not the mayor of the local government—the mayor;
  - (c) the chief executive officer of the local government.
- Maximum penalty—100 penalty units.
- (3) For subsection (2), the notice must state—
  - (a) details about why the councillor is not qualified to be a councillor under this division; and
  - (b) the day the councillor became disqualified.

This amendment inserts clause 25A and new sections 182A to 182G in divisions 7 and 8 in chapter 6, part 2, to provide for the automatic suspension of councillors. A person is automatically suspended as a councillor when charged with a disqualifying offence, and the amendments provide for when a suspension ends. Also if a person is appointed or elected as a councillor and a proceeding for a disqualifying offence has been started but has not ended, the person is automatically suspended as a councillor when the councillor's term starts.

The amendments provide for when a person is charged with a disqualifying offence and require the councillor to immediately give notice unless there is a reasonable excuse to the minister, chief executive officer and the mayor stating the charge and the day charged. A maximum of 100 penalty units applies. A suspended councillor must not act as a councillor; however, they are entitled to their base remuneration and must comply with their accountability obligations, such as updating their register of interests.

The amendments provide for the minister to request a criminal history check from the Police Commissioner on a councillor who gave a notice or if the minister reasonably suspects a councillor has a charge or conviction or a disqualifying offence and for appropriate privacy protections for information received.

There are transitional provisions put in place as a consequence of this amendment. Clause 25B, new sections 325 to 327, provides for transitional provisions to apply in relation to a disqualifying offence whether the act or omission constituting the offence was committed before or after the commencement

of the amendments. Accordingly, if a proceeding for a disqualifying offence against a councillor had been started before the commencement but had not been ended, the councillor is automatically suspended as a councillor on the commencement of the amendments and must immediately after commencement give notice to the minister, the mayor and the chief executive officer. Likewise, if before the commencement of the amendments the councillor was convicted of an offence, that is, a new disqualifying offence, and on the commencement the disqualifying period for the offence would not have ended, the councillor automatically stops being a councillor on the commencement and must immediately give notice as above.

**Mr KRAUSE:** We touched on this issue briefly in consideration in detail yesterday. The minister was able to provide the House with details of how many councillors were impacted by this retrospective provision which would make them ineligible to remain as councillors. I want to ask the minister whether he is aware of the identity of those councillors and also whether or not they themselves—the six affected councillors—are aware they are impacted by these provisions. I think three of them are widely known in the public domain, but I am not sure that the other three are. If the minister is able to shed any other light on the details of the councillors who are affected by this and where they are from in the state that would enlighten the House.

**Mr HINCHLIFFE:** I can update the House. The number is different to what it was yesterday because there has been a vacancy caused by another operation of the act as a consequence of a councillor who failed to attend the number of meetings they need to attend. They have failed to meet the qualifying obligations of a councillor, so they are no longer a councillor and there is a vacancy there. One of the councillors who is affected by this is no longer impacted, so the number is now five.

As you say, there are councillors who are more well known in this space. The other two councillors who are affected are councillors in discrete Indigenous communities, and this matter was of significance in my contemplation of what sort of offences would be included and captured by this automatic suspension process. I am pretty confident that the subject councillors are aware they will be the subject of these matters because they indeed clearly relate to integrity offences. I will also write to every councillor and mayor in Queensland after the passage of this legislation to advise them about their obligations under the legislation.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 23, as read, agreed to.

Clause 24—

 **Ms LEAHY** (4.27 pm): This clause deals with the conflict of interest provisions. As we outlined in the second reading debate, these provisions were removed in 2011 by the then Labor government and now they are being put back in. I think this signals that rather than go on a merry-go-round there really does need to be some work done to try and get it right. We have governments taking it out and governments coming back and putting it in. There should be something that is easier to operate and manage in councils. The reason why it was taken out in 2011—I think then Paul Lucas was the minister for local government—was because it did not work. Now we are putting something back in that has been proven not to work. I think there needs to be a better way to look at how we deal with these conflict of interest provisions and how we deal with them in a meeting. I do not think it is the right way forward because we are on swings and roundabouts going backwards and forwards. There needs to be a think tank that can sit down and say, 'We are going to get this right. We are not going to go backwards and forwards.'

Long-term councillors, who were on council in 2011, would be looking at this and asking why we are going back to this provision. They would be seriously questioning that because they would have been subject to these requirements prior to 2011. I think we need to find a better way forward. I heard the minister say in his second reading speech that this would be addressed later, but I think we need to do better. We are just swinging from one side to the other and it is not solving the problem. It is not working for local government or resulting in a good outcome for local government. That perception is permeating the community. I think it is important that we do something better than we are doing at present.

**Mr JANETZKI:** Over the past couple of days I have talked a lot about these bills and in particular local government. I should say that the council in my region, Toowoomba Regional Council, is conspicuous by its absence. I believe that it is a strong council with strong governance frameworks.

Yesterday I talked about conflicts of interest and material personal interests and how they might be managed. Ultimately I think it comes down to culture—a culture that needs to be cultivated right throughout local government areas across Queensland. By the account of the evidence that has come to light, that is before the CCC, in some instances conflicts have been underanalysed. Once the law is in place it will be up to each individual council to take this forward and find its own processes for identifying and managing conflicts. There should be a more enlightened approach.

I reflect on corporate Australia. Anyone in corporate Australia with a conflict of interest would be expected to remove themselves from the boardroom and not have one of their colleagues suggest that they remove themselves. I would like to see more awareness of conflicts of interest within local government and amongst councillors, because I think the public demands it. The public demands a higher standard of accountability than it did before. While these laws will go some way to meeting that demand, it is incumbent on the minister, the department and local governments throughout Queensland to develop a stronger culture. The law is now there, but now it is over to them to develop the systems for identifying and then managing conflicts of interest into the future.

**Mr MOLHOEK:** I rise to express my concerns with regard to clause 24. As I said earlier, the issue of conflicts has had broad discussion over many previous iterations of legislation. Here we are yet again considering the issue of conflicts. I point out to the House that many of the decisions made by councils are in line with the recommendations of council officers. I have seen it all too often: members of the public who are disgruntled about something—perhaps they did not understand the planning scheme when they purchased a particular property or they did not understand what was going on in their local community at some level—when they find out that a developer or another community member has certain rights in relation to a decision to be made by the council, use every phrase they can to suggest a level of corruption or a conflict of interest.

If a review were conducted of major councils across the state I think it would find that, when there is a resolution proposed to council to approve something or make a determination about something, 99.9 per cent of the time it comes with a recommendation from the officers of the council—those employees who have the legal expertise and are charged with the responsibility to make sure the council is making a good and proper legal decision. In my time in council, in response to community outcry on occasions, because of the manipulation of the media and the commentary from certain minority groups, the council spent some \$40 million defending council decisions, of which 90 per cent were in line with officers' recommendations.

I am very concerned that the term 'conflict of interest'—or the inference that someone has a conflict of interest—is often used far too broadly. I could understand the need for robust discussion of a conflict or a potential conflict if the council were to go against the recommendations or advice of the officers, but to broadly say that a councillor has a conflict of interest and needs to disclose it on every single matter, even when a decision is recommended by officers of the council, is a bridge too far.

**Mr MILLAR:** I reiterate the importance of an education program, especially for local councillors in Western Queensland. As members would know, many local councils in that area represent a service, not a career opportunity. Councillors are involved in small business, engineering firms, primary production and so on.

I note that the minister said he would write to every mayor and every councillor. I think it is important that there is some guidance for those councillors—especially in Western Queensland and rural and remote areas—about what is a conflict and where they stand on a conflict of interest. The smaller the community, the more likely it is that there would be some concerns over what is a conflict of interest. Those councils do not have the resources of the bigger councils, which would have in place integrity programs to educate councillors.

I can tell the minister—I have spoken to him about this before—that it is getting harder and harder to find people to stand for election to councils in Western Queensland. For councils in the bigger cities and the south-east, being a councillor can be a career. For people in Western Queensland it is definitely a service. Councillors in Boulia, Bedourie and the Diamantina shire travel long distances and then have

to understand what is a conflict of interest. Are they allowed in the meeting? Have they broken the law? Are they worried about breaking the law? That detracts from them being able to serve their communities.

I know that the minister is writing to all councillors and mayors. I ask him to take into consideration explaining what is a conflict of interest and offering an education program for people out there.

**Mr HINCHLIFFE:** I make it clear on the issue of conflict of interest that the changes contained in this bill—to echo the phrase used by the member for Warrego, the flipping back to the solution that was previously in play—are in response to the recommendations of the CCC. Yesterday in the debate a lot of people were making claims and counterclaims about the recommendations of the CCC. This provision is very clear: to implement recommendations 23 and 24 of the Belcarra report, the bill amends the Local Government Act 2009 and the City of Brisbane Act 2010 by inserting provisions similar to provisions that were omitted in 2011 and 2012.

In considering possible ways to improve how councillors manage conflicts of interest, the Crime and Corruption Commission ‘recalled previous versions of the LG Act which contained much more stringent provisions on conflicts of interest’. The CCC did not support requiring councillors to leave the room or abstain from voting for all conflicts of interest—or, indeed as we heard from the member for Southport, none it seems—but did consider that ‘there is value in other aspects of the original provisions’. In relation to recommendation 23—

The CCC notes that the rationale for removing the original requirement ... was that it is sometimes possible and appropriate for a councillor to determine that they can make a decision in the public interest, and that other councillors are not necessarily in a better position than the councillor themselves to determine if there is a conflict. The CCC acknowledges that this may sometimes be the case.

However, the CCC stated that—

Requiring other councillors to decide whether a councillor has a conflict of interest and whether they should stay in the room to vote on a matter ensures that alternative and more independent perspectives are taken into consideration.

It went on further—

... that other councillors can give voice to other perspectives, and may be better able to reflect on the perception of a conflict than the councillor in question.

As a consequence, the government’s response to the Belcarra report supported recommendation 23. Further, in relation to recommendation 24, the CCC noted—

... that the previous requirement was removed on the basis that it was ‘an unnecessary duplication as all councillors are bound by the local government principles’, and not disclosing another councillor’s conflict of interest would breach these. In the CCC’s view, however, relying on the local government principles alone does not reflect the seriousness of undeclared conflicts of interest.

It went on further—

Re-introducing a specific obligation on councillors to report another councillor’s conflict of interest would increase councillors’ accountability and reinforce the importance of dealing with conflicts of interest in transparent and accountable ways.

As I have said, it was the government’s commitment from before the election to implement recommendations 23 and 24 of the Belcarra report. That is what the bill does. The bill implements those recommendations. I acknowledge the fact that this is a flip back to the past and there has been some commentary that that did not work then. We have seen evidence that what is in place now does not work. The CCC says it does not work.

**Ms Leahy** interjected.

**Mr HINCHLIFFE:** In 2017—not 2011, not 2012, not whenever—the most recent occasion, the CCC’s clear and absolute undeniable recommendation is that we go back to these provisions, go back to this formula. That is what we will do. I am more than happy for us to continue to work on how we improve accountability and transparency measures—I am absolutely committed to that—but what we are doing here is implementing our commitment to the people of Queensland to implement the Belcarra recommendations.

Clause 24, as read, agreed to.

Clause 25, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clauses—



**Mr HINCHLIFFE** (4.42 pm): I move the following amendment—

14 After clause 25

Page 43, after line 7—

*insert*—

**25A Insertion of new ch 6, pt 2, divs 7 and 8**

Chapter 6, part 2—

*insert*—

**Division 7 Automatic suspension of councillors**

**182A Automatic suspension for certain offences**

- (1) A person is automatically suspended as a councillor when the person is charged with a disqualifying offence.
- (2) Subsection (3) applies if, when a person is appointed or elected as a councillor, a proceeding for a disqualifying offence against the person has been started but has not ended.
- (3) The person is automatically suspended as a councillor when the person's term as councillor starts.

**182B When a person is charged with disqualifying offence and proceeding is started**

For this division and division 8—

- (a) a person is charged with a disqualifying offence when—
  - (i) a police officer arrests and charges the person for the offence; or
  - (ii) the person is served with a notice to appear for the offence; or
  - (iii) the person is served with a complaint for the offence under the *Justices Act 1886*; or
  - (iv) a charge for the offence is made against the person in a proceeding without a complaint under the *Justices Act 1886*; or
  - (v) an ex officio indictment against the person for the offence is presented to the Supreme Court or the District Court; and
- (b) a proceeding for a disqualifying offence is started against a person when the person is charged with the offence.

**182C Obligation to give notice if charged with disqualifying offence**

- (1) This section applies if—
  - (a) a councillor is charged with a disqualifying offence; or
  - (b) a proceeding for a disqualifying offence has been started, but has not ended, against a councillor when the councillor is appointed or elected.
- (2) The councillor must immediately give a notice that complies with subsection (3) to each of the following, unless the councillor has a reasonable excuse—
  - (a) the Minister;
  - (b) if the councillor is not the mayor of the local government—the mayor;
  - (c) the chief executive officer of the local government.

Maximum penalty—100 penalty units.

- (3) For subsection (2), the notice must state—
  - (a) the provision of the law against which the councillor is charged; and
  - (b) the day the councillor was charged.

**182D Effect of councillor's suspension**

- (1) This section applies while a councillor is suspended as a councillor.
- (2) The councillor must not act as a councillor.
- (3) If the councillor is the mayor or deputy mayor, the councillor is also suspended as mayor or deputy mayor.
- (4) The councillor's obligations under division 5 are not affected.
- (5) The Minister's power to exercise a power in relation to the councillor under chapter 5, part 1, division 3 is not affected.
- (6) The councillor is entitled to be paid remuneration as a councillor.
- (7) In this section—

**remuneration**, as a councillor, does not include an amount payable to a councillor for performing a particular responsibility, including, for example, attending a meeting of the local government or any of its committees.

**182E When suspension of councillor ends**

If a councillor is suspended under section 182A, the suspension ends when the earliest of the following happens—

- (a) for each disqualifying offence to which the suspension relates—
  - (i) if the councillor is convicted of the offence and appeals the conviction—the conviction is set aside or quashed on appeal; or
  - (ii) if the councillor is convicted of the offence and does not appeal the conviction—the time within which an appeal must by law be started ends; or
  - (iii) the proceeding for the offence otherwise ends;

*Note—*

If the councillor is convicted of a disqualifying offence, the councillor's office becomes vacant. See section 162.

- (b) the councillor's term ends under section 160;
- (c) the councillor's office becomes vacant under section 162.

**Division 8 Criminal history information****182F Criminal history report**

- (1) This section applies if the Minister—
  - (a) receives a notice from a councillor—
    - (i) under section 158A in relation to the conviction of the councillor for a disqualifying offence; or
    - (ii) under section 182C; or
  - (b) reasonably suspects a councillor has been charged with, or convicted of, a disqualifying offence.
- (2) The Minister may ask the police commissioner for a written report about the criminal history of the councillor that includes a brief description of the circumstances of a conviction or charge mentioned in the criminal history.
- (3) The police commissioner must comply with the request.
- (4) However, the duty to comply applies only to information in the police commissioner's possession or to which the police commissioner has access.
- (5) In this section—  
**criminal history**, of a councillor, includes—
  - (a) a spent conviction; and
  - (b) every charge made against the councillor for an offence, in Queensland or elsewhere.

**182G Confidentiality of criminal history information**

- (1) This section applies to a person who possesses criminal history information because the person—
  - (a) is or was an officer, employee or agent of the department; or
  - (b) is or was a councillor, officer, employee or agent of a local government.
- (2) The person must not, directly or indirectly, disclose criminal history information to any other person unless the disclosure is permitted under subsection (3).  
 Maximum penalty—100 penalty units.
- (3) The person is permitted to disclose the criminal history information to another person—
  - (a) to the extent necessary to perform the person's functions under this Act; or
  - (b) if the disclosure is authorised under an Act; or
  - (c) if the disclosure is otherwise required or permitted by law; or
  - (d) if the person to whom the information relates consents to the disclosure; or
  - (e) if the disclosure is in a form that does not identify the person to whom the information relates; or
  - (f) if the information is, or has been, lawfully accessible to the public.
- (4) The person must ensure a document containing criminal history information is destroyed as soon as practicable after it is no longer needed for the purpose for which it is given.
- (5) In this section—  
**criminal history information** means the information contained in—
  - (a) a report given to the Minister under section 182F; or

- (b) a notice given to the Minister, a councillor or the chief executive officer of a local government—
  - (i) under section 158A in relation to the conviction of a councillor for a disqualifying offence; or
  - (ii) under section 182C.

**25B Insertion of new ch 9, pt 13**

Chapter 9—

*insert—*

**Part 13 Transitional provisions for Local Government Electoral (Implementing Stage 1 of Belcarra) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2018**

**325 Disqualifying offence committed before commencement**

Chapter 6, part 2, as in force after the commencement, applies in relation to a disqualifying offence, whether the act or omission constituting the offence was committed before or after the commencement.

**326 Existing charge for disqualifying offence**

- (1) This section applies if a proceeding for a disqualifying offence against a councillor had started before the commencement but has not ended.
- (2) The councillor is automatically suspended as a councillor on the commencement.
- (3) Chapter 6, part 2, division 7 applies in relation to the councillor as if the councillor was suspended under section 182A.
- (4) Immediately after the commencement, the councillor must give a notice that complies with subsection (5) to each of the following, unless the councillor has a reasonable excuse—
  - (a) the Minister;
  - (b) if the councillor is not the mayor of the local government—the mayor;
  - (c) the chief executive officer of the local government.

Maximum penalty—100 penalty units.

- (5) For subsection (4), the notice must state—
  - (a) the provision of the law against which the councillor was charged; and
  - (b) the day the councillor was charged.
- (6) The information contained in the notice is taken to be criminal history information for section 182G.

**327 Existing conviction for new disqualifying offence**

- (1) This section applies if—
  - (a) before the commencement, a councillor was convicted of an offence that is a new disqualifying offence; and
  - (b) on the commencement, the disqualifying period for the offence would not have ended.
- (2) The councillor automatically stops being a councillor on the commencement.
- (3) Immediately after the commencement, the councillor must give a notice that complies with subsection (4) to each of the following, unless the councillor has a reasonable excuse—
  - (a) the Minister;
  - (b) if the councillor is not the mayor of the local government—the mayor;
  - (c) the chief executive officer of the local government.

Maximum penalty—100 penalty units.

- (4) For subsection (3), the notice must state—
  - (a) the provision of the law against which the councillor was convicted; and
  - (b) the day the councillor was convicted.
- (5) Section 153(7) applies in relation to the offence.
- (6) The information contained in the notice is taken to be criminal history information for section 182G.
- (7) In this section—

**conviction** includes a spent conviction.

**disqualifying period**, for a new disqualifying offence, means the period stated in section 153(1) during which a person convicted of the offence can not be a councillor.

**new disqualifying offence** means an offence that, under section 153—

- (a) is a disqualifying offence after the commencement; but
- (b) was not a disqualifying offence before the commencement.

**25C Insertion of new sch 1**

After section 327, as inserted by this Act—

*insert—*

**Schedule 1 Serious integrity offences and integrity offences**

section 153

**Part 1 Serious integrity offences**

**Criminal Code**

54A(1)	Demands with menaces upon agencies of government
57(1)	False evidence before Parliament
60(1)	Bribery of member of Parliament
87(1) or (1A)	Official corruption
92A(1) or (2)	Misconduct in relation to public office
98B(1)	False or misleading information
98C(1) or (2)	Bribery
98D(1) or (2)	Forging or uttering electoral or referendum paper
110	Stuffing ballot boxes
112(1)	False or misleading information
119B(1)	Retaliation against or intimidation of judicial officer, juror, witness etc.
122(1)	Corruption of jurors
123(1)	Perjury
126(1)	Fabricating evidence
127(1)	Corruption of witnesses
129	Damaging evidence with intent
131(1)	Conspiracy to bring false accusation
132(1)	Conspiring to defeat justice
133(1)	Compounding an indictable offence circumstance—the penalty in subsection (2) applies to the offence
140(1)	Attempting to pervert justice
193(1)	False verified statements
398(1)	Punishment of stealing circumstance—a circumstance of aggravation with a maximum penalty of 7 years or more imprisonment applies to the offence
399	Fraudulent concealment of particular documents circumstance—paragraph (b) of the penalty applies to the offence
408C(1)	Fraud circumstance—a circumstance of aggravation mentioned in subsection (2), (2A) or (2B) applies to the offence
408E(1)	Computer hacking and misuse circumstance—a circumstance of aggravation mentioned in subsection (3) applies to the offence

415(1)	Extortion
430	Fraudulent falsification of records
433(1)	Receiving tainted property
442B	Receipt or solicitation of secret commission by an agent
442BA	Gift or offer of secret commission to an agent
442D	False or misleading receipt or account
442E	Secret commission for advice given
442EA	Offer or solicitation of secret commission in return for advice given or to be given
442F	Secret commission to trustee in return for substituted appointment
442G	Liability of director etc. acting without authority
488(1)	Forgery and uttering circumstance—paragraph (a) or (b) of the penalty applies to the offence
541(1)	Conspiracy to commit crime circumstance—a maximum penalty of 7 years imprisonment or more applies to the offence

**Crime and Corruption Act 2001**

198(1)	Contempt of person conducting commission hearing
--------	--

**Criminal Proceeds Confiscation Act 2002**

250(1)	Money laundering
--------	------------------

**Electoral Act**

307B(1)	Schemes to circumvent prohibition on particular political donations
---------	---

**Local Government Electoral Act**

169(1)	False or misleading information
170(1) or (2)	Bribery
175(1) or (2)	Forged electoral papers
194B(1)	Schemes to circumvent prohibition on particular political donations

**Part 2 Integrity offences**

**This Act**

171(1)	Use of information by councillors
171A(2) or (3)	Prohibited conduct by councillor in possession of inside information
171B(2)	Obligation of councillor to correct register of interests circumstance—paragraph (a) of the penalty applies to the offence
175C(2)	Councillor's material personal interest at a meeting
175E(2) or (5)	Councillor's conflict of interest at a meeting
175H	Offence to take retaliatory action
175I(2) or (3)	Offence for councillor with material personal interest or conflict of interest to influence others
234(1)	False or misleading information

**Criminal Code**

54(1)	Interference with Governor or Ministers
55(1)	Interference with the Legislature
58(1)	Witness refusing to attend, answer question or produce a thing before Legislative Assembly or authorised committee
78(1) or (2)	Interfering with political liberty

85	Disclosure of official secrets
98E(1)	Influencing voting
98F	Providing money for illegal payments
98G	Voting if not entitled
99(1), (2), (3), (4) or (5)	Voting if not entitled
100(1) or (2)	Hindering or interfering with voting conduct
101(1) or (2)	Bribery
102	Publishing false information about a candidate
113(2), (3), (4) or (5)	Interfering with secrecy at elections
128	Deceiving witnesses
130	Preventing witnesses from attending
133(1)	Compounding an indictable offence circumstance—the penalty in subsection (3) applies to the offence
194(1)	False declarations
204(1)	Disobedience to statute law
398(1)	Punishment of stealing circumstance—no circumstance of aggravation applies to the offence
399	Fraudulent concealment of particular documents circumstance—paragraph (a) of the penalty applies to the offence
408C	Fraud circumstance—the circumstance of aggravation mentioned in subsection (2), (2A) or (2B) does not apply to the offence
408D(1) or (1A)	Obtaining or dealing with identification information
408E	Computer hacking and misuse circumstance—no circumstance of aggravation, or the circumstance of aggravation mentioned in subsection (2), applies to the offence
414	Demanding property with menaces with intent to steal
488(1)	Forgery and uttering circumstance—paragraph (c) of the penalty applies to the offence
541(1)	Conspiracy to commit crime circumstance—the maximum penalty for the crime in question is less than 7 years imprisonment

**Electoral Act**

307A(1)	Offence about prohibited donations
307C(1)	False or misleading information relating to determinations
427(2)	Obligation to repay particular political donations

**Local Government Electoral Act**

171	Assisting illegal payments
186	Influencing voting by violence or intimidation
189	Voting if not entitled
194A(1)	Offence about prohibited donations
194C(1)	False or misleading information relating to determinations
212(2)	Obligation to repay particular political donations

This amendment inserts clause 25C which inserts schedule 1 to prescribed serious integrity offences and the integrity offences.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 26—

 **Mr HINCHLIFFE** (4.43 pm): I move the following amendment—

**15 Clause 26 (Amendment of sch 4 (Dictionary))**

Page 43, after line 10—

*insert*—

***disqualifying offence*** see section 153(6).

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 26, as amended, agreed to.

Insertion of new clauses—

**Mr HINCHLIFFE** (4.43 pm): I move the following amendment—

**16 After clause 26**

Page 43, after line 20—

*insert*—

**Division 3 Amendments commencing on proclamation**

**26A Amendment of s 150L (What is *misconduct*)**

Section 150L(1)(c)(iv), '173(4) or (5)'—

*omit, insert*—

175G

**26B Amendment of s 150AY (Functions of investigators)**

Section 150AY(b), second dot point, 'or 172(5)'—

*omit, insert*—

175C(2), 175E(2) or (5), 175H or 175I(2) or (3)

**26C Amendment of s 175G (Duty to report another councillor's material personal interest or conflict of interest at a meeting)**

Section 175G(2), note, '176(3)(d) and 180'—

*omit, insert*—

150L(1)(c)(iv), 150AQ and 150AR

Amendment agreed to.

Clauses 27 to 29, as read, agreed to.

Clause 30—

 **Mr JANETZKI** (4.44 pm): Once more into the breach, I move the following amendments—

**5 Clause 30 (Insertion of new pt 6, div 1A)**

Page 45, line 28, 'but'—

*omit, insert*—

or

(iii) an employee organisation under the *Industrial Relations Act 2016*; or

(iv) an association of employees that is registered as an organisation under the *Fair Work (Registered Organisations) Act 2009* (Cwlth); but

**6 Clause 30 (Insertion of new pt 6, div 1A)**

Page 53, line 17, 'or (ii)'—

*omit, insert*—

, (ii), (iii) or (iv)

**7 Clause 30 (Insertion of new pt 6, div 1A)**

Page 53, line 23, 'or (ii)'—

*omit, insert*—

, (ii), (iii) or (iv)

## 8 Clause 30 (Insertion of new pt 6, div 1A)

Page 54, line 5, 'or (ii)'—

*omit, insert—*

, (ii), (iii) or (iv)

These amendments are similar to the amendment that was moved yesterday. However, on this occasion it relates to the inclusion of the ban on political donations into the union movement in local government. There have been two key themes that have been running through the contributions from the opposition throughout the debate yesterday and again today. The first one is fairness. I actually think that the opposition has put the case of fairness quite clearly and quite persuasively. I think Queenslanders expect a fair fight. They expect a level playing field, a fair crack at the competing ideas on display in this House and a fair battle of competing visions for Queensland. What these donation bans thus far achieve is quite the opposite. That is one key theme that has repeated itself throughout the contributions during the debate over the last couple of days.

The second theme is the theme of the ever-growing and the ever-strengthening evidence on display to justify the inclusion of union donations into this bill. Today I want to focus a little bit more on the Royal Commission into Trade Union Governance and Corruption because there most recently there was much evidence given of widespread and deep-seated misconduct by union officials. In the report Justice Heydon details a long list of union officials who may have committed crimes including blackmail, bribes and threats of violence across a wide range of industries and unions.

**A government member:** How did those blackmail charges go?

**A government member:** They got dropped!

**Mr JANETZKI:** Perjury was prevalent.

**A government member:** The blackmail charges got dropped.

**Mr JANETZKI:** I take the interjections. It is hardly a ringing endorsement that the allegations of blackmail have been dropped when there are bribes and threats of violence still on foot. I do not think it is much of a defence of the trade union movement for that to be raised here in this House. Justice Heydon interestingly said that in many parts of the world constituted by the trade union movement the movement consisted of louts, thugs, bullies, thieves, perjurers, those who threaten violence, errant fiduciaries and organisers of boycotts. These are the people who are bankrolling the Labor Party. These are the officials who determine—

**Mr Bailey** interjected.

**Mr JANETZKI:** I take the interjection from the member for Miller. These are the union officials who are working through back channels delivering messages—directions—for government policy straight to the personal inbox of the member for Miller. These amendments must be supported.

**Mr HART:** I rise to support the sensible amendments moved by the shadow minister, just as his amendment dealing with state members before it was very sensible. This is all about perception at the end of the day. The people out there who vote for our councillors perceive that there is an issue, and we all accepted that with developer donations. They also perceive quite strongly that there are issues with donations from gambling institutions, property unions, alcohol companies and law firms. As has been mentioned in this place in the last few days, a ReachTEL survey was done in the last couple of weeks about perception in this area. It showed that, of the people who were surveyed, 76 per cent of them thought that there was an issue with gambling donations to local government. The poll showed that 73 per cent were concerned about donations from the property industry. Straightaway we see that there is perceived to be more concern with the gambling industry.

**Mrs D'ATH:** Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I question the relevance of these comments being made in relation to this amendment, especially as the amendment is a consequential amendment that has no application because the other amendments were not successful.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Ms McMillan): Order! I ask the member to return to the bill.

**Mr HART:** The other amendment was about donations to state campaigns. This is about donations to local government campaigns.

**Mr HINCHLIFFE:** Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The amendment that is being debated now is a consequential amendment of the earlier amendment that was moved by the member for Toowoomba South. These consequential amendments are merely about renumbering. If the members opposite can explain to us why it is important to change the numbering of the clauses in the legislation, that would be really helpful.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you, Minister. I ask the member to return to the amendment.

**Mr HART:** Madam Deputy Speaker, I am speaking to the amendment. I am talking about the amendment that has been proposed by the shadow Attorney-General. It is quite clear that this provision is about donations to local government. Obviously, there would have been some effect on the numbering, but this amendment is more about donations to local government and that is what I am talking about.

Sixty-three per cent of the people who were polled for this survey said that they were worried about union interference in local governments. That is their perception. I can tell members that, from moving around my electorate on the Gold Coast, the people there have exactly the same issues. They are worried about union interference in EBAs inside—

**Mr Power** interjected.

**Mr HART:** Madam Deputy Speaker, I am trying to make a point but there is continual interference from the member up the back, who does not know what this clause is about. The amendment states—

*omit, insert—*

or

- (iii) an employee organisation under the *Industrial Relations Act 2016*; or
- (iv) an association of employees ...

*(Time expired)*

**Mr KRAUSE:** I rise to speak in favour of the amendment moved by the member for Toowoomba South, which, if implemented, would put in place a ban on union donations in the Local Government Electoral Act. This is a sensible amendment. We spoke about this amendment yesterday in relation to amendments to the Electoral Act, the measures that would have been put in place had that amendment been put in place, and the influence that has been exerted by the union movement for many years over the Queensland government and the Australian government as a result of the influence purchased by the union movement over the Australian Labor Party and the greasing of the wheels of the political machine that this influence buys.

We do not want to see that occur at the local government level. This amendment should be supported to keep that influence out at the local government level. That influence costs taxpayers millions of dollars each year and, if that influence were extended to the same extent in the local government space, the same would occur at the local government level. I support the amendment moved by the member for Toowoomba South.

I also pose a question for the minister. If clause 30 of the bill is implemented, does that mean that a political-party endorsed candidate at the local level will not be able to donate to their own political party to have expenditure made for their campaign? I understand that that candidate will be able to spend their own money on their campaign, but will they be able to donate to their own party in order for that money to be expended on their campaign, or will they be prohibited from donating to that campaign because they are a developer? That is a question that I would like an answer to. I support the amendment moved by the member for Toowoomba South. We want to keep union influence out of local government.

**Ms LEAHY:** The purpose of this amendment is to ensure that there is a level playing field for those people in local government. This amendment effectively bans union donations in local government.

I thought that it might be of interest to the House to refer to an ABC news report. This legislation is modelled on New South Wales legislation. This article states that the Premier of New South Wales is about to overhaul the electoral funding laws in New South Wales by halving the amount of money that the unions and third parties are allowed to spend. The article states—

The move is part of a broader package of measures, which the Premier said was aimed at reducing corruption and undue influence in elections.

The Premier of New South Wales has to deal with the unions because of their undue influence and the corruption. The New South Wales Premier is quoted in the article as saying the following—

Our reforms will drive greater integrity, transparency and accountability ... and help protect our democratic values and freedoms.

If the government wants our legislation to model that of New South Wales, perhaps it should not cherrypick that New South Wales legislation.

The member for Southport talked about how much it costs to run campaigns. If we are not very careful, we will create the situation where the only group of people who will be able to afford to stand for election to a local government are multimillionaires. It would be incredibly disappointing if we took away—

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Ms McMillan): Order! I thank the member. Under the provisions of the resolution agreed to by the House and the time limit for the consideration in detail of the bills having expired, the question is—

That clauses 30 to 35 of the Local Government Electoral (Implementing Stage 1 of Belcarra) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, and the minister's amendment No. 17 as circulated, as read, be agreed to.

Amendment as circulated—

17 **Clause 33 (Insertion of new s 201A)**

Page 57, line 7, 'electoral'—

*omit, insert—*

election

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Clauses 30 to 35, as amended, agreed to.

### Third Reading (Cognate Debate)

 **Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Ms McMillan): Under the provisions of the resolution agreed to by the House and the time limit for the third readings of the bills having expired, the question is that the Local Government (Councillor Complaints) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Question put—That the Local Government (Councillor Complaints) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill, as amended, read a third time.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The question is that the Local Government Electoral (Implementing Stage 1 of Belcarra) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Question put—That the Local Government Electoral (Implementing Stage 1 of Belcarra) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill, as amended, read a third time.

### Long Title (Cognate Debate)

 **Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Ms McMillan): Under the provisions of the resolution agreed to by the House and the time limit for the long title of the bills being agreed to having expired, the question is that the long title of the Local Government (Councillor Complaints) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill be agreed to.

Question put—That the long title of the Local Government (Councillor Complaints) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The question is that the long title of the Local Government Electoral (Implementing Stage 1 of Belcarra) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill be agreed to.

Question put—That the long title of the Local Government Electoral (Implementing Stage 1 of Belcarra) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

## COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

### Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (4.58 pm): I seek to advise the House of the determinations made by the Committee of the Legislative Assembly at its meeting today. The committee has resolved, pursuant to standing order 136(3), that the Economics and Governance Committee report on the Ministerial and Other Office Holder Staff and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018 by 5 July 2018.

### MOTION

#### Referral to Education, Employment and Small Business Committee

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (4.59 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That the Education, Employment and Small Business Committee inquire into and report to the Legislative Assembly by 16 November 2018 on the problem of wage theft in Queensland.

In undertaking this inquiry, the committee should consider—

- (a) the incidence of wage theft in Queensland, with reference also to evidence of wage theft from other parts of Australia;
- (b) the impact of wage theft on workers, families, law-abiding businesses, the economy and community;
- (c) the various forms that wage theft can take, including through unpaid super, the misuse of ABNs and sham contracting arrangements;
- (d) the reasons why wage theft is occurring, including whether it has become part of the business model for some organisations;
- (e) whether wage theft is more likely to occur in particular industries, occupations or parts of the state or among particular cohorts of workers;
- (f) the effectiveness of the current regulatory framework at state and federal level in dealing with wage theft and supporting affected workers; and
- (g) options for ensuring wage theft is eradicated, including consideration of regulatory and other measures either implemented or proposed in other jurisdictions interstate, nationally or internationally and the role of industrial organisations, including unions and employer registered bodies in addressing and preventing wage theft.

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (5.00 pm): This announcement was made by the Premier with the comrades on Labour Day. Last year on Labour Day it was the labour hire inquiry that the Premier announced in front of all the unions. Each year at the Labour Day march we see a bit of union payback so I was expecting something big this year. Little did I expect this motion. If we look back in the history of time, back when Cameron Dick, the Minister for State Development was, in fact, the industrial relations minister—

**Ms Jones:** A great minister!

**A government member:** He was.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take the interjection from the member for Cooper who said that the member for Greenslopes was a great IR minister and then he confirmed he was. The humility and the hubris of the member for Greenslopes! While we are talking about the member for Greenslopes, when Julia Gillard asked the states to refer all the industrial relation powers to the Commonwealth when the member for Greenslopes was the industrial relations minister, what did he say? Anna Bligh was the premier and the minister for industrial relations said, believe it or not, when he referred powers to the Commonwealth—

The finalisation of this referral bill has been a significant and major piece of work. Negotiations with the Commonwealth and other jurisdictions have been conducted over a period of time and with constant regard to the rights of the Queensland workforce.

...

I strongly commend the bill to the House.

Now we have a state based parliamentary inquiry into wage theft in relation to the industrial relations system that he referred to the Commonwealth. He said at the time that it was a great referral. He said, 'Julia Gillard, leader of the federal Labor Party, I will do whatever you want. You can have all the industrial relations powers from the state', and referred it to the Commonwealth. It gets better. The Minister for Education, who is the current industrial relations minister, at the time was the member for Brisbane Central. This is what the former member for Brisbane Central said about this piece of legislation—

In conclusion, this bill strikes, in my view, the balance in establishing a national IR system but respects state rights at the same time. It is in the best interests of workers and business.

The former member for Brisbane Central said in Mackay that the industrial relations referral was in the best interests of workers and business.

There are more than enough safeguards and protections for workers' pay and conditions—more than Work Choices ever gave any worker in this country. I commend this bill to the House.

If Julia Gillard's laws are so good, why are we now debating a motion about those very laws that they got rid of? The Liberal National Party is consistent in its approach. We opposed the referral of the industrial relations system to the Commonwealth because we knew there would be concerns raised in the future. We are always hesitant to give up state based rights, particularly with respect to the industrial relations system. The former minister for industrial relations got up in Mackay and was happy to refer it: 'Yes, Julia Gillard, I will do whatever you want and refer it.'

Those opposite had nothing else to talk about on Labour Day, because they have done everything the union movement bought them off to do, so out of the blue comes this motion to look at wage theft through unpaid superannuation, the misuse of ABNs and sham contracting arrangements. They are all federal government responsibilities. Those opposite talk about sham contracting; this motion is a political sham. It was only designed so the Premier could get up in front of the comrades, their union mates, and say, 'We still love you. We are still doing everything you want us to do.'

The unionists at the Labour Day march were chanting and acting surprised—as if they did not know about this announcement from the Premier. As if they did not know about the announcement of this inquiry into wage theft and other related matters! It is on the basis of absolute hypocrisy and, as I have said all week on various matters, the arrogant Labor government says one thing in opposition and does another thing in government like it is wiped from the pages of history.

If those opposite want a fair dinkum review into wage theft I will move an amendment so that we can have a fair dinkum review and the parliamentary committee can look at other important matters that Queenslanders feel left behind about by the Labor government. I move—

That the following words be inserted after 'preventing wage theft':

- '(h) Current and former nurses and other health staff who have unresolved disputes from Labor's failed health payroll debacle;
- (i) Concerns that have been raised in the media and the parliament about the payment of contractors, including security guards, from the recent Commonwealth Games; and
- (j) The use of contractors, consultants and labour hire workers in the Queensland public service.'

The reason I move that amendment to the substantive motion is as a result of a story in the *Gold Coast Bulletin* from 13 May 2018 titled 'Commonwealth Games security staff claim wages have not been paid' and an article on 9 May in the *Courier-Mail* titled 'Public servant reporting system "encourages inaccuracy"'. One of the state's largest unions has called for an overhaul of how public servants are counted claiming current statistics are not realistic as they exclude contractors, consultants and labour hire workers.

A few weeks ago we saw a story in relation to the absolute blowout of the Public Service in Queensland and now the union is saying that that blowout does not include contractors, consultants and labour hire workers employed by the Labor government. Together Queensland branch secretary Alex Scott said the current counting method, the minimum obligatory human resource information, was acting as an incentive for greater use of the labour hire workers, consultants and contractors by departments to avoid accurate reporting of staffing levels within the Queensland Public Service. I think that deserves looking at because that is actually a Queensland matter. That is actually something that the Queensland industrial relations minister has carriage of.

The matters contained in the motion moved by the Premier are all federal matters. We are moving sensible amendments dealing with state based matters. The nurses who are still suffering from Labor's payroll debacle, the biggest maladministration in Queensland's history, deserve answers. When Cameron Dick was the health minister he sent debt collectors after these nurses for the likes of \$400.

We raised that in the parliament. Despite the poor nurses writing letter after letter and parliamentarians writing letter after letter to no avail, after I asked a question of the Premier the former health minister stood in this parliament and said, 'We'll look at it.' All of a sudden, that very day, the debt collector was called off. They are applying an ad hoc arrangement when matters are raised in this parliament. How many hundreds of thousands of nurses are still suffering years later, because Labor bungled the Health payroll? I think that needs to be investigated.

I think Together union branch secretary Alex Scott's concerns about the blowout in Public Service numbers and the inaccuracy of the reporting of Public Service numbers should be looked at by the parliamentary committee. That is what the Queensland parliamentary committee should be looking at, not federal matters. If the state IR minister has a problem with a federal matter, the Labor government should not have referred the industrial relations powers to the Commonwealth, which is what they did. The minister can shake her head all she wants, but she supported it. She voted for it. She said that state rights would be protected and that this is going to be the best thing for the workers. Is the minister now saying that she failed the workers of Queensland? I suspect so.

*(Time expired)*

 **Mr WATTS** (Toowoomba North—LNP) (5.10 pm): What an interesting motion brought by the same Labor Party that referred the very powers it now wants to investigate to another jurisdiction. It seems strange that some people on the other side enthusiastically held the view that we should permanently give up powers of this chamber to another jurisdiction, yet now we have a motion to reach into that jurisdiction.

**Mrs D'ATH:** Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The referral of the powers that happened many years ago is not the substance and not in any way part of the scope of this referral to a committee. It is about wage theft.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The motion talks about the economy, the community, ABNs, sham contracting arrangements, wage theft. It is the federal jurisdiction and it is a direct correlation to the federal industrial relations powers, not those of the state.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Ms McMillan): Thank you, member for Kawana. Please resume, member.

**Mr WATTS:** This is a bizarre situation. We are planning to spend Queensland taxpayers' money looking into certain practices when, even if some of those practices exist, the jurisdiction to do anything about them has been handed over. I do not think that is the best investment for Queensland taxpayers' money. In the amendment, we see reference to another example of something that was not a great investment of Queensland taxpayers' money, which, of course, is the Health payroll debacle. That approximately \$1.2 billion error caused enormous stress and pain in the community. I have had a nurse—

**Ms Grace** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, member for McConnel!

**Mr WATTS:** Madam Deputy Speaker, I am about to talk about a constituent of mine who is suffering from cancer and, as a former nurse, is being pursued for an overpayment. She has asked me not to disclose her details, so I will not. However, we are talking about a long time ago. My constituent was paid, underpaid, overpaid and incorrectly paid. She was completely messed around, which put a lot of stress into her life. Now, whilst suffering from cancer, she is being pursued for an overpayment, but no evidence is being put forward of that overpayment. They just say, 'We think it is this number'.

The amendment to the motion is critical to ensure that, once and for all, we put to bed the Labor Health payroll debacle. It has been a blight on the Queensland Labor Party, which made such a mess of paying people. Strangely enough, some of those people are being defended by their unions in the wage claims and other things that they are being pursued for. If we are going to have an investigation into so-called wage theft, we certainly need to look at the Health payroll debacle, the psychological and health impacts of it, the underpayments and overpayments and the relentless pursuit of people, many of whom have now left the Public Service, some through stress, some through illness and some of their own accord.

All of those things were caused by a completely incompetent Labor government and the implementation of a payroll system to pay one of the most critical work sectors in the public service of Queensland, that is, the people who look after our sick, our aged and those who need help and support. That workforce was very badly treated because of their incompetence. If we are going to spend taxpayers' money, we should spend it investigating that.

**Ms Grace** interjected.

**Mr WATTS:** I take the minister's interjection, because she is relentlessly interjecting.

**Ms Grace:** You sacked them.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr WATTS:** If the minister would stop for just one moment and allow the person with the call to talk—

**Mr Minnikin** interjected.

**Ms Grace** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Chatsworth and member for McConnel.

**Mr WATTS:** The simple point is that, in my electorate, I too stood up and said that we needed to make sure we treated the Public Service with humanity and that we acted carefully. The minister can go and check the *Toowoomba Chronicle*, because I was very clear on my position. The point was this: the people who did leave the Public Service received the most generous redundancy payments that any public servant had been offered in Queensland. I am happy to say that I did stand up for the Public Service in Toowoomba and I was counted. That is my first point. My second point is that—and again I have not been given permission to share details—I received many requests from people who were looking for redundancies at that time. They were only too happy to take the redundancy package and move on, although not for a moment do I suggest that that was everybody.

The simple fact is that the failed Health payroll system was a complete debacle. When the minister stands to address the House on this issue, she needs to be able to put her hand on her heart and say, 'No, we will not investigate the complete disaster that was the Health payroll system, because there are no unresolved issues.' We know there are unresolved issues and, if you are true to your word about the treatment of public servants in Queensland, you will support, at the very least, part (h) of this amendment.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Through the chair.

**Mr WATTS:** Through you, Madam Deputy Speaker, at the very least the minister should support an investigation into the payroll debacle. There is a more recent occurrence that I want to raise, although there are only a few minutes left on the clock. I have worked in the security industry in Queensland. It is a tough industry. It is an industry where you often work late shifts and long hours. You have to abide by many laws. Lots of training is involved. It is a difficult industry. Often you get moved to various locations because of functions, activities and everything else.

We know that for the Commonwealth Games to be held in Queensland several exemptions needed to be made for interstate operators so that their security guards could work here. It is incumbent on this government to make sure that those people are paid correctly, as was agreed, and on time. That is clearly not happening.

I am sure the minister will be strongly supporting the second part of the amendment to the Premier's motion as well. As someone who stands up for workers, why would the minister not support the amendment to investigate the underpayment and non-payment of people who recently worked at the Commonwealth Games held in Queensland. I think that part of the amendment should also be strongly supported. I look forward to the minister's contribution supporting that part of the amendment. The first two parts of the amendment should clearly be supported if we are talking about a just and proper investigation.

The last part of the amendment is quite interesting. The unions themselves are always looking to make sure that they have maximum full-time or FTE employment, particularly in the public sector. They are concerned about contractors, consultants and labour hire workers in the Queensland Public Service. Let us have a look at that. Let us have a bit of a fish. Let us see what is going on in that space and find out whether or not the Together union has a good point. Then let us enact legislation in this place based on the advice and research that comes forward from such an investigation.

I look forward to the minister's contribution in relation to the member for Kawana's amendment to the motion which supports our nurses, supports our security guards who made sure we were safe at the Commonwealth Games and supports our workers in the Queensland Public Service not to find themselves in competition with labour hire, consultants and contractors. I look forward to the minister's contribution.

*(Time expired)*

**Hon. G GRACE** (McConnel—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Industrial Relations) (5.21 pm): I support the Premier's motion in relation to the wage theft inquiry. This is a referral to a parliamentary committee. We are not debating legislative change. It is simply a referral to a committee. There are going to be months of submissions and months of evidence gathering in relation to this issue. Unless those opposite have been hiding under a rock, there has been outstanding evidence nationally in relation to the wage theft of ordinary workers.

**An opposition member** interjected.

**Ms GRACE:** I will take that interjection. We want to know what is happening in Queensland. It is happening nationally with 7-Eleven and others.

**Mr Minnikin** interjected.

**Ms GRACE:** The ones that you sacked. The nurses that were sacked by the Newman government.

This is a referral with regard to wage theft. It is not a fishing expedition, as it was put by the member for Toowoomba South. It is not a case of all of a sudden believing the crocodile tears of those opposite that they are concerned about the union movement and how they view workers. It is not about the use of labour hire—legislation which is now enacted, but which they opposed. Labour hire people are being registered and licensed in this state. We know who they are and where they are working. They are doing the right thing by the workers. This is just muddying the waters and rewriting history.

When it comes to industrial relations the member for Kawana knows about as much about industrial relations as a two-year-old attending preschool would. Let us not rewrite history. When the Corporations Act was used by the Howard government for the first time in Australia to regulate industrial relations, over 98 per cent of Queensland's private industrial relations system went to the Commonwealth. To suggest that we were going to hold a separate industrial relations system for fewer than two per cent of workers in this state is ludicrous. All they are doing is playing politics. Employers wanted that to occur as well.

The majority of workers are under the Corporations Law covered by the federal system. We referred a minimal number of workers because at that time it would have been ridiculous to keep them in a separate system. That was a hostile takeover by the Howard government.

If those opposite believed that we should have maintained them in the state system, why did the member for Kawana not take them back when they were in government? Why did he not bring them back into the state system if he was so concerned that they were given to the federal system? He does not believe it. It is a political stunt. He comes in talking about that when they had no intention of ever doing it. Do not come in here with crocodile tears when talking about referring that small percentage of the workforce to the Commonwealth after a hostile takeover of IR.

What I say is exactly the case, not the spin and political angle put on it by the member for Kawana. When it comes to wage theft, I point out, in case those opposite have been hiding under a rock, that there has been evidence after evidence of employees who have been underpaid or not paid. There have almost been business cases built around not paying workers their proper wages. Workers in Queensland are being impacted by that.

Not a day goes by in my office where workers are not writing to us about the underpayment of wages and their industrial conditions. We have to refer them to the federal jurisdiction in order for them to get some sort of remedy in relation to what has been going on for them. It is becoming a national disgrace. We want to know how Queensland workers are being impacted by this.

If the federal system under this Turnbull government is not making sure workers are being paid then we as a state need evidence and have to suggest what needs to be done to remedy the situation. As I said this morning, I notice more money is being given for the registration of industrial organisations. I know extra money is being given to the ABCC. There is overwhelming evidence that 7-Eleven, Domino's, Pizza Hut and recently huge multinationals like Caltex have business cases where they have been underpaying workers. It is a way they balance these shops against their petrol stations. Big multinationals are ripping workers off. Backpackers are not being paid.

We have had the first employer in this state sent to prison for not paying what the Fair Work Commission said needed to be back paid. A tourism operator in Cairns did not abide by the orders to back pay workers. That is what is occurring. If they do not have the power to do it then we need to find out exactly what is happening.

A parliamentary inquiry is the best way to do that. They have broad terms of reference. It is about what models are being used. How many workers are coming forward about the use of ABNs? I use the example of my daughter. Young people who have no intention of operating a business, do not have a permanent address and have just left university are being provided an ABN to get a job. This has to stop. There are not only implications in the industrial relations system but also implications in the taxation system. There is unpaid superannuation and unpaid income tax. All of those issues are affecting Queensland workers every day. I support the Premier's motion 100 per cent.

The amendment moved by the member for Kawana is just crocodile tears and filibustering. They are using what is a very important issue as a political football. We will not allow those opposite to use workers as a political football in this House.

Wage theft is a real situation. There are a number of examples where it is occurring. We want the opportunity for workers to come forward to a parliamentary committee, made up of members from both sides. We want the committee to hear evidence throughout Queensland and find out what is happening. We know that when one pays workers properly and they get their entitlements they are better workers. We know that that is the case. If the federal legislation is not keeping pace and does not have the ability to enforce this in this state then we are going to make it an issue. As the industrial relations minister, I will not stop advocating on behalf of those workers who are not paid correctly.

I will not be supporting the politically motivated amendments by the member for Kawana. They have nothing to do with wage theft. I support the motion moved by the Premier and I urge all in this House to do likewise. Let us give workers the ability to come to a bipartisan parliamentary committee to put their case. Let us find out what is happening in Queensland. Let us go forward and protect those workers as best we can in this state. That is what this side stands for. I support the motion from the Premier.

Sorry, Madam Deputy Speaker, I have not finished yet. I move that the question be put—

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Ms GRACE:** No, my time had not expired.

**Mr Hart** interjected.

**Ms GRACE:** I did not sit down.

**Mrs Frecklington:** You turned your microphone off.

**Ms GRACE:** I did not sit down and I still had time on the clock.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I will take advice from the Clerk.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I rise to a point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker. Whether the minister sat down or not, as Deputy Speaker you had given the call to the member for Burleigh.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Kawana, I said that I would take advice from the Clerk. Member for McConnel, you were still on your feet so I would like you to proceed please.

**Ms GRACE:** Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I think I was having a drink at the time. I knew I had two minutes left on the clock.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Ms GRACE:** No, I did not. That is not true.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Clerk has advised of the rule.

**Ms GRACE:** Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I move—

That the question be now put.

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

**AYES, 53:**

**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.

**KAP, 3**—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

**PHON, 1**—Andrew.

**Ind, 1**—Bolton.

**NOES, 39:**

**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.

Resolved in the affirmative.

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

**AYES, 39:**

**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.

**NOES, 53:**

**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.

**KAP, 3**—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

**PHON, 1**—Andrew.

**Ind, 1**—Bolton.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Mr Bleijie) negated.

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

*In division*—

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** I remind members that the standing orders still apply when the House is in division.

**AYES, 53:**

**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.

**KAP, 3**—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

**PHON, 1**—Andrew.

**Ind, 1**—Bolton.

**NOES, 39:**

**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.

Resolved in the affirmative.

## PRIVILEGE

### Notice of Motion, Dissent from Deputy Speaker's Ruling

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (5.41 pm): Mr Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising. During the debate, the Deputy Speaker in the chair was the member for Mansfield. The Minister for Industrial Relations had completed her contribution and had sat down, and the Deputy Speaker had then given the call to the member for Burleigh. The minister, upon realising that she had forgotten to move that the motion be put, then again rose. I believe the video footage will show that the member for Burleigh quite clearly had the call and that the Minister for Industrial Relations had completed her contribution. It is on that note that I give notice that I will move dissent from the Deputy Speaker's ruling to go back to the Minister for Industrial Relations.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Kawana, if you can provide that notice in writing over the coming days, that will be appreciated. I will give consideration to the matter upon receiving your correspondence.

## MOTION

### Order of Business

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (5.42 pm): I move—

That government business orders of the day Nos 2 and 3 be postponed.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

## BIRTHS, DEATHS AND MARRIAGES REGISTRATION AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 7 March (see p. 294).

### Second Reading

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (5.43 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

The Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Amendment Bill 2018 was introduced into the parliament on 7 March 2018. The bill was referred to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee for consideration. I thank the committee for its consideration of the bill. The committee tabled its report on the bill on 23 April 2018. I note that the committee unanimously recommended the bill be passed and I thank the committee for its unanimous recommendation. In its report the committee also recognised that this amendment will have a significant positive impact for members of the LGBTIQ community. The committee noted the unanimous support of the parties that made submissions to the committee.

It is fitting that I stand here today delivering my second reading speech on what is International Day Against Homophobia, Biphobia and Transphobia—a worldwide celebration of sexual and gender diversities. This year's focus of the worldwide celebration is creating alliances for solidarity. The day is a recognition that strengthening alliances within the LGBTIQ community and with LGBTIQ stakeholders will harness the LGBTIQ community's energy and, in turn, bring about further change for the better. I wish everyone a happy International Day Against Homophobia, Biphobia and Transphobia.

On the topic of solidarity and coming together, I would like to warmly thank and congratulate the individuals and organisations who made submissions and appeared before the committee. These submissions, and in particular the personal accounts of the impact of the current law on individuals in the transgender community, articulate so very clearly and emotionally the need for change.

The purpose of the bill is to amend section 22 of the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 2003 to remove the restriction that a person be not married before the person's sex reassignment is noted in the register of births or the adopted children register. The Palaszczuk government acted quickly to bring legislation before this House to remove this restriction that discriminates against the transgender community.

The bill itself is quite simple. It removes seven words from section 22. The seven words to be removed are 'only if the person is not married'. Whilst in size the bill itself is not significant, the Palaszczuk government completely understands how very important the removal of those seven words are to the gender-diverse community. At a purely legal level, the amendments in the bill are necessary to respond to the impending removal of an exemption in the Commonwealth Sex Discrimination Act 1984 on 9 December 2018. Currently, section 40(5) of the Sex Discrimination Act provides an exemption from unlawful discrimination under the act for a refusal to make, issue or alter an official record of a person's sex if a law of a state or territory requires the refusal because the person is married. In practice, the SDA exemption means that, where a Registry of Births, Deaths and Marriages officer refuses to alter a person's sex on an official record where this is in accordance with the law of that jurisdiction, this action does not constitute unlawful discrimination against a person under the SDA.

From 9 December 2018, the Marriage Amendment (Definition and Religious Freedoms) Act 2017, which introduced marriage equality, will repeal this exemption. The effect of the removal of the Sex Discrimination Act exemption will be that, from 9 December 2018, where a registry officer refuses

to note the reassignment of a person's sex on the basis that the person is married, this action may become the subject of a discrimination complaint under the SDA. However, more importantly, at a more human level, the amendments are necessary to remove a form of unjust and painful discrimination facing members of Queensland's transgender community.

The effect of the current law is that a married person seeking legal recognition of the reassignment of their sex must divorce their partner. This is not a cost or a consequence that any law of this state should impose on any members of our community. Further, as noted in submissions to the committee, divorce will only be an option if the requirements for divorce under the Family Law Act 1975 are met, which may not always be the case—bearing in mind the requirements for a divorce are that the marriage has broken down and there is no reasonable prospect of reconciliation and that the married couple have been separated for at least 12 months and one day. The law as it currently stands leaves a married transgendered individual with two equally distressing options: either satisfy the requirements of divorce and go through the divorce process—this is obviously not an option for those living in a happy marriage—or, alternatively, stay married and live with the pain of not being able to change their birth certificate to properly reflect who they are.

A further unacceptable and humiliating impact of the current marriage restriction is that, where a person remains married following sexual reassignment surgery, the person's former gender may be revealed when they are required to prove their identity because their birth certificate—a primary identity document—would not be updated to reflect their true gender. This has the potential to cause repeated and significant stress and anguish and risks exposing the person to stigma, which is still an unfortunate reality for members of our transgender community and the LGBTIQ community. I say 'our' transgender community because transgender people are part of our greater community, and the Palaszczuk government hopes this reform goes some way to helping the transgender community to live their lives openly and without judgement.

This Palaszczuk government is absolutely committed to ensuring our laws support the rights and dignity of all Queenslanders equally. Today is another example of our commitment. We will do this by building upon our existing achievements of: reintroducing civil partnerships after the Newman government abolished them; expunging historical homosexual offences; removing gay panic as a defence; standardising the age of consent; providing funding for the LGBTI Community Legal Service for the first time ever; and allowing same-sex adoption.

In conclusion, the Human Rights Law Centre's comments to the committee's public hearing sums up so well what this bill delivers at its core for transgender Queenslanders. They stated—

It is a small but significant change that will mean transgender people can be free to be who they are while maintaining their commitment to the person they fell in love with.

This bill is only possible due to the federal parliament legalising same-sex marriage late last year, and we have seen so many happy couples now wed. To that end, can I congratulate two very dear friends Shane Newcombe and Ethan Tyler from Redcliffe, who married last Saturday. I thank them for letting me share that very special day with them. I very proudly commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr JANETZKI** (Toowoomba South—LNP) (5.51 pm): I rise to address the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Amendment Bill 2018 introduced into the House by the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice on 23 April 2018. The LNP will not oppose this legislation. The LNP firmly believe that all members of our community deserve to be treated equally and with dignity and respect. We constantly find that the highest priority for Queenslanders, irrespective of gender, sexuality or race, is a properly managed economy; access to a bed in a world-class hospital when needed; the best of education delivered in a safe, inclusive environment; safe communities free from crime; and better and more affordable infrastructure including roads, electricity and water. That is our top priority.

The key objective of the bill is to amend section 22 of the current act to remove the restriction in that provision on noting the reassignment of a married person's sex on the register of births or the adopted children register. In reviewing this legislation, I want to thank the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee, which received 10 submissions from interested stakeholders.

This legislation, and specifically this provision, was based on the previous definition under the Commonwealth Marriage Act 1961 that marriage was between a man and a woman. Of course, we know that changed late last year due to the will of the Australian people and changes brought forward by the federal coalition government. Given the changes to the definition of 'marriage', it is a flow-on requirement that section 22 of this Queensland act is amended. This also needs to change by 9 December 2018, when the current exemption in the Sex Discrimination Act from anti-discrimination law in relation to a refusal to alter a person's sex on an official record because the person is married where the refusal is in accordance with state and territory laws will be repealed.

All submitters were supportive of the bill. The Human Rights Law Centre, the Gay and Lesbian Rights Lobby and Rainbow Rights Watch said that the bill does not go far enough. They argued that the bill should provide that a person does not have to undergo reassignment surgery to have a change of sex noted on their birth certificate. They also raised concerns that birth certificates continue to require gender be noted as either male or female. The Human Rights Law Centre raised concerns, saying—

The BDM Act also contains a number of other outdated, unnecessary and invasive requirements that significantly disadvantage transgender, gender diverse and intersex people in Queensland. For example:

- In order to apply for their sex marker to be changed, individuals are still required to have undergone sexual reassignment surgery ... and medical evidence is required instead of self-affirmation ...
- Contrary to best practice and the jurisprudence of the High Court, the BDM Act does not yet expressly allow a person to specify their sex marker as categories other than male or female.

One thing that does concern us—and it came at the same time that this bill was tabled—was a discussion paper released by the government titled 'Registering of life events recognising sex and gender diversity and same-sex families'. There is no question that everyone deserves to be treated with dignity and respect. Increasingly, however, it seems that this government's only agenda is political correctness. We will continue to watch this trend closely in the months and years ahead.

As I mentioned at the outset of my contribution to this debate, the highest priority for Queenslanders, irrespective of gender, sexuality or race, is a properly managed economy; access to a bed in a world-class hospital when needed; the best of education delivered in a safe, inclusive environment; safe communities free from crime; and better and more affordable infrastructure including less congestion on our roads and cheaper electricity, fuel, rego and water. That is our focus. We want a future for Queensland that gives everyone a chance to succeed, regardless of their gender, religion or race, an outlook in which Queensland's best days are ahead of it for everyone.

The changes in this specific legislation are important and consequential to the changes we saw in the federal parliament late last year. As I have said, the change is obligated to be effected by 9 December 2018 when the current exemption in the Sex Discrimination Act is to be repealed. The LNP will not be opposing that.

 **Mr RUSSO** (Toohey—ALP) (5.56 pm): I rise in the House to speak in support of the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Amendment Bill 2018. This bill was referred to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee for its consideration. The committee tabled its report on 23 April 2018 which recommended that the bill be passed. I commend the committee's report to the House. I will also be recommending that members of this House vote in favour of this legislation.

I take this opportunity on behalf of the committee to thank those individuals and organisations who made written submissions on the bill, those who briefed the committee and those who appeared at the committee's public hearing. I would also like to thank our committee secretariat and Hansard as well as the Department of Justice and Attorney-General.

The bill amends section 22 of the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 2003 to allow the reassignment of a married person's sex to be noted on the register of births or the adopted children register. Currently, a married person would need to divorce their spouse to have the reassignment of their sex noted in those registers. The bill fixes this anomaly.

All submissions to the committee expressed support for the bill. Rainbow Rights Watch described the effect of the current section 22. They stated—

The Section 22 divorce requirement puts many gender diverse Queenslanders in a difficult position of being required to choose between legal recognition of their marriage, and legal recognition of their sex or gender.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Stewart): Member for Toohey, can you please move that the debate be now adjourned.

Debate, on motion of Mr Russo, adjourned.

## PRIVILEGE

### Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by Members, Apology

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (5.58 pm): I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising. On Tuesday I said that the member for South Brisbane while minister for local government received 326 complaints about corruption in the Labor Ipswich City Council. I understand now that the minister received a staggering 326 pages of complaints. I would like to correct the record and I apologise to the House for any misunderstanding.

### **Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by Members, Apology**

 **Mr MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (5.59 pm): I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising. For the reasons just given by the opposition leader, I withdraw and apologise for the misunderstanding.

### **Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by Members, Apology**

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (5.59 pm): I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising. For the reasons outlined by the Leader of the Opposition, I too apologise for the misunderstanding.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

### **Mother's Day, Flowers**

 **Mr BATT** (Bundaberg—LNP) (6.00 pm): Last week during the four days leading up to that most important special Sunday—Mother's Day—I visited all of the aged-care facilities in my electorate of Bundaberg and delivered over 530 bunches of chrysanthemums to those special mums in people's lives. I delivered 530 bunches of chrysanthemums to those more senior mums in Bundaberg and chocolates for the staff of those retirement villages. I would like to thank the management and staff of the eight facilities in Bundaberg that invited me: Kepnock Grove, TriCare, Gracehaven, Bolton Clarke Fairways, Anglicare Meilene, Blue Care Pioneer Lodge, Blue Care Riverlea and Blue Care Milbank.

**Mr Costigan:** Did you book in?

**Mr BATT:** Yes, I did book in for my future years. I purchased these flowers from the local Endeavour Foundation which, as most people would know, is a not-for-profit organisation that operates in Bundaberg and all around Queensland. They grow the flowers right in the middle of Bundaberg, and it is a lot of work. It takes amazing timing to get the blooms ready on the week of Mother's Day each year because so much depends on conditions, which change over the preceding four or five months. They planted over 6,000 plants to make 9,000 bunches of flowers for Mother's Day.

It is great for those people in the Bundaberg community to assist people with disabilities who work at the Endeavour Foundation, who do things like the flowers and packing potatoes and onions for Woolies and other places. Over 90 people in Bundaberg work with people with disabilities at the Endeavour Foundation in assisting them and helping them create better lives for themselves and their families. When the opportunity came for me to give a bit back to this community group by buying my chrysanthemums from them, I did not think twice about it.

I wanted to do this to make sure that the mums and those staff in the aged-care facilities did not feel forgotten, because a lot of those people do not have anyone to support them in their senior years. It is important to make sure that we thank those people for the hard work they do all the time in these facilities. On special days like Mother's Day it is also nice to make them feel extra special. I was also rewarded and made to feel very extra special with plenty of cuddles and kisses from those senior ladies. There were lots of huge smiles, bright eyes and even a few joyful tears as well. It made my week. It was a fantastic four days, and I thank all of those people in the community for assisting me.

### **Community Hubs**

 **Mrs MULLEN** (Jordan—ALP) (6.03 pm): It was my absolute pleasure to recently represent the Queensland health minister at the launch of Ipswich Community Hubs. Auspiced through Community Hubs Australia and in partnership with Access, the five community hubs are based at Fernbrooke State School, Redbank Plains State School, Riverview State School, Staines Memorial College and WoodLinks State School. Community hubs serve as an entry point to connect new arrivals and migrant families with each other, their school and existing services. The hubs provide the opportunity to gain information, learn life skills, build confidence, meet key people and connect with other new arrivals in a safe place. In particular, the hubs assist with navigating Australian culture and systems including housing, health, legal, education and employment. They also help with building English language skills and confidence and support the learning, development and wellbeing of newly arrived youth and connect them with the appropriate services.

Dozens of community hubs operate under the National Community Hubs Program, which is recognised as a leading model to engage and support migrant women with young children. The focus on migrant women is important, as many migrant women can spend most of their time at home isolated from the rest of the community. Some migrant women cannot drive; some have limited public transport

access; many have young children and cannot access childminding. As a result, they can miss out on available services to learn or receive health support. It also means that many of the children can arrive at school without having much, if any, English language or social skills. The hubs can provide early intervention for these young children, whether through the need to have hearing checked, speech therapy provided or behavioural concerns addressed.

I took the opportunity to visit one of the hubs at Staines Memorial College to get a firsthand look at the invaluable work the hubs provide. Meeting with the hub coordinator, Alek Arok, I was invited to sit in on a sewing class that was held for some of the local mothers. Speaking with them it was very clear that the class was more than about learning to sew but a way to meet other mothers and to have a chat and a laugh—to connect. It is a testament to the wonderful Ipswich community that organisations such as Zonta Club of Ipswich have taken the initiative to support the sewing classes through donations of fabric and hands-on teaching. I was particularly heartened by the enthusiasm of Staines Memorial College in supporting the community hub. I would like to commend the principal, Mr Norton Sands, for understanding not only the importance of this project for his school community but also the broader Ipswich community. In fact, I would like to commend all of the principals whose schools are participating in the community hubs program.

My mother's family arrived in this country in the 1950s following displacement in their home country. This is an issue that is personal for me. I wish that my mother's family could have had the type of support that the community hubs are offering our newly arrived community members. It is a program that I am pleased to support and a model I will continue to champion.

### **Lockyer Electorate, Schools**

 **Mr McDONALD** (Lockyer—LNP) (6.06 pm): I would like to take this opportunity to mention some of the invaluable work that is done by educators in my electorate. Members in this House may not be aware that my electorate is home to 34 schools. These range in size and scope from large high schools with over 1,000 students to small community based primary schools with as few as seven students. It is the latter of these I would like to mention today.

The staff at these schools find themselves in the unique position of having to fulfil all of the facets of teaching and support offered by multiple staff at larger schools. Not only do they devote their time to educating our next generation; they also serve as their students' principals and counsellors. They also commit to being key members of our small rural communities. They go above and beyond normal expectations to ensure their students are provided with the same level of learning and support that is offered to their peers in larger schools.

Take, for example, the staff of the Mount Sylvia State School. Mount Sylvia is a school with 26 students that is served by four full-time teaching staff. Despite its small size, together with a dedicated P&C and a tight-knit community the school hosts the highly successful Up the Creek Festival. In 2017, the festival's inaugural year, the festival was the proud recipient of the Lockyer Valley's Australia Day Community Event of the Year Award. I commend the school for this terrific achievement. I look forward to seeing what they can produce on 11 August this year, when they once again play host to the festival. I encourage anyone who has the opportunity to attend to do so. Come along and see what a small group of professionals and a dedicated community can do.

I would also like to mention the staff and students of Ma Ma Creek State School. This school, with two full-time teaching staff, plays host to 16 students ranging from prep to year 6. These students, many of them second and third generations at the school, engage in a multi-age classroom learning environment. In this environment every student is not only provided with the chance to learn at his or her year level but is also challenged by their peers to improve and learn to the best of their ability. They also provide teachers with the chance to get to know their students and the students' families on a more intimate level, giving them the knowledge required to tailor a student's learning to produce the best outcomes possible.

Nothing can possibly express the infinite gratitude that I and the members of our small communities in Lockyer have for our educators. Without these dedicated staff, students could need to travel well beyond their homes and communities to complete their education. For this we are forever grateful.

### **Koala Protection**

 **Ms BOYD** (Pine Rivers—ALP) (6.09 pm): Koalas are an iconic species of national and international importance. They hold a special place in our hearts, and it is heartbreaking to picture a world without them. Due to a variety of pressures, there is a very real threat to our koala populations.

On Sunday, 6 May it was my pleasure to join with Pine Rivers Koala Care and so many locals at Old Petrie Town to celebrate Wild Koala Day. Sadly, despite years of dedicated policy and planning regulations, koala populations have been in steep decline.

Last sitting week in this place the Palaszczuk government put an end to broadscale land clearing. We also formed the Koala Expert Panel to advise on the most appropriate and realistic measures for long-term protection. The panel recommended an integrated set of recommendations addressing the decline of koalas in South-East Queensland from many pressures including urban development, car strike, dog attack and diseases. The report heralds a new direction for the conservation of koalas in Queensland, with all six of the recommendations being accepted by the Palaszczuk government. It is a comprehensive and innovative template to balance development and koala preservation—a complex and challenging task, particularly in urban landscapes like my community.

The Koala Advisory Council, comprising varied stakeholders, will coordinate the implementation of a new South-East Queensland koala conservation strategy. It is clear that koala conservation is not just the responsibility of the state and nor do we have all of the means to respond. That is why we will continue to work closely with stakeholders.

The importance of community support in this space cannot be understated. Our local Pine Rivers Koala Care provides an essential wildlife rescue, rehabilitation and relocation role and looks after local koala populations and habitat. I put on record my thanks to Pine Rivers Koala Care volunteers for their hard work and dedication to helping create a safe living environment for koalas in the Pine Rivers community. I encourage them to keep working to safeguard these iconic creatures, now and into the future. They can be assured that the Palaszczuk government will play its part.

We take the protection of our koala populations very seriously and are committed to maintaining viable and healthy koala populations in South-East Queensland and across the state. I want Queensland to be a place where we can show the next generation a wild koala in its native habitat, safe in open eucalypt forest. In time, I hope they are able to do the same with the generation after that. We in Labor will continue to work towards ensuring the most realistic and appropriate actions are in place to safeguard viable wild koala populations long term in Queensland.

Wild Koala Day was a great day for our community to increase awareness of the environment and the wildlife that depends upon it. On the day we planted over 200 trees. Fourteen community and environmental groups participated and presented. There were macropods, possums and koalas, which were fantastic for the crowd to explore and ask questions around. I thank the stallholders and the many businesses that worked in with Pine Rivers Koala Care.

### **Nicklin Electorate, Volunteers**

 **Mr HUNT** (Nicklin—LNP) (6.12 pm): I rise to acknowledge the incredible community groups in the electorate of Nicklin and the contribution they make to our community, economy and lifestyle. It is timely to acknowledge the volunteers who are the backbone of these amazing community groups as it is National Volunteer Week next week. According to the ABS General Social Survey in 2014, there were at that time 983,200 volunteers in Queensland contributing an estimated \$11.6 billion to the Queensland economy.

On Saturday night Police-Citizens Youth Clubs, PCYC, will hold a gala ball here in Brisbane to celebrate their 70th anniversary. Established in 1948, PCYC will mark 70 years of service to the community—70 years of helping our young people to be all they can be, 70 years of the local police building relationships with young people at risk of getting involved in criminal activities and showing them a better way, with opportunities and support. Prior to my election to this House in November last year I was honoured to have served the previous 17 years as a police sergeant branch manager in this wonderful community organisation.

Since being elected as the member for Nicklin I have met with many impressive groups doing some pretty amazing things. I congratulate all of the community groups in the Nicklin electorate on the work they do. I thank their tireless volunteers. As their elected member I will continue to do all I can to support their endeavours. On Wednesday, 20 June I will be hosting a community groups forum at the PCYC in Nambour with a range of guest speakers who can assist groups with things such as making grant applications and fundraising. I encourage community groups to register their interest in what will be a great forum with my electorate office.

Some of the great local organisations I have met with so far include Cooroy Area Residents' Association, Cooroy Chamber of Commerce, Crushers Leagues Club, Dulong Futures, Genealogy Sunshine Coast, Kenilworth and District Chamber of Commerce, Kenilworth First Response, Mapleton

and District Community Association, Mapleton Bowls Club, Mapleton Men's Shed, Nambour Alliance, Nambour Community Centre, Nambour Cricket Club, Nambour Garden Club, Nambour Little Athletics, Nambour Men's Shed, Nambour museum, Nambour & Districts Netball Association, Nambour RSL Sub-Branch, Kureelpa Dulong Neighbourhood Watch, Palmwoods Living History Society, Palmwoods theatrical society, PCYC, Reviving Nambour, STEMM Program, Sunshine Coast Riding for the Disabled, Woombye and Palmwoods Community and Business Association, Yandina and District Community Association Inc., Yandina Eumundi RSL Sub-Branch and more. There are many wonderful organisations in the Nicklin community. I thank the volunteers for their service.

### Reconciliation in Queensland Schools Program

 **Ms HOWARD** (Ipswich—ALP) (6.15 pm): I would like to raise awareness today of the Reconciliation in Queensland Schools program, which is helping to create a legacy of reconciliation in our Queensland schools. I recently attended the celebration of a completed reconciliation project at Raceview State School. The completion of this project was celebrated by members of the Raceview State School community and members of our local Indigenous community including the family of the late Les Davidson.

Reconciliation is an act of coming together to build respect and trust between Indigenous and Australian communities. Raceview State School's reconciliation project clearly showed that we are on our way to reaching that goal. I wish to congratulate Raceview State School on this wonderful achievement, and I would like to personally thank the family of Les Davidson—Tracey Evans, Molly Evans, and Uncle Errol. I also wish to thank the Principal of Raceview State School, Theresa Sheehan, and the Deputy Principal, Francine Hayler, for inviting me to their celebration.

The completed project was a tremendous example of school students and local Indigenous elders working together to strengthen reconciliation in our community and build respectful and lasting relationships. The project featured a stunning mural of the late Les Davidson, an important member of the Ipswich community who played a large role in establishing welfare services to Aboriginal people in Ipswich such as affordable housing and health. I would like to personally thank his granddaughter, Tracey Evans, for taking the time to tell her grandfather's story about the important legacy he left for Ipswich.

Les Davidson was a remarkable figure. He was the first Aboriginal person in Ipswich to become a qualified tradesman. He helped secure the Aboriginal Cemetery Reserve at Deebing Creek. He helped to secure federal funding to purchase nine houses for families in need, and he co-founded the first Aboriginal medical service in Queensland, now known as Kambu, which still operates to this day in Ipswich. Les was an inspiration to our community and it was a joy to see his legacy memorialised in the mural at Raceview State School.

Raceview's reconciliation project also saw students and Indigenous elders work together to create a bush tucker garden which grows a variety of native berries, lemon myrtle and warrigal greens. Indigenous elders Anne and Gary Young from the Bush Garden Association volunteered much of their time and valuable knowledge to help the students establish this garden, and I wish to thank them also. All students and members of the Raceview school community can access the bush tucker garden, giving everyone the chance to experience and enjoy native bush tucker, as well as get involved in helping to maintain it for future students. The garden offers a wonderful opportunity for students to grow their own food and to have instilled in them a sense of responsibility.

Raceview State School is proud of its achievement in creating the reconciliation mural and bush tucker garden, and I commend its efforts in playing an active role in helping to advance reconciliation in the Ipswich community. I wish to also thank the Office of the Commonwealth Games for delivering the Reconciliation in Queensland Schools initiative and providing Raceview State School the funding to make its project a possibility.

### Coolum Beach Surf Club

 **Mr PURDIE** (Ninderry—LNP) (6.18 pm): I rise to acknowledge all the volunteers, office bearers, staff and athletes at the Coolum Beach Surf Club. The summer patrol period is coming to an end for another year. The good, hardworking members of this club have volunteered their time to keep both locals and visitors safe on the beach and in the surf this summer. I particularly highlight all those club members who made the long trek over to Perth for the recent Australian Surf Life Saving Championships. They represented our club with pride and brought home a swag of medals, led by the boardriding team who won four gold, one silver and one bronze medal. A special congratulations goes

to Bruce Dunne Sr, who retained his national longboard title for the fourth consecutive year. Bruce is a passionate member of the Coolum Beach Surf Club and will duly be awarded his life membership of the club later this month.

Congratulations also go to Finn Walsh, who took out the male 14 years shortboard title, and Jodie Waring, who assisted the club's overall points tally by winning both the short and longboard events. Team coach and local identity Paddy Lynch narrowly missed out on gold but secured a silver medal in the masters longboard final. Toby Andrews added to the medal haul with a bronze in the 14 years shortboard final and just off the dais with fourth placings were Will Dunne, Cooper Waring and Liana Walsh.

Congratulations go to the masters beach relay team of Kate Tomba, Emma Rahui, Jodie Waring and Heidi Dunne for their silver and to Kate for her oh-so-close silver medal in the beach flags. Jodie Waring also secured a well-deserved bronze in her two-kilometre run. The surf boat teams went from two down to three due to an untimely injury to Gary Barben in the lead-up to the titles and, even though the legendary old boys crew could no longer compete without Gary, John Ellingson, Ron Trembath and Bill Sharry still made the huge trek across the country by road to deliver the surf boats and all the other watercraft and ensure they all arrived safely. Surf boat sweep Patrick McGuire said all the boat crews loved competing in their first Aussie titles and are already looking forward to the Aussie titles when they return to Queensland next year. I hope they all get a well-deserved break over winter and we look forward to their return to our local beaches next summer.

### **Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by Members, Apologies**

 Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (6.21 pm): What we have seen this afternoon is just extraordinary from the Leader of the Opposition, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the Manager of Opposition Business who have all come in here at five minutes to six to apologise to this parliament.

This all came about because on Tuesday of this sitting week there were questions put to the Deputy Premier—the second most senior member of this government—that sought to impugn and imply that the Deputy Premier had not acted while she was minister for local government in relation to serious complaints relating to corruption with her department relating to local government. The Deputy Premier gave an answer at the time.

The Deputy Premier stood up in this place on Wednesday and gave a very clear, detailed explanation of the facts of the situation in explaining that these matters had all been referred to the CCC and clearly stated that it was not 326 complaints but rather 326 pages relating to three complaints from one complainant. In fact, the Deputy Premier did not even need to do that because the document that the LNP tabled on Tuesday says '326 pages'—on two pages of this document it clearly says '326 pages'—and the Leader of the Opposition on Tuesday in the media said that she would apologise if it was not 326 complaints. She said that on Tuesday.

The Deputy Premier came in here and gave a very detailed answer on Wednesday clearly stating that it was not 326 complaints. She came in here again today and tabled documents from the Crime and Corruption Commission proving that all of these documents had been considered by the CCC, yet it took until five minutes before 6 pm this afternoon for the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Everton and the member for Kawana to come in here to apologise, smiling and laughing as they stood up and apologised one by one after we have heard all of this rhetoric today about democracy and the behaviour of people in this parliament. Those opposite come in here and throw these allegations around, misleading this parliament. It is a disgusting abuse of power—

*(Time expired)*

### **Toowoomba Second Range Crossing, Tolls**

 Mr WATTS (Toowoomba North—LNP) (6.24 pm): I rise to talk about one of my favourite projects in my electorate and the good member for Lockyer's electorate—the Toowoomba second range crossing. Today I want to talk about the tolls that the Toowoomba second range crossing will have upon its completion. The people of the Darling Downs, the Western Downs, Toowoomba—in fact, people up and down the east coast—and the many people who are involved in logistics movements here in Brisbane are trying to plan their futures. We know that this road will open, albeit seven months late. We are not quite sure exactly the causes for that, but the proponent has to deal with a slip that it has suffered. It will be delivered six or seven months late, but all the same the people of Toowoomba, the

Darling Downs and the east coast of Australia need to understand what the toll is going to be so that they can start planning their business costs, their haulage costs and understand their fuel loadings. This is the engine room that drives the east coast of Australia in that it goes through Toowoomba and my electorate and through the electorate of Lockyer. In fact, most of it is in the electorate of Lockyer.

The original business case in today's value is that the toll for a car should be \$3.98. With regard to light commercial vehicles, there have been a couple of different suggestions between \$5 and \$20. With regard to a heavy commercial vehicle—again, there were different business cases at different times—it was suggested that the toll be between \$23 and \$27. The people of Toowoomba and the Western Downs need to hear from this minister before this budget is announced because this is the money that will pay for the maintenance. We need to understand how much he is planning to put on them so that they can plan their businesses. Is he going to be true to the original business case or is there some financial chaos going on in the background that we are not aware of that is going to drive these tolls up? I do not know the answer to that. I call on the minister to let us know what the tolls are going to be so that people can plan their businesses.

I want to raise another issue. When improvements were made to the existing range into Toowoomba there was great work with the environmental people in Redwood Park and the other environmental groups to get a really good rehabilitation of the cuts. I am hearing some worrying rumours about financial restriction and the amount of regrowth that will be planted on to some of those cuts. I ask the minister to look into this and I ask the minister to allow me to go for a trip along the range crossing so that we can start understanding how it is going to be rehabilitated. It goes through a sensitive area of the Toowoomba range and we need to ensure that the native vegetation is protected as it does that.

### Smith, Mr C

 Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning) (6.27 pm): In 20 days time Queensland will go into battle in a foreign land—Victoria. The mighty Maroons State of Origin side will line up against the New South Wales Blues for the first State of Origin game for 2018, which will be played at the MCG, and this week we learnt that they will do so without their captain, one of the greatest Rugby League players in living memory and one of the city of Logan's favourite sons—Cameron Smith, who has announced his retirement from representative football. A product of the mighty Logan Brothers Rugby League Club, Cameron Smith is one of the greatest big-match players the game has ever seen and he grew up in the electorate of Woodridge, where his parents still live today.

I know there has been some conjecture in recent days about which Rugby League player should be immortalised in bronze outside the Cauldron. I know that some of my colleagues' Rugby League allegiances may lie with Ipswich's favourite son—the 'Little General' Alfie Langer—and my colleagues from North Queensland will no doubt be beating the drum for the great Johnathon Thurston to be honoured in this way. However, when they compare their fine efforts to Cameron Smith's list of representative achievements in the greatest game of all, all members of the House will undoubtedly agree that Cameron Smith's achievements are unsurpassed.

Cameron Smith played a record 42 Origin games for Queensland with a record 26 wins. He played 21 games as captain, third behind 'The King' Wally Lewis on 30 and Darren Lockyer, just one ahead, on 22. He was man of the match seven times in Origin games and was responsible for an incredible 1,566 tackles in Origin football—a staggering 700 more than second placed Gary Larson. Cameron Smith also played the second highest number of tests for Australia—56 tests, with the Kangaroos coming away victorious in 49 of those 56 tests.

Cameron Smith is a Rugby League genius. He has won two premierships with the Melbourne Storm and two world cups with the Kangaroos and it is for these reasons that it gives me great pleasure as the member for Woodridge to announce that I have launched a petition today calling for the installation of a statue of Rugby League great Cameron Smith at Suncorp Stadium, and I thank the members representing Townsville because I know they will support this petition. As the Premier said on Tuesday morning in this House, she is keen to hear from Queenslanders about immortalising Queensland Origin greats, so tonight I want to take this opportunity to urge all citizens of the electorate of Woodridge, the city of Logan and the state of Queensland—in fact, anyone with Maroon blood running through their veins—to sign the petition to ensure that the Rugby League achievements of Cameron Smith can be immortalised forever in a statue at the Cauldron.

The House adjourned at 6.30 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