



RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

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

Email: hansard@parliament.qld.gov.au

Phone (07) 3553 6344

FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-SIXTH PARLIAMENT

Wednesday, 13 February 2019

Subject	Page
PRIVILEGE	109
Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by a Minister	109
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Correspondence, dated 19 November 2018, from the member for Coomera, Mr Michael Crandon MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Curtis Pitt, regarding possible misleading of the House by the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, Hon. Mark Bailey	109
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Correspondence, dated 7 December 2018, from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, Hon. Mark Bailey, to the Speaker, Hon. Curtis Pitt, responding to allegations that he misled the House	109
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	110
School Group Tours	110
PETITIONS	110
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	110
Floods, Recovery Assistance	110
Year of Outback Tourism	111
Burke, Mr A	111
Closing the Gap, Report Card	112
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships: Queensland Closing the Gap Snapshot Report Card 2018 [162]	112
Defence Industry, Jobs	112
Tourism Industry	113
Floods, Recovery Assistance	113
Floods, Recovery Assistance	114
State Schools, Infrastructure	114
Maryborough, New Generation Rollingstock	115
Works for Queensland	116
Atlas Gas Pipeline Project	116

Table of Contents – Wednesday, 13 February 2019

TAFE, Nursing Subsidy.....	116
Youth Justice Initiatives.....	117
Waste	117
ABSENCE OF MINISTER.....	118
NOTICE OF MOTION	118
Bushfire Prevention and Preparedness, Inquiry	118
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	119
Floods, Ross River Dam	119
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Email, dated 11 February 2019, from Mr Ken Pearce to various recipients titled 'Townsville Flooding—Ross River Dam, Mismanagement of major public infrastructure continues in Queensland with devastating consequences for the community, costing billions'.	119
Floods, Ross River Dam	120
Anti-Cyberbullying Taskforce.....	120
Schwarten, Hon. R.....	121
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from the <i>Daily Mercury</i> , dated 9 February 2019, regarding referral of a matter to the Crime and Corruption Commission by the Hon. Robert Schwarten, a Queensland Building and Construction Commission board member.	121
South-East Queensland, Traffic Congestion	122
JM Kelly Builders	123
Royal Commission into Misconduct in the Banking, Superannuation and Financial Services Industry	123
JM Kelly Builders	124
Mossman Mill.....	124
JM Kelly Builders	125
Sexual Violence.....	125
Minister for Housing and Public Works	126
Great Barrier Reef Island Resorts Rejuvenation Program	126
PRIVILEGE.....	127
Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by the Premier	127
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 8 February 2019, from the Director-General, Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Mr Dave Stewart, to the member for Burleigh, Mr Michael Hart MP, regarding the finding from a Department of Housing and Public Works investigation that a breach of the Queensland Government Advertising and Marketing Communication Code of Conduct had occurred.	127
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	128
Residential Care Facilities	128
M1 Upgrade.....	128
State Schools, Air Conditioning	129
Labour Hire Licensing Scheme	129
Fardon, Mr RJ	130
Housing Affordability	130
Gold Coast, Casino Proposal	131
Police Service, Recruits	131
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	132
Correction of Answer to Question, Sexual Violence.....	132
Queensland Government Advertising and Marketing Communication Code of Conduct, Breach	132
PERSONALISED TRANSPORT OMBUDSMAN BILL.....	133
Message from Governor	133
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Message, dated 12 February 2019, from His Excellency the Governor recommending the Personalised Transport Ombudsman Bill 2019.	133
Introduction	133
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Personalised Transport Ombudsman Bill 2019.....	133
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Personalised Transport Ombudsman Bill 2019, explanatory notes.	133
First Reading	135
Referral to Transport and Public Works Committee	135
TRANSPORT LEGISLATION (ROAD SAFETY AND OTHER MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL	135
Introduction	135
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Transport Legislation (Road Safety and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2019.....	135
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Transport Legislation (Road Safety and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2019, explanatory notes.	135
First Reading	137
Referral to Transport and Public Works Committee	137
POLICE SERVICE ADMINISTRATION (DISCIPLINE REFORM) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	138
Introduction	138
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Police Service Administration (Discipline Reform) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019.....	138
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Police Service Administration (Discipline Reform) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019, explanatory notes.	138
First Reading	141
Referral to Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee.....	141
CRIMINAL CODE (NON-CONSENSUAL SHARING OF INTIMATE IMAGES) AMENDMENT BILL	141
Second Reading	141

Table of Contents – Wednesday, 13 February 2019

CRIMINAL CODE AND OTHER LEGISLATION (MASON JETT LEE) AMENDMENT BILL	146
Introduction	146
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Criminal Code and Other Legislation (Mason Jett Lee) Amendment Bill 2019.	146
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Criminal Code and Other Legislation (Mason Jett Lee) Amendment Bill 2019, explanatory notes.	146
First Reading	148
Referral to Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee	149
CRIMINAL CODE (NON-CONSENSUAL SHARING OF INTIMATE IMAGES) AMENDMENT BILL	149
Second Reading	149
Consideration in Detail	161
Clauses 1 to 10, as read, agreed to.	161
Third Reading	161
Long Title	162
WASTE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING (WASTE LEVY) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	162
Second Reading	162
MOTION	180
Bushfire Prevention and Preparedness, Inquiry	180
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Photograph, undated, depicting Baloon Cave, Carnarvon National Park.	186
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Photograph, undated, depicting Baloon Cave, Carnarvon National Park damaged after a bushfire in 2018.	186
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to.	191
Resolved in the negative.	191
WASTE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING (WASTE LEVY) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	191
Second Reading	191
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, undated, from the member for Bundamba, Mrs Jo-Ann Miller MP, to the Chief Executive Officer, Ipswich City Council, objecting to an application for material change of use by Austin BMI.	192
ADJOURNMENT	202
Hervey Bay Electorate, Health Services	202
Hawker Pacific	202
Nuffield Scholarship	203
Redlands Electorate	203
Bruce Highway and East Feluga Road Intersection	204
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Nonconforming petition regarding Feluga intersection.	204
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Email, dated 21 December 2018, from Mr Ross Threlfall regarding Bruce Highway/East Feluga Road intersection.	204
Weather Events, Bushfires	205
Scenic Rim Electorate, Public Transport; Bushfire Risk	205
Waterford Electorate	206
Gold Coast, Casino Proposal	206
Redcliffe Electorate	207
ATTENDANCE	208

WEDNESDAY, 13 FEBRUARY 2019



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.

PRIVILEGE

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



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on 19 November 2018 the member for Coomera wrote to me alleging that the Minister for Transport and Main Roads deliberately misled the House on numerous occasions since 2016. In summary, the statements complained of were to the effect that (a) the LNP Newman government did nothing on the M1 motorway with regard to funding, planning or construction and (b) the Newman government cut the intraregional transport corridor from the SEQ Regional Plan in 2014 and stopped the Gold Coast city council from putting it into its 2015 city plan.

I wrote to the minister seeking a response to the allegations. The minister responded on 7 December 2018. On the evidence before me, I consider that the minister has provided an adequate explanation for his statements. Therefore, I have decided that the matter does not warrant the further attention of the House via the Ethics Committee and I will not be referring the matter.

I remind all members of the requirement of section 269(2) of the standing orders which states that, when raising a matter of privilege, a member should write to the Speaker at the earliest opportunity. I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

Tabled paper: Correspondence, dated 19 November 2018, from the member for Coomera, Mr Michael Crandon MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Curtis Pitt, regarding possible misleading of the House by the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, Hon. Mark Bailey [157].

Tabled paper: Correspondence, dated 7 December 2018, from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, Hon. Mark Bailey, to the Speaker, Hon. Curtis Pitt, responding to allegations that he misled the House [158].

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

Leave granted.

On 19 November 2018, the Member for Coomera wrote to me alleging that the Minister for Transport and Main Roads deliberately misled the House on numerous occasions since 2016.

In his letter to me, the Member for Coomera alleged that the minister misled the House and provided the information on which he based his allegation.

In summary, the statements complained of were to the effect that:

- (a) the LNP Newman Government did nothing on the M1 motorway with regards to funding, planning or construction; and
- (b) the Newman Government cut the Intra Regional Transport Corridor from the SEQ Regional Plan in 2014 and they stopped the Gold Coast City Council from putting it into their 2015 city plan.

Section 269(2) of the Standing Orders state that when raising a matter of privilege, a member should write to the Speaker at the earliest opportunity. Some of the Member for Coomera's allegations related to statements made by the minister in 2016 and 2017. Raising a matter two years after the matter arose cannot be described as at the earliest opportunity.

Despite the timing of the correspondence from the Member for Coomera, I wrote to the minister seeking a response to the allegations. The minister responded on 7 December 2018.

In his response, the minister argued that his statements were not factually incorrect or misleading and provided the information on which he had based his statements.

The Member for Coomera provided information available in the 2012-3 and 2013-14 budget papers to support his argument that Ministers statements regarding the M1 funding, planning or construction were incorrect and misleading.

The minister in his response argued that his statements were not factually incorrect or misleading and provided the information on which he had based his statements.

The minister referred to the Budget Capital Statements (BP3), as evidence to support his argument that there were no new funding decision taken by the Government in the relevant period. Of course, capital funding can be allocated which does not appear in BP3.

The arguments of the parties appear to be based on differing interpretations of the reporting of the allocation of funding. The minister has explained the basis for his statement, which was based on different information than the allegation made by the Member for Coomera.

In relation to the Intra Regional Transport Corridor and its non-inclusion in the Coast City Council 2015 city plan there is no dispute between the Member for Coomera and the minister that the IRTC was not included in the council's draft 2015 Gold Coast City Plan.

Whether the Newman Government 'stopped' the Gold Coast City Council from including the IRTC in the 2015 Plan appears to be a matter of differing interpretation between the Member for Coomera and the minister.

The Member for Coomera appears to argue that the Newman Government didn't 'stop' the council from including it but merely pointed out the procedural requirement that it shouldn't be referenced until it was a gazetted future state-controlled road.

The minister appears to argue that the Newman Government effectively 'stopped' the council from including it in the plan by advising that the council could not reference it until it has been gazetted.

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 consider that the minister has made an adequate explanation of his statements, such that it is open to interpretation as to whether the statements were factually incorrect.

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 remind all members of the requirement of section 269(2) of the Standing Orders which state that when raising a matter of privilege, a member should write to the Speaker at the earliest opportunity.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

School Group Tours

 **Mr SPEAKER:** I wish to advise honourable members that we will be visited in the House this morning by students and teachers from Varsity College in the electorate of Mermaid Beach and Mansfield State High School in the electorate of Mansfield.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, members.

Mr Stevens interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Mermaid Beach. I will do my best.

PETITIONS

The Clerk presented the following paper petition, sponsored by the Clerk—

Vietnamese Community in Queensland, Flag

From 15 petitioners, requesting the House to formally recognise the "Yellow Flag" as the heritage flag of the Vietnamese community Queensland [\[159\]](#).

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


Castle Hill PCYC Facility, Pool

Mr Stewart, from 1,351 petitioners, requesting the House to intervene where possible into the pending closure of the Castle Hill PCYC facility to ensure the pool facility remains accessible to local aged residents to maintain health and fitness [\[160\]](#), [\[161\]](#).

Petitions received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Floods, Recovery Assistance

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.34 am): The tragic death from waterborne disease of a woman in Townsville underlines the dangers of the floods—a danger that is not yet over. We must take seriously the warnings of health professionals, which include wearing protective clothing as well as mosquito repellent. Sadly, these dangers are even more pronounced in our north-west.


Agriculture minister Mark Furner has arrived in Mount Isa and will make his way today to Julia Creek. He and the opposition spokesperson left yesterday to base themselves in the region, as has Brigadier Stephen Jobson of the Australian Defence Force. I have asked Major General Stuart Smith, who is charge of our recovery operations, to meet with them as well.

Today I update the House on further measures to assist our farmers. Yesterday afternoon I chaired a meeting comprising AgForce, the Meat & Livestock Association, other industry representatives, meat processors, agriculture minister Mark Furner, the chief vet and senior officials from the department of agriculture. With the assistance of the ADF, a first round of coordinated fodder drops has been completed. A second is underway. Disposal of animal carcasses is also underway, but vast areas are still underwater and deep mud is expected to hamper access for many days. Heavy earthmoving equipment will be staged to access properties as conditions improve. I can also confirm that I have spoken with the Queensland Resources Council to see if there is any equipment from the mining industry that can be brought in to assist during this recovery process. Removal operations will be prioritised to those near homes, water supplies and roads.

The carcasses present significant health risks including botulism and Q fever, which is why Queensland's chief vet has warned anyone dealing with them to fully cover their hands and feet. It is easy to see the impact of the disaster on stock. What is hidden but not ignored is what this is doing to people. Nature is cruel. Having nursed their herd for years, there was the spirit-lifting hope of drought-breaking rain only to be quickly followed by the soul-crushing losses through flood.

The Royal Flying Doctor Service has counsellors already in these communities doing what they can. We are ready to send more as well. This disaster spreads from Winton to Townsville to the gulf. I want everyone in the regions to know that, although our problems are large, they are not unsolvable. We are listening to each other, we are working together and we are acting as fast as conditions allow.


Year of Outback Tourism

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.36 am): Many people are looking for ways to help communities affected by these floods. Our flood appeal is one way, and I can advise that it is at nearly \$4 million. Cash to either the Red Cross, St Vincent de Paul, Givit, Uniting Care or the Salvation Army will go to people who need it most. There is also another way—a way in which communities and councils have told us can really help them. People can start planning their outback holiday. Before the disaster, I declared this year the Year of Outback Tourism. We are spending \$3 million supporting major events across the outback and \$10 million on new attractions. Nothing will help these communities more than knowing that, once everything is cleaned up and back to normal, people are coming to visit.

Tourism is worth \$350 million and supports more than 3,700 jobs in outback Queensland. If people have never seen the Mount Isa rodeo in August, they are missing out. Longreach, Barcaldine and Winton are magical places of our state. This is where Qantas and *Waltzing Matilda* were born, where people will see the Stockman's Hall of Fame. I know the tourism minister will have more to announce about this over coming days.

The outback is where people can dig up a dinosaur and fossick for gems, and it is all within an easy drive. I am calling on families, grey nomads, school groups and honeymooners to start planning their outback adventure. After the clean-up, let them know you are coming. There is a reason we say that Queensland is the best. To find out why, start planning to head west.


Burke, Mr A

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.38 am): When it comes to inspirational lives, Queensland is spoiled for choice. As always, it is the unsung heroes whose stories resonate the most. Such a man was Arthur Burke. For 20 years he and his wife, Di, organised Brisbane's Anzac Day dawn service. I had the privilege of knowing him for six years. I know that other members in the chamber would have known him as well.

Arthur treated everyone as if they were the most important person in the world, and never once did he let on his own importance. Arthur rose from a gunner in the Army to command his own regiment. That is a remarkable career on its own, but he did so much more. While serving in Vietnam it was customary to dig a trench and then build a command post from the timber and tin that was dropped from a helicopter. Arthur suffered this just once before disappearing towards an American base and returning a short time later with a shipping container that was fitted out with all the things necessary for a command post that could easily be moved, saving time and energy.

In later years, neighbours at his Aspley home would have no inkling that the man lovingly tending to his beloved Jag had designed and built the Army's next-generation artillery. He established and nurtured the 105 Battery Association that cared for their history but, more importantly, cared for each other. Arthur died on 16 January surrounded by his children and the grandchildren he loved. It is the Arthur Burkes of Queensland who make Queensland. I am not the only one saddened by his passing. I am greatly honoured to have known Colonel Arthur Ronald Burke OAM, an officer and a gentleman.

Closing the Gap, Report Card

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (9.39 am): Today marks 11 years since then prime minister Kevin Rudd delivered the national apology to the stolen generation. The apology acknowledged that past laws and policies had inflicted profound grief, suffering and loss on Australia's first nations people and was seen as a critical turning point in the relationship between our first nations people, Australian governments and the community.

During the apology, the prime minister committed the Australian government to harnessing the determination of all Australians to close the gap in Indigenous disadvantage. Queensland affirmed its commitment in April 2008 by signing the Close the Gap Statement of Intent. Each year since 2008 the prime minister has delivered a report to parliament. The report provides an update on progress made nationally against each of the seven Closing the Gap targets. In 2018, the Palaszczuk government committed to providing a report to the Queensland parliament on progress against targets. We are the first jurisdiction to produce a Closing the Gap report card. With National Close the Gap Day falling on 21 March this year, it is timely that I table for the benefit of the House Queensland's first Closing the Gap report card.


Tabled paper: Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships: Queensland Closing the Gap Snapshot Report Card 2018 [162].

I am encouraged by the progress being made in early childhood education, year 12 attainment, literacy and numeracy, and health outcomes. We are on track to achieve the 2025 target of having 95 per cent of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander four-year-olds enrolled in early childhood education, with 85.3 per cent enrolled in 2017. We are also set to meet our target of halving the gap in year 12 attainment or equivalent by next year. The numeracy gap for year 3 students has reduced from 22.5 per cent in 2008 to 10.3 per cent in 2017. For year 9 students, the gap has reduced from 20.6 per cent in 2008 to 10.4 per cent in 2017. Queensland's Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people have the highest life expectancy nationally.

While these results are welcome, there is still so much more to be done, which is why the governments of Australia have been reviewing the Closing the Gap initiative. A national ministerial council on closing the gap is being formed with members from across all jurisdictions and with representation from Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. The council will share ownership and responsibility for finalising a jointly agreed framework and targets by mid-2019. The Palaszczuk government will continue to work in partnership with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, communities and organisations to close the gap. The 2018 snapshot report and full report card are available on the Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships website.

Closing the Gap is a bipartisan endeavour. It transcends politics and it is the responsibility of all levels of government. It is incumbent on all of us in this House to continue to dedicate ourselves to the task of closing the gap and to working in genuine partnership with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children, families and communities to make a real difference to their lives.

Defence Industry, Jobs


 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning) (9.42 am): Defence means jobs, and today I am pleased to report how the Palaszczuk government is working to bring more defence jobs to Queensland. In line with our top economic priority—the creation of more Queensland jobs—and the Premier's election commitment, Defence Industries Queensland will now be known as Defence Jobs Queensland, to drive the state's defence industry agenda. This new name emphasises our commitment to supporting the creation of highly paid, knowledge-based defence industry jobs for Queensland—because jobs are what we want and jobs are what we are delivering for Queensland.

Construction of the \$170 million Military Vehicle Centre of Excellence at the Redbank Motorway Estate in Ipswich is underway, supporting 300 jobs a year over two years. When this facility is fully operational, it will deliver Boxer combat reconnaissance vehicles for the Australian Army and contribute

\$1 billion towards Queensland's economy. The construction of this facility strengthens our chances of securing the next phase of the Land 400 project, which has the potential to create hundreds of additional jobs for Queensland. We are working to spread these jobs to all of our state. The recent creation of a Ministerial Council on Defence Industry and Jobs and the North Queensland and South Queensland defence advisory boards shows how we are working with regional Queensland to cut them into the defence jobs bonanza.


This week, we are keeping our 'khaki state' in the spotlight as a leading force in supporting industry and defence. Today, Queensland's Chief Strategic Defence Adviser, retired Lieutenant General Peter Leahy, former head of the Australian Army, is flying the flag for our government and the state's burgeoning defence industries at the Australian Defence Magazine Congress in Canberra. This major defence industry conference has evolved into a key event in the defence calendar, attracting over 600 delegates each year. Our government is making the most of this national event by showcasing Queensland at the conference so we can advance our mission to create more manufacturing jobs in Queensland.

Tourism Industry

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Cooper—ALP) (Minister for Innovation and Tourism Industry Development and Minister for the Commonwealth Games) (9.44 am): We know that business events are crucial to the growth of our tourism industry and business and trade opportunities for Queensland. That is why at the last election we committed to double the funding for business events in Queensland. I am very proud to confirm that, off the back of the Palaszczuk government's election commitment, new economic modelling released today shows that more than \$50 million will be pumped into Queensland's economy from international business events already secured this year—and we are only in February. That is 16 new business events attained by the Palaszczuk government that will lure more than 22,000 delegates to Queensland in 2019—events like SportAccord on the Gold Coast in May, with more than 1,500 delegates from 100 countries; Amway's annual incentive program in Cairns in March, where more than 6,000 employees from China will come to Queensland; and our premiere innovation event QODE in Brisbane in April.

The great news does not stop there. We have also locked in new business events between 2020 and 2026 that we already know will generate a further \$135 million for Queensland and bring some 56,000 delegates to our state. This includes the congress of the International Communication Association on the Gold Coast, the World Congress of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences in Brisbane in 2021 and the 14th International Conference of Archaeozoology in Cairns in 2022. We invest in business events because we know that having national and international business leaders come to Queensland opens the doors to new opportunities for trade and investment. We have some of the best conference facilities in the world in one of the most sought after locations in the world.

Floods, Recovery Assistance

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumbidgee—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (9.46 am): Our thoughts continue to be with the people of North Queensland right now. They have been through the unimaginable. Our front-line staff have worked tirelessly to keep residents safe in the worst moments of the disaster and now in the clean-up. We are reminded that, though the floodwaters may be receding, there are still dangers. My heart goes out to the family and friends of a woman who died in Townsville of melioidosis, a bacterial infection. As of today, there have been 10 confirmed cases of bacterial infections from floodwater. Such infections can be treated with strong antibiotics. People with low immunity, the elderly and young children may be at higher risk.

Queensland Health is encouraging all residents to take precautions to avoid skin infections during the clean-up period by wearing protective clothing like boots and gloves and by washing thoroughly with soap after exposure to muddy water. Queensland Health is conducting targeted media messaging and working closely with GPs and emergency departments to address the risks of disease from floodwaters. The Townsville Hospital and Health Service has been providing extensive public health information to local media and will continue to provide advice to the local community on the risks of contact with floodwaters. All public hospitals are fully open to provide treatment to anyone who feels unwell after contact with floodwaters.


I want to thank our healthcare professionals on the ground in North Queensland for their efforts. As floodwaters rose, along with other Emergency Services, the Queensland Ambulance Service was quick to respond. More than 60 officers were deployed to North Queensland throughout the monsoon

event to reinforce local operations. They responded to around 100 flood related incidents, despite cut-off roads, heavy rains and flooding. Our ambos pitched in for rescues, evacuations, support at evacuation centres and the lengthy clean-up and recovery that continues still.

The Townsville Hospital emergency department remained open through the entire weather event to provide acute and urgent care to those who needed it during the floods. Doctors, nurses and paramedics came from around the state to help on the front line in Townsville, including one senior medical officer from Emerald who drove all the way to Charters Towers to support the Charters Towers Hospital. Another senior medical officer, Dr Louise, cancelled her leave to travel back to Townsville early. Another, Dr Manoj, who was due to start his appointment at Charters Towers on Monday, decided to travel there earlier and start early. Vanessa, a clinical nurse from Kowanyama, was trapped in Charters Towers by the weather, so she went to work at the Charters Towers Hospital with the full support of Torres and Cape HHS.

These are just some examples, but there are so many more. To all our first responders, again I say thank you. I know we have the best possible front-line staff taking care of Queenslanders whenever we need it.

Floods, Recovery Assistance

 **Hon. CJ O'ROURKE** (Mundingburra—ALP) (Minister for Communities and Minister for Disability Services and Seniors) (9.50 am): As the clean-up continues, we enter perhaps one of the most challenging phases of recovery. It smells, there is mould, it is hot and, unfortunately, it is taking its toll on many people's emotional and physical health. I take a moment to pass on my condolences to the family and friends of the woman who lost her life to melioidosis.


At a time when things seem so tough we pull together. People from all walks of life have stepped up and supported their fellow North Queenslanders. Our emergency services, our SES members, members of the Australian Defence Force and Townsville City Council staff have also done an amazing job to support the response and recovery phase.

North Queensland Cowboys players were just some of the people who jumped in boats to help those affected by rising floodwaters leave their homes. I also know that Brad Webb, better known to the House for his work on water for Townsville, also pitched in by driving his vehicle through floodwaters, getting people out just in time. Now, with the community recovery effort well and truly underway, we are seeing more examples of the community pulling together to get things done and support one another.

North Queensland neighbourhood centres, which are part of a network of 124 government funded centres across the state, have been the front and centre of efforts to help people recover from the disaster. For example, Community Gro centres in Townsville have seen many locals coming through their doors seeking help and support. They shared a story of a local grandmother caring for three children who visited the centre because she had a leaking roof, wet bedding and no power for three days following the flooding and she did not know what to do. Staff at the centre were able to spend time listening to her over cups of tea and then provided wideranging assistance to help her get back on her feet. This included helping her to apply for all the grants that were available to her; providing practical support with food, linen and mattresses; and assisting her to contact Ergon to get the power restored. For longer term support they have also ensured that she had access to legal assistance and the supports to help her.

This type of holistic support is invaluable to people during these tough times and I have been incredibly heartened by all the offers of help I have seen. Some local companies have even been offering their entire workforce to assist. I encourage every single person—anyone—who is able to help to contact them and offer their assistance.

State Schools, Infrastructure

 **Hon. G GRACE** (McConnel—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Industrial Relations) (9.52 am): Across the state in 2019 some 830,000 students have taken to the classroom, the state's highest ever overall enrolment count, with 560,000 attending state schools. Around 66,000 of these students are beginning their school career in prep. As well as being a special day for students, their parents and carers—

Ms Jones: My Gracie.

Ms GRACE: I take the interjection of the member for Cooper. Her Gracie was also one of those prep starters—

Dr Miles: And Bridie.


Ms GRACE:—and the Minister for Health's Bridie was also one of those. I will take any other interjections that people in the House have. Proud parents! To cater for the increase in enrolments, the Palaszczuk government is employing an additional 3,700 teachers over four years. This year we welcomed more than 1,500 new teachers to Queensland state schools, definitely putting us on track to meet our commitment. We have also employed more than 200 teacher aides, who are now supporting and working with students right across the state.

To mark the first day of the school year, I was very pleased to join the Premier and the member for Jordan at Queensland's newest state school, Spring Mountain, near Springfield. This impressive approximately \$40 million state-of-the-art facility will become the hub and deliver the future educational needs of this growing community.

The Palaszczuk government is delivering world-class infrastructure for our state schools. A further eight new schools will be built this year and will be ready for the start of the 2020 school year, with new high schools in Calliope, Coomera, Mango Hill, Yarrabilba, Providence at Ripley Valley and Fortitude Valley; a new primary school at Ripley Valley; and a new special school at Caboolture. In fact, I was proud to join the Premier and the member for Gladstone to turn the first sod on the construction of the new Calliope high school. It was great to see future students of the school lending a helping hand to turn the sod. I commend the member for Gladstone for his tireless advocacy for a new high school on behalf of the Calliope community, many of whom were on hand to toast with style.

This year there are a total of 43 locations offering the Palaszczuk government's remote kindergarten initiative, 14 of which are new to the program such as Baralaba, Callide and St Lawrence in Mirani. Without this initiative, these young Queenslanders would not be able to participate in a kindergarten program because they live in a very rural or remote location. Programs like this further demonstrate our commitment to giving Queensland kids a great start.

Maryborough, New Generation Rollingstock

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (9.55 am): The Palaszczuk government is committed to supporting rail manufacturing jobs in Maryborough, a city with a long and proud tradition of Queenslanders building trains for Queenslanders. We make no apologies for ensuring that from this year Maryborough will be the central hub for delivering vital modification works for our state's NGR train fleet. Over the next five years staff at Downer EDI's Maryborough factory will undertake modifications to make the NGR fleet one of the most accessible in the country. This means long-term job opportunities for the Maryborough region and for the around 300 Downer staff.

Last month I had the pleasure of visiting Maryborough to join the member for Maryborough and Downer EDI staff in welcoming the first NGR train to Maryborough. The member for Maryborough knows there has been a renewed sense of optimism across the community since we confirmed in December that this work would come to town. We gave our word to the people of Maryborough that this work would be done in their town and we will honour that commitment. The Premier made it clear that this government would lead the way in terms of prioritising jobs for Queenslanders. The Buy Queensland policy puts local jobs first, and we are doing the same with this contract with Downer for the NGR fleet.

The rectification of these trains, designed in close consultation with the disability sector, also demonstrates our government's commitment to listening and delivering for everyone in our community. I have full confidence in the skill and craftsmanship of Maryborough's workforce. Staff are familiarising themselves with the layout and internal fittings of the train, readying their workshop for the first of 75 trains that will eventually roll through Maryborough. These works add to the \$157 million commitment that this government has been investing in Maryborough since 2017 to maintain and refurbish Queensland Rail's trains. As I speak, trains are in Maryborough receiving mechanical overhauls, servicing and maintenance work to support our iconic Queensland Rail regional services.


There are now 45 NGR trains out of 75 that are available for service in South-East Queensland. This has allowed Queensland Rail to provide an additional 46,000 seats on key services across the network, with six-car sets replacing three-car sets. NGR trains also began service on the Cleveland and Shorncliffe lines for the first time earlier this month. When the rectification works at Downer are in full swing, up to eight NGR trains will be undergoing modifications at one time by Maryborough workers. Work is due to start on the first train modification later this year—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, please resume your seat. Members to my left, I am listening to the minister's statement. I believe he is being quite factual and straight with his presentation. I ask that you listen to the ministerial statement. If not, please take your conversations outside.

Mr BAILEY: Work is due to start on the first train modification later this year with the expectation that all trains will be progressively upgraded and rectified by early 2024.


Works for Queensland

 **Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (Minister for Local Government, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (9.58 am): I have good news for regional Queensland! We have another \$200 million now available for local councils through the Works for Queensland program. Half of that, \$100 million, has been fast-tracked for the first half of 2019. This is money that can be used to build new parks and gardens, better roads and other important community facilities, and it will help boost local economies. It will also add to the fantastic employment record of the hugely successful Works for Queensland initiative. This exceptional program is another sign of the Palaszczuk government's leadership on jobs. It is a massive hit with regional councils and supports more than 13,000 jobs, with even more on the way.

Mr Stewart: We love it in Townsville!

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I take that interjection from the member Townsville. Whether it is Townsville's Heatley Park upgrade, improvements to the Maryborough CBD or the restoration of the reception room in Rockhampton City Hall, Works for Queensland is delivering terrific results. We fast-tracked \$100 million in Works for Queensland funding because we want to see more job-generating projects underway even sooner. The total Works for Queensland funding now tops \$600 million across the three funding rounds. I say to eligible regional councils, 'Get your bids in for a slice of this new Works for Queensland funding.' The guidelines for funding are now available to all 65 eligible councils, with applications open until March. Eligible projects range from roadworks, town beautification, tourism projects, parks and playground upgrades, as well as renewable energy initiatives. I urge regional councils to partner with the Palaszczuk government to create the infrastructure and jobs that our local communities need.


Atlas Gas Pipeline Project

 **Hon. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy) (10.00 am): Queensland continues to do the heavy lifting on gas policy and production. Today I am pleased to announce that our first domestic-only gas project has moved a step closer. My department has issued a petroleum facility license to Jemena, which will now build a gas processing plant near Wandoan on the Western Downs. That gas is from Senex's Atlas field in the Surat Basin and is the first gas to be produced from Queensland that is designated for the domestic market only. The processing plant is part of Jemena's \$140 million Atlas gas pipeline project, which will create 150 valuable jobs. This pipeline will transport gas from Project Atlas via Jemena's infrastructure to the Wallumbilla gas hub in south-west Queensland, and from there it will stay in Australia to power local jobs.

Queensland continues to do the heavy lifting on gas. This will have far-reaching benefits for Australian manufacturers and contribute to our future energy security. Gas is expected to flow to Australian businesses by the end of this year. The Palaszczuk Labor government continues to rise to the challenge of bringing energy and feedstock to our manufacturers to maintain jobs in this state. Industry is right behind us on this. The Queensland Resources Council describes Queensland as the state that is keeping the east coast market afloat. Senex is on the record as saying that it strongly supports our far-sighted policy to introduce more natural gas into the domestic market. As they note, Project Atlas will create jobs in construction and operations as well as business opportunities across the Western Downs.

The Senex project is on 58 square kilometres of land that the Queensland government granted for domestic-only gas production in March 2018. Almost 25,000 square kilometres has been released in Queensland for gas exploration since early 2017, almost a third of it now for domestic use only. Queensland gas is in demand around the world. The latest statistics show that LNG exports in the 12 months to November 2018 were worth \$13.1 billion. Our challenge has been to pull the right policy levers to ensure we maintain these export commitments, which see billions of dollars flow into our state's economy every year while ensuring that we have gas for domestic use only. This is leadership in action.


TAFE, Nursing Subsidy

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Small Business and Minister for Training and Skills Development) (10.03 am): I am pleased to inform the House that almost 5,000 students have commenced their training for free since we kicked off the free TAFE campaign in

August last year, and enrolments for this year are still open. Young Queenslanders want opportunities to get the training and skills to get a job and build a career, and that is what free TAFE is providing. We are making training free so that all Queenslanders will have the opportunity to get the skills and training they need to fill the jobs of the future. Removing barriers such as the cost of courses can make a huge difference for people who are looking to gain skills for their dream career. That is why we have doubled the subsidy for the deployment of nursing to make it \$4,000 cheaper for eligible students to gain this valuable qualification. I am pleased to report that our investment in training in our state's fastest growing industry is delivering results. Since doubling the subsidy available for the deployment of nursing we have seen a 37 per cent jump in enrolments compared to this time last year.

The rise in student numbers is certainly welcome news. We know that the Jobs Queensland Anticipating Future Skills report showed that health care and social assistance were the top industries predicted to grow. Already employment demand for enrolled nurses is strong, and it will only continue to increase with our ageing population. We want to make sure that Queensland has the right people with the right skills to meet our workforce demands. That is why the Premier hosted the Future of Work—Skills and Industry Summit last November to bring together industry, small business, the training sector and heads of government so we can continue to work together to grow our economy and jobs for Queenslanders. I am proud to be part of a government that supports young Queenslanders with initiatives like free TAFE and more affordable training.

Youth Justice Initiatives

 **Hon. DE FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (Minister for Child Safety, Youth and Women and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (10.05 am): I would like to update the House on the many positive things that are happening right now in the youth justice system. At the end of last year I was very pleased to release the Palaszczuk Labor government's youth justice strategy and the government's response to Bob Atkinson's report into youth justice. The community expects young people to be accountable for their actions, and so do we. The community also does not want to see young people reoffending, and that is why the way forward for us will be based on what works.


I will be coming back with a detailed action plan for implementing our youth justice strategy, but in the meantime I am very pleased to announce an investment of \$17 million for a range of new services aimed at preventing young people from reoffending. We put in place a range of bail support and legal advocacy initiatives from the middle of 2018 to help hundreds of young people comply with their bail conditions. We will now be extending those services across Queensland to Townsville, Cairns, Mount Isa, Bundaberg, Rockhampton, Mackay, Toowoomba and the remote south-west, the south-west Brisbane corridor, Beenleigh and across South-East Queensland.

Most of the young people in detention in Queensland are on remand, not sentence. We know that if young people go into detention they are more likely to reoffend. Bail support services provide the support that is needed for young people to do what they need to do to meet the requirements of their bail. It may be linking them with mental health or drug and alcohol support, housing assistance and the certainty of three meals a day, transport assistance, or simply encouragement to stay on track. There is good evidence to show that these kinds of services work. On Friday last week I visited Legal Aid which, with the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Legal Service, will deliver a statewide legal advocacy service. This is a \$3.1 million investment to provide support so that young people can access the help they need, including legal representation and bail applications.

Our youth justice strategy is about changing the story for our young people and our communities. We have made more new investments to boost support for young offenders to get back on track: an extra \$2.28 million over two years for the intensive case management of young people in Cairns, Rockhampton and Logan, which is another way to connect young people to the right services that can help; an additional \$1.34 million over two years to help young people meet the conditions of their bail; and almost \$1.3 million over two years for enhancing family group meetings for high-risk Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander young people.

Change will take time, but we are determined to continue working hard while keeping our eye on what we want to achieve—supporting our young people and reducing offending—while helping to keep our communities safer.

Waste

 **Hon. LM ENOCH** (Algeester—ALP) (Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef, Minister for Science and Minister for the Arts) (10.08 am): Last week I released the report *Recycling and waste in Queensland 2018*. Sadly, the report shows that rates of waste in Queensland are on the rise. In

2017-18 more than 1.2 million tonnes of waste was trucked across the border into Queensland—a 37 per cent increase on the previous year. On top of that, the waste being generated within our state also increased, with reported waste generation now exceeding 10 million tonnes for the first time. These figures are alarming—

Mr Crisafulli interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Broadwater, you are warned under the standing orders.

Ms ENOCH: These figures are alarming and are cause for concern. This is why the Palaszczuk government is developing a comprehensive waste strategy that will prevent Queensland from being the dumping ground for other states, create incentives to divert waste from landfill and encourage more recycling and resource recovery. We know that for every 10,000 tonnes of waste disposed of in landfill only three jobs are supported while the same amount of waste recycled would support more than nine jobs. The data is clear: waste to landfill is a lost economic opportunity.

The encouraging news from the report is that Queenslanders increased their recycling effort for household and business waste, with close to five million tonnes of materials being diverted from landfill, but with only 45 per cent of waste being recycled we still have a long way to go. The Palaszczuk government's ban on single-use plastic bags and the introduction last year of Containers for Change, Queensland's container refund scheme, are important initiatives to support recycling and re-use and the jobs that go with it. It is clear that Queenslanders are passionate about improving how we manage waste, and our government's—

Ms Grace interjected.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister for Education and Leader of the Opposition, this is not a time for a conversation across the chamber.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I bring your attention to the standing order with respect to anticipation of debate. We are debating the waste reduction strategy today that the minister will be speaking about. I dare say she is anticipating her own debate on waste reduction.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Kawana. As I hear the minister's statement she is talking generally about the issue of waste reduction, not specifically to the bill, but I will continue to listen to her contribution. Thank you for your point of order.

Ms ENOCH: As I said, it is clear that Queenslanders are passionate about improving how we manage waste. Our government's comprehensive waste strategy will provide the backbone for that enthusiasm. I encourage the House to consider the latest report and help fight the war on waste.

ABSENCE OF MINISTER



Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (10.12 am): I advise the House that the Minister for Agricultural Industry Development and Fisheries will be absent from the House for the remainder of this week's sitting. The minister is travelling with the shadow minister in northern and western Queensland to support the communities after the recent devastating floods. The Premier and Minister for Trade will take questions for the minister during question time.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Bushfire Prevention and Preparedness, Inquiry



Mr MILLAR (Gregory—LNP) (10.12 am): I give notice that I will move—

1. That the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee inquire into and report to the Legislative Assembly by 6 May 2019 on the effectiveness of the Queensland government's bushfire prevention and preparedness activities leading to the 2018 Queensland fires.
2. In undertaking this inquiry, the committee should consider:
 - (a) analysis of fire reduction practices conducted on state owned land and national parks including the maintenance of strategic fire breaks and fire access trails and the reduction of fuel loads;
 - (b) examination of the appropriateness of funding provided by government to implement fire reduction practices on state owned land and national parks and provide for overtime for QPWS officers when they are needed to assist with the response to a fire in a national park;

- (c) the effectiveness of the government's native vegetation and land management laws and practices in managing fire in the Queensland context;
- (d) the reduction in the QFES hazard reduction burns in 2017 and 2018 compared to previous years;
- (e) the effectiveness and timeliness of government issued fire reduction permits needed by landholders to conduct fire preparedness activities;
- (f) the failure to implement any of the Auditor-General's recommendations from *Bushfire prevention and preparedness* (report 10:2014-15);
- (g) consideration of the appropriateness of penalties for those deliberately starting fires; and
- (h) analysis of communication practices undertaken to provide information to affected communities before, during and after bushfire events.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr SPEAKER: Question time will conclude today at 11.14 am.

Floods, Ross River Dam



Mrs FRECKLINGTON (10.14 am): My first question is to the Premier. I table an email sent by a registered professional engineer about the recent Townsville flooding.

Tabled paper: Email, dated 11 February 2019, from Mr Ken Pearce to various recipients titled 'Townsville Flooding—Ross River Dam, Mismanagement of major public infrastructure continues in Queensland with devastating consequences for the community, costing billions' [163].

It states—

... the dam would have protected the community if the gates had been professionally operated.

In light of the government's public confusion about whether the Ross River Dam is used for flood mitigation, does the Premier have confidence in the operations of the Ross River Dam during the recent flooding?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for the question. Of course we welcome any correspondence or issues being forwarded to the independent Inspector-General Emergency Management, who is conducting the review that Minister Crawford announced last week. In relation to that, I am advised that the person in question has made contact with the inspector-general and will be having further discussions with them.

For the record, I will talk about what the review will assess so that everyone is clear about the comprehensive review that will take place in relation to the flood event. The review will assess the preparation and planning by state and local governments and the community; the response to the weather event including measures taken to inform the community, protect life and private and public property, and manage the supply of essential services; dam operations, in particular for the Ross River Dam, and associated emergency procedures; resourcing, overall coordination and deployment of personnel and equipment; and other related matters the Inspector-General Emergency Management considers relevant, including, for example, land use planning and building codes. Of course, I expect everyone to cooperate with that review.

As I said yesterday in the House—I stand by those statements—everybody cooperated in the best interests of the people of the communities that were impacted. The No. 1 priority was to keep communities safe. Secondly, I make it very clear to this House that the No. 1 source of authority in relation to this is the Bureau of Meteorology. It is disappointing that one of the members opposite has criticised the bureau to the effect that the bureau was 'woeful'. For the benefit of this House I will quote what a spokesperson has said about the bureau. A recent article states—

A ... spokesman defended the bureau's work, and said it had received resounding praise from all levels of government.

'Monsoonal systems such as this one are unpredictable and difficult to forecast, but BOM is proud of the efforts of its meteorologists, hydrologists and many other staff who have worked around the clock to keep Australians safe,' he said.

That comment was from a federal government spokesperson. I sat around the table with those experts from around Australia, brought together to provide the best evidence they possibly could. We do not control monsoonal events. This independent inquiry will go to all of the issues that have been raised. If anyone has any further evidence they are more than welcome to submit that to the independent inspector. That is the right thing to do. We followed this process after Cyclone Debbie and after the bushfires. I add that this system was set up by the LNP in government.

Floods, Ross River Dam

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: My second question is also to the Premier. I refer the Premier to the reported confusion between Townsville City Council and SunWater about the process required to pre-emptively release water from Ross River Dam. Can the Premier guarantee that buck-passing and inaction did not delay water releases, which experts claim would have reduced flood damage?

Ms PALASZCZUK: As I said, and I will say it again—I answered it in response to the previous question—I believe that all agencies worked in the best interests of the people of the city. While I am on my feet, I pay tribute again to Minister O'Rourke, the member for Townsville and the member for Thuringowa, who are doing an extraordinary job in extraordinary times.

As far back as Australia Day—and I was there for the Australia Day event—Townsville was on water restrictions. It had had years of drought. No-one could have predicted that a monsoonal trough would have sat over Townsville and caused the damage that it did. Everywhere I went and everyone that I spoke to—

Ms Trad: A year's worth of rain.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Yes. Let me clarify that for the record too: one year's worth of rain in eight days—not a one-in-100-year event but a one-in-500-year event. The independent inquiry will continue. It will make a thorough examination and it will report back and I will make that report public, as we have done in the past. For those opposite to come in here and try to politicise and criticise—

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: We heard the member for Burdekin criticising the bureau, criticising the experts. I will always listen to the experts. The mayors will listen to the experts. There has been extraordinary cooperation from local, state and federal levels. I do not hear criticism from the federal government. The federal government is prioritised with me on making sure that people get back into their homes and that the recovery effort is helping them. I am in constant contact with the Prime Minister and we are talking now about the north-west and the impacts that are happening there for our cattle producers. We on this side of the House will always put people first. The Labor government on this side of the House will always put people first. We will always do that. As I said, I am confident that all levels of government and all agencies work together in the best interests—

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Kawana!

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Ms PALASZCZUK: We know the member for Kawana never listened to expert advice, and still does not. We look forward to the comprehensive review that will be tabled.

Anti-Cyberbullying Taskforce

Ms McMILLAN: My question without notice is to the Premier. Will the Premier please update the House on progress of the government's response to the Queensland Anti-Cyberbullying Taskforce report?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Mansfield for that question. I also want to pay tribute to the work that she did in relation to the task force on combating cyberbullying. I understand that there are some students in the gallery today from her electorate, so welcome to Parliament House. It is lovely to see them here.

Cyberbullying is a big issue facing young people across our state and I am very pleased that it was my government that stepped up to the plate as the first government in Australia to start talking about the issues of combating cyberbullying. Whilst I am on my feet, I also take this opportunity to congratulate Kate and Tick Everett for being named local heroes from the Australia Day awards. It was very well deserved given what they have gone through and what they are now doing in terms of ensuring that young people have the opportunity to have their say and to talk about the issues that tragically took the life of their daughter.

Today I am very pleased to announce that the membership of the implementation committee will be appointed today. It will be chaired by QUT legal academic Peter Black, who will bring his expertise in social media as well as his experience as a member of the Anti-Cyberbullying Taskforce to his role

as chair of the committee. The committee also includes six members with skills in technology, education, legal, media and family and parenting issues and strong representation from young people. I think it is very important that when you have an implementation committee you have young people involved so they can ensure that they have the most up-to-date information.

When I went to COAG I was also able to raise this issue with the premiers and the Prime Minister and it is now on the national agenda and, at my request at the COAG meeting in December, we also considered the issue of the right to be forgotten for victims of cyberbullying and abuse. This was supported in principle, with the federal government to consult with states and territories and bring back a proposal to COAG on how to achieve this initiative. I am writing to the Prime Minister seeking an update on this issue as well as other task force recommendations that require national action, and this also includes giving the eSafety Commissioner the power to require social media companies to publish detailed data on complaints and requests to remove cyberbullying material, the response times and outcomes.

I want to conclude by saying that I have also personally written to the CEOs of major international social media companies Facebook, Instagram, YouTube and Google to reinforce their obligations to put in place measures to protect children and young people using social media and contribute to awareness campaigns on cyberbullying. I am also writing to television networks, broadcasters and streaming services to formally request them to include bullying in program consumer advice. This was another important recommendation from the task force.

Schwarten, Hon. R

Mr MANDER: My question without notice is to the Premier. In relation to bullying, in a recent media interview QBCC board member and Labor stalwart Rob Schwarten repeatedly used the most vile and obscene profanity, including to describe the shadow minister for housing and public works. I table the report.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Daily Mercury*, dated 9 February 2019, regarding referral of a matter to the Crime and Corruption Commission by the Hon. Robert Schwarten, a Queensland Building and Construction Commission board member [\[164\]](#).

What action has the Premier taken to discipline Mr Schwarten for this disgusting conduct, or is this language acceptable to the Palaszczuk government?

Ms Jones interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Cooper, I have asked that questions be heard in silence and for all members to my right that will be the final warning today.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for the question. I have not seen this report. I am happy—

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: No, I am happy to have a look at it.

A government member interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Yes, he just asked. I have just received it, I will have a look at it and I will get back to you.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Kawana!

Ms PALASZCZUK: Sorry, but I might be dealing with some natural disasters. Sorry about that.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Ms PALASZCZUK: I also refer the member for Everton to the accusations that he made against the Deputy Premier in this House. I find it ironic that the member for Everton has not apologised in this House.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Pause the clock. Premier, please resume your seat. Whilst I appreciate there may be some direct references, member, there is no requirement for any member to make direct responses, including using the word 'you'. I ask members to consider your words before speaking, particularly given the context of this question.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I believe that all members of parliament should set high standards. That was one of the recommendations from our Anti-Cyberbullying Taskforce—that we should be role models in the community. For the member for Everton not to publicly apologise to the Deputy Premier for those references is disgraceful.

Mr Powell interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Glass House, you are warned under standing orders. Member for Toowoomba South, you are coming very close.

Ms PALASZCZUK: In relation to Mr Schwarten, my understanding is that he has referred himself to the CCC over those allegations and they will be thoroughly investigated. I do not support that kind of language. Everybody knows my views on that.

Ms Jones: You never have.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I never have, but those opposite should think very long and hard about questions and the standards that they set in this House when—

Ms Jones interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK:—that is right—it comes to raising these types of issues.

South-East Queensland, Traffic Congestion

Ms SCANLON: My question without notice is to the Premier. Will the Premier update the House on her government's plan to tackle congestion in South-East Queensland?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Gaven for her question because I want to address a couple of issues. The first is that my government is beginning to commence the upgrades of the M1, and I know that the Minister for Transport will have more to say about something very shortly. Construction will soon be well and truly underway and that is great news for commuters who are travelling between Brisbane and the Gold Coast. Once again, that is a priority of our government.

Secondly, we know that the No. 1 infrastructure project for the south-east of our state is indeed Cross River Rail. It is money that we have put on the table—over \$5 billion—and it was wonderful that the Deputy Premier and I had the opportunity to join with the federal Leader of the Opposition, Bill Shorten, because federal Labor has committed to funding the Cross River Rail project, recognising that rail infrastructure is absolutely vital to transforming our cities. If the Prime Minister wants to back in the South-East Queensland City Deal, he had better start showing some money. Otherwise, he is all talk and no action.

Mr Molhoek interjected.

Mr Boothman interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Southport, member for Theodore, I realise it might be an issue that you are both very passionate about. I ask you to cease your interjections.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The member for Southport loved taking a selfie with me when he was on the Gold Coast light rail that Labor built. He was the only one there, but he enjoyed that public transport that we helped build for the Gold Coast. I thank the member for that lovely interjection. It was very well timed.

In all seriousness, I have started to notice some ads running on the television by the federal government: \$75 billion is going to be spent on infrastructure across Australia over the next 10 years. When we break down that money over 10 years, that does not really seem to be too much. Compared to their contribution, we are spending \$46 billion over four years for Queensland. Where is the infrastructure money going? My concern is that the Morrison Liberal National Party government—whatever you want to call them—

Mr Dick: It's hard to remember.

Ms PALASZCZUK: It is hard to remember. There have been so many prime ministers.

Ms Trad: The Abbott-Turnbull-Morrison government.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is right. I go to COAG and there has been Tony Abbott and there have been quite a few. We know people in Australia and Queensland like stability. In all seriousness, we need to see a commitment from the federal government to transport infrastructure, especially when it comes to rail, and not give all the money to New South Wales and Victoria.

(Time expired)

JM Kelly Builders

Mr HART: My question without notice is to the Premier. In 2016 the Premier received at least four letters with concerns about JM Kelly (Project Builders) before it collapsed in liquidation with hundreds of Queenslanders owed tens of millions of dollars. Can the Premier explain why she did not act in 2016 when she received the first letter and last week denied ever seeing it?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Burleigh for the question. My advice is that, when those letters were received, they were forwarded to the relevant ministers for response.

In relation to subbies across our state, it has been a priority of my government to ensure that people get paid. In fact, it was my government—not those opposite—that introduced project bank accounts. I will go back into the history. Those opposite spoke against the bill. During the debate on the bill the member for Burnett said—

... I want to remind the House that this is probably the worst piece of legislation that has come before the House...

The members opposite are trying to be the champion of tradies. The member for Southport submitted a statement of reservation to the committee report on the bill stating—

... the Bill, as stands, is rushed ... will add substantial red tape and compliance costs ... without making any ... improvements.

It is my government—a Labor government—that is doing everything it can to ensure that people get paid. The minister advises me that those matters that those opposite have raised are under investigation by PwC and there will be a public examination through the Federal Court. If anyone has any other issues, they should raise it through those direct channels.

Royal Commission into Misconduct in the Banking, Superannuation and Financial Services Industry

Ms RICHARDS: My question is to the Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships. Will the Deputy Premier please advise the House on how the recommendations into the Royal Commission into Misconduct in the Banking, Superannuation and Financial Services Industry will impact Queenslanders?

Ms TRAD: I thank the member for Redlands for the question. The report by Commissioner Hayne is damning of the financial services industry and the extent of misconduct and greed-driven behaviour. Commissioner Hayne made 76 recommendations in areas including banking, financial advice, superannuation, insurance and agricultural lending, which significantly affects Queensland primary producers.

Mr Hart interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Burleigh, you are warned under the standing orders. There is nowhere to hide when you do those sorts of things.

Ms TRAD: Commissioner Hayne also addressed some shocking instances of misconduct, including fees for no service, of preying on customers, including those with disabilities—and I am sure we were all shocked by that instance particularly—preying on people with minimum English skills and also preying on vulnerable Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders in remote communities all while receiving exorbitant executive bonuses. It is absolutely critical—it is critical to mums and dads, it is critical to small businesses, it is critical to communities—that we have a financial services industry that acts in the interests of their customers, in the interests of Australians.

If banks want to rebuild trust with Australians, it starts here in Queensland in the north and the north-west, because their response to this natural disaster—to the flooding that we have seen in North Queensland and North-West Queensland—must be fair and must be compassionate. If they want to rebuild trust, it starts here in Queensland. It is simply unacceptable that financial institutions have been making record profits from personal tragedies, in times of financial stress for families.

Let us not forget that Scott Morrison and the LNP were dragged kicking and screaming to the royal commission. How many times did they vote against it? Was it once?

A government member interjected.

Ms TRAD: That is right. It was not once, it was not twice, it was not 10 times, it was not 20 times; it was 26 times the Morrison LNP government voted against this royal commission. We cannot trust them to implement the recommendations from Commissioner Hayne.

Some recommendations can be implemented swiftly to protect customers—protect Australians—immediately. I call on the Morrison federal government to make additional sittings in the federal parliament to pass legislation immediately to further protect customers. If those opposite cared one iota for the people of Queensland and the way banks treat them, they would join us in that call.

(Time expired)

JM Kelly Builders

Mr LAST: My question without notice is to the Premier. I ask: following the collapse of JM Kelly (Project Builders) into liquidation in 2016 with debts of tens of millions of dollars, why did the Labor government allow 21 lucrative government contracts with the builder to be transferred to a related company with no guarantee that subbies and suppliers would get paid?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am advised by the minister that all of these matters are being investigated by PwC. As I said, there will be an open examination about that.

Mossman Mill

Ms LUI: My question is to the Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning. Will the minister please update the House on what action the government is taking to save the Mossman mill?

Mr DICK: I thank the member for Cook for her question. There is no greater champion for the community of Mossman than the member for Cook. The member for Cook has been an unrelenting advocate for her community both to the government in general and also to me as minister. That is why, after meeting with the member for Cook late last year, I was very pleased to announce on 21 December a \$25 million package for Far Northern Milling Pty Ltd to assist in the establishment of an innovative biorefinery to support the ongoing sustainability of Mossman mill.

That biorefinery has the potential to not only underpin the future of the mill but also create a dynamic new industry for the people of Mossman and the Tablelands. When it comes to sugar, the people of Mossman and also the growers, to their credit, realise that they can no longer be a price taker. They need to find a way to add value to the best product in the world—Queensland sugar. We have been very pleased to do that.

Far Northern Milling, on behalf of the local growers, intends to establish a biorefinery that will provide a viable future for the mill and long-term economic benefits for the community. Our \$25 million support package, championed by the member for Cook, will support Far Northern Milling as they work towards finalising their business and, if successful, constructing the biorefinery. I understand the business case is now complete. It includes \$4 million as an initial contribution to provide executive support to get the project moving and to support an engineering study, which is very important to get the technical details right.

The work of the member for Cook stands in stark contrast to that of the federal member for Leichhardt, Warren Entsch. He has set a new standard for hypocrisy politics and inaction when it comes to supporting his community. In November last year there was much fanfare from the member for Leichhardt. He was with the Deputy Prime Minister, Warren Truss—no, not him—Barnaby Joyce—no, not him, that other bloke, whoever he is. That other bloke stood up with Warren Entsch and said they are going to put \$20 million into the mill to make sure it is sustainable for the future. What have we seen? They said they want a positive business case. We have that. They have delivered. Still there is no money from the federal government. They wanted a co-contribution from the state government. We have given them the \$25 million and still nothing.

This represents the federal government from top to bottom: all talk, no action when it comes to supporting Queensland. In particular, when it comes to supporting rural agricultural producers—the people they pretend to represent—there is nothing from the former National Party, the LNP. This has been a great achievement by the member for Cook. There is more work to be done. We are not there yet. It is a big challenging project. The future of the Queensland economy is the bioeconomy and we are working hard to deliver it for Mossman.

Ms SIMPSON: Mr Speaker?

Mr Powell interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Sorry, member for Maroochydore, you are being interrupted by the member for Glass House, who is already on a warning.

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, members to my right.

JM Kelly Builders

Ms SIMPSON: My question without notice is to the Minister for Housing and Public Works. The minister received allegations of fraud inside JM Kelly in July 2016 but waited six months, until January 2017, to refer the allegations to the Queensland Police Service and then only finally took action against the company in late 2018. Why did the minister delay action on these serious allegations of fraud, putting hardworking subcontractors at risk?

Mr de BRENNI: I appreciate the question from the member. I appreciate the opportunity to discuss allegations of fraud within the construction industry. When those allegations were raised with my department an internal investigation was conducted to ascertain whether there was the requisite evidence of those allegations. That internal investigation found that there was not a requisite level of evidence to support an ongoing investigation into those matters.

Notwithstanding that, the matters in relation to JM Kelly and other building industry failures at the time were the catalyst for nation-leading security of payment laws being introduced by the Palaszczuk Labor government that have been backed in by a federally commissioned report into security of payments in the construction industry. As the Premier mentioned, it is the Palaszczuk government that has funded the public examination of JM Kelly. That is the fourth public inquiry that the Palaszczuk government has commissioned through the QBCC to publicly examine allegations of misconduct in the construction industry.

I know that the member for Burleigh is a little bit upset about remarks made to him by members of the QBCC board, but tens of thousands of small business subcontractors in Queensland are upset with the member for Burleigh, the member for Everton and the LNP government for the actions that they took.

Ms Simpson: Why did you delay? Why did the minister delay?

Mr de BRENNI: I just explained that. The member for Maroochydore should listen to the answer. News media has been running a 'Back our Subbies' campaign and it highlights the companies that have failed under the LNP's ridiculous minimum financial requirements laws. Let us look at the report. In 2016 there was the Cullen Group, \$45 million, and Walton Construction. While we are talking about fraud and allegations of fraud, questions remain unanswered for the member for Everton. On 8 February 2014—

Ms SIMPSON: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. My point of order is the relevance to the question with regard to delay under this minister and JM Kelly.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you. Minister, you have 30 seconds remaining on the clock. I would like you to ensure that you are rounding out your response to answer the question from the member for Maroochydore.

Mr de BRENNI: I think it is very important that matters and allegations in relation to fraud are properly investigated. That is why we are funding a public examination. There are more allegations of fraud in relation to the construction industry. The LNP trust received \$430,000 from Walton Construction as it collapsed. In fact, it received more than \$1.4 million from Walton Construction as it went under. The member for Everton is yet to answer those allegations of fraud in this place or anywhere else.

Sexual Violence

Ms LINARD: My question is to the Minister for Child Safety, Youth and Women and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence. Will the minister update the House on the Palaszczuk government's work in relation to sexual violence?

Ms FARMER: I thank the member for her question on what is a really critical issue and, unfortunately, an issue of which the community is becoming increasingly aware. Not a week seems to go by without our hearing a really horrific report of a sexual assault or sexual abuse or sexual harassment. Although we know that sexual assault does affect men, 83 per cent of sexual assault victims are women. This is why the Palaszczuk Labor government has been intent on redoubling its efforts on tackling this terrible issue.

In addition to the work we are already doing around the *Not now, not ever* task force recommendations and our response to the Royal Commission into Institutional Child Sexual Abuse, last year I announced a raft of new initiatives to address sexual violence, which included \$12 million in priority actions to address youth sexual violence; the development of a sexual violence framework; the establishment of a cross-sectoral youth violence advisory group, and I am just about to announce the

membership of that group; a grants program to continue the conversation around sexual violence in Queensland, and we received over 300 applications for those grants; and also our commitment to a public conversation about what is a terrible issue.

The number of sexual assault offences is absolutely shocking, but what is even more shocking is the number of offences that go unreported. That is at, we estimate, 70 per cent. The reason for this is well documented. Victims do not want to report because of the fear of shame, the fear of embarrassment, the fear that people will not believe them, the fear that action will not be taken on what has happened to them, the retraumatising when the details are played out in public and the fear that those details will be mishandled and misinformed, which is why what happened in this House yesterday is really shocking.

Mr Mander interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Deputy Leader of the Opposition, you are warned under standing orders. I have already given you some clear guidance today. Interjections are not appropriate.

Ms FARMER: The shadow Attorney-General read into *Hansard* the personal details of a very traumatic event at the hands of the member for Whitsunday. While the shadow Attorney-General may have thought that this was a great way to score political points, my concern is, and the concern of every right minded person in this community is, for that young woman.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Members, that sort of cross-chamber attack is not acceptable in this House. Minister, you have five seconds remaining. Do you have anything further to add?

Ms FARMER: Did the LNP seek the consent of that family and that young woman before those personal details were laid out?

Minister for Housing and Public Works

Mr BENNETT: My question without notice is to the Premier. The Minister for Housing and Public Works has been found to have breached the government's advertising code of conduct. When the Premier breached the same code in 2010, Anna Bligh ordered her to repay the costs of breaching material, which was some \$8,500. Will the Premier show the same leadership and require Minister de Brenni to repay to the taxpayers the cost of breaching material?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I do not have the report in front of me. I thank the member for the question.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I am sorry, Premier; please resume your seat. Members to my left, the Premier had barely opened her mouth to provide a response and the interjection level was unacceptable. I will start sending members out of the chamber if you are unable to hear my guidance and listen to the instructions provided.

Ms PALASZCZUK: My recollection is that there was no finding against the minister.

Mr Bleijie: Yes, there was.

Ms PALASZCZUK: No, my understanding is that there was not. I will get back to the member about that, but my understanding is that the finding was not against the minister.

Great Barrier Reef Island Resorts Rejuvenation Program

Mrs LAUGA: 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 progress of the government's \$50 million commitment to rejuvenate Queensland's Great Barrier Reef island resorts?

Ms JONES: I thank the honourable member for her question and for her commitment to her local community. Everyone knows how passionate she is about seeing Great Keppel Island restored to its former glory. Recently my family and I had the great privilege of holidaying in the honourable member's electorate. I offer my congratulations for the great work that is being delivered there through our Works for Queensland program. Yeppoon is such a great community.

On Friday this week, the project team that is working on Great Keppel Island will be meeting with the Livingstone Shire Council to talk about the water infrastructure plans for Great Keppel Island, which is another milestone in delivering that project. The federal member for Capricornia has had months and

months to come on board, but we have seen zero, zilch, zip from her, which is unlike federal Labor. A Bill Shorten Labor government will match our \$25 million commitment, which will create real jobs in the community of Yeppoon and in the member's electorate.

Great Keppel is just one of a number of islands that we are supporting through our Great Barrier Reef Island Resorts Rejuvenation Program. There is also Green Island off Cairns, Bedarra Island off Innisfail, Orpheus and Pelorus islands off Townsville, and South Molle Island, Hamilton Island, Hayman Island and Hook Island in the Whitsundays. As we have just heard, a lot of money is going to the Whitsundays community. One side of politics stands up for the people of Whitsundays and it is the Labor government.

Even though LNP members come into this House and make-believe that their leader acted swiftly, the question that she refused to answer on the public record was this: was that the first complaint that the LNP or her office had ever received about the member for Whitsunday?

Mrs Frecklington: Absolutely.

Ms JONES: I take that interjection. I have read the transcripts of the interviews with the Leader of the Opposition. When asked whether this was the first case, she said, 'I cannot divulge private information'. Yesterday in the House, we saw a big change with regard to private information.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms JONES: You deny it! I call on the Leader of the Opposition to say, since the Deputy Premier called out the behaviour of their member eight months ago—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Pause the clock. Minister, certainly there are a lot of interjections and I am having difficulty hearing you. I ask you to ensure that you are being relevant to the question in your response.

Ms JONES: There is nothing more relevant than standing up for the women of Queensland, whether it is in the Whitsundays or in the LNP. I am calling on the LNP leader to come clean about the very—

Opposition members interjected.

Mrs Frecklington: Billy Gordon, Rick Williams.

Ms JONES: That is your interjection? A pox on both their houses. What about the women who have been sexually assaulted by your members?

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Pause the clock. Minister for tourism, I ask you to put your comments through the chair and I ask you to come back to the question asked.

Ms JONES: As I said, the one thing that the member for Kawana and I agree on is that the people of the Whitsundays deserve better than they currently have. My question, the answer to which everyone deserves to know, is this: when did the LNP first find out about his behaviour when the member for—

(Time expired)

Interruption.

PRIVILEGE

Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by the Premier



Mr BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (10.54 am): I rise on matter of privilege suddenly arising. With respect to the Premier's previous answer to the House about the minister not having breached the code of conduct, I table a letter from the Premier's director-general in which he says—

The Department of Housing and Public Works (DHPW) has now completed the investigation and in doing so, found that the Queensland Government Advertising and Marketing Communication Code of Conduct was breached.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 8 February 2019, from the Director-General, Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Mr Dave Stewart, to the member for Burleigh, Mr Michael Hart MP, regarding the finding from a Department of Housing and Public Works investigation that a breach of the Queensland Government Advertising and Marketing Communication Code of Conduct had occurred [165].

That is from the Premier's own director-general.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The recommendations are clearly listed on page 7 of the report and for clarification—

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, with respect—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order, members! I am providing a ruling to a point of order. I do not wish to debate this matter in the House. If it is a matter of privilege suddenly arising, I assume the member for Kawana will be writing to myself as Speaker.

Mr BLEIJIE: Correct, Mr Speaker. I will be writing to you in that regard.

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

Mr SPEAKER: This had better be a relevant point of order, Minister.

Mr de BRENNI: It is. The findings of the report that are outlined in that letter were that there was a breach of the code not by myself but in the administration offices in the QBCC.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr Brown interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Capalaba, you are warned under standing orders. Minister, I have just given clear instructions that I do not wish to debate this matter in the House at this point in time. I ask you to resume your seat. If you have any matters that you wish to raise with me, please provide those in writing.

Mr de BRENNI: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will write to you.

Mr SPEAKER: Alternatively, you may rise to give a ministerial statement at an appropriate time after question time.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Resumed from p. 127

Residential Care Facilities



Mr DAMETTO: My question is to the Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning. Under the state government Planning Act, residential care facilities have been allowed to operate in Queensland's quiet streets and suburbs, disrupting the lives of residents. Will the minister consider amending the act to give local government more control over the zones in which those facilities can operate?

Mr DICK: This is the first time that this matter has been raised with me. I am happy to pursue it, if the honourable member would like to write to me and articulate his concerns. He talked about residential care facilities. I am very happy to look at that. I am not quite sure what he means by 'residential care facilities', whether it is aged-care facilities or something else. I need to know the details before I can provide the honourable member with a considered answer.

M1 Upgrade

Mrs McMAHON: My question is to the Minister for Transport and Main Roads. With major construction currently underway on the M1, can the minister please update the House on its progress and what it means for motorists?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the honourable member for Macalister for her question. She is a fierce advocate for the M1, as is every member of this government. Two major upgrades are underway and there will be another two straight after. They are fully funded and fully committed to. We will have a minimum of six lanes all the way to the border. That comes after the appalling record of the previous government, which neglected the M1. Not a single M1 upgrade was started in the entire three years they were in government with their record majority.

In contrast, we have delivered \$2.3 billion worth of funding for M1 upgrades. Two of those upgrades are very obvious to anybody who drives on the M1 every day. It is major work that should have been started and funded under the previous government, but was ignored by the LNP with their cuts, their sackings and their selling. They absolutely ignored the M1 to their detriment and to detriment of every M1 motorist.

We are about to see a major milestone in the upgrade of the M1 at the Gateway merge. I can report to the House that the construction of a new four-lane bridge over the M1 at Underwood Road is well and truly underway. From next Thursday night, 21 February, the first of 52 girders, each weighing

65 tonnes, will be lowered into place. That massive job will require temporary traffic diversions around the major construction site on the M1 at night. Detours will be in place at night for northbound and southbound traffic along a 5.5-kilometre section of the M1 between Eight Mile Plains and Springwood.

Traffic heading in both directions on the M1 will be diverted onto Logan Road, the old highway, between 9 pm and 5 am from Sundays to Thursdays and from 11 pm to 6 am on Fridays and Saturdays. These night-time diversions will be in place from Thursday, 21 February to Saturday, 9 March. There is no doubt that these diversions will add to the travel times of people driving between Brisbane and the Gold Coast at night and in the early hours of the morning for a short period of time. We want to give motorists as much notice as we can of this necessary work so that they can take appropriate action.

I thank all M1 motorists for their patience. What we are seeing is action to build a better M1 under the Palaszczuk Labor government. People will get more of it. As soon as these two upgrades are finished another two M1 upgrades will happen because of this government's leadership and backing of every M1 motorist travelling between Brisbane and the Gold Coast.

State Schools, Air Conditioning

Mr BLEIJIE: My question without notice is to the Premier. Today temperatures are expected to reach 40 degrees in Ipswich, 37 degrees in Mount Gravatt, 36 degrees in Chermside and 38 degrees in Nerang as part of a region-wide heatwave. How can the Premier deny our kids and teachers the opportunity to learn in cooler schools by refusing to back the LNP's plan to air-condition every state school classroom in Queensland?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Kawana for the question. The LNP is yet to say where that funding will come from to pay for that.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Kawana!

Ms PALASZCZUK: I will take that interjection.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Premier resume your seat. Member for Kawana, you have asked the question. You are warned under the standing orders. We are nearly there.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Please never let him be in charge of Treasury. Being in charge of the courts and legislation was bad enough. We know where the boot camps got us.

Ms Trad: And industrial relations.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Yes. There is some advice for the shadow Treasurer on how to put together the budget.

Through the cooler schools program more than 380 state schools in the hottest and most humid parts of the state have had air conditioning installed in over 3,500 classroom. To provide for cooler schools this year we are providing \$21 million for air conditioning in Queensland state schools, another \$16 million for upgrades and replacements and a further \$5 million for maintenance. That needs to be on the public record. The department always prioritises the schools that are in the hottest regions of our state.

It might also be time for those opposite to acknowledge that the increasing temperatures and natural disasters we are seeing are the result of climate change. We know that on that side of the House they are climate change deniers.

Outside the cooler schools zone, schools make decisions in consultation with their community about air conditioning. Schools can also install air conditioning in classrooms using state funding and P&C funding. To help schools fund infrastructure works my government has increased the maintenance budget for state schools by \$425 million on what the LNP budgeted. We have also committed another \$258.6 million for non-state school infrastructure across the state.

I thank the member for Kawana for the question. I look forward to them detailing in their budget reply this year exactly where that money is going to come from because, according to the member for Kawana, it is going to come out of thin air.

Ms Jones: Under his mattress. Behind his mirror. Stashed behind his mirror.

Ms PALASZCZUK: It might be under the bed.

Labour Hire Licensing Scheme

Mr BROWN: My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations. Will the minister advise the House on efforts to implement a national labour hire licensing scheme?

Ms GRACE: I thank the member for the question. I know that for many years he advocated for labour hire licensing laws that would protect vulnerable workers and raise standards in the industry. It was great to see that he was here when we introduced those laws.

The Palaszczuk government is proud to have led the way. We are the leaders in Australia when it comes to introducing Australia's first labour hire licensing scheme to protect vulnerable workers and raise the standards in the labour hire industry. When it came to the evidence we did not bury our heads in the sand. We acted. That is unlike the federal government when it came to the banking royal commission where it had to be dragged kicking and screaming.

In light of all the evidence, we did not sit on our hands—we legislated. Those opposite did not vote for these laws. They were dragged kicking and screaming and voted against a scheme that is working so well. We did not ignore the evidence. We implemented the recommendations. I do not know whether we can trust the Morrison government to do so should they be re-elected at the next election.

We implemented these tough new laws—the ones that the LNP fought tooth and nail to oppose—to regulate an industry that for far too long went unregulated. The new laws have been a great success. When we started I think we estimated, based on WorkCover and business data that we were able to collect, that the maximum number of labour hire businesses that would apply for a licence would be 2,000. As at 16 April, we had had 3,783 applications for licences in this state. That demonstrates that these laws have been very well received.

We are getting companies coming out of the woodwork saying that they operate in this space. We are seeing great benefits from this. We are seeing the unit in the department work cooperatively with other state and federal agencies in regulating this industry. More importantly, in terms of WorkCover additional policies have been taken out and an additional half a million dollars in premiums have been collected. We have seen a reduction in uninsured claims from injured workers.

We are very proud of the work that we have done in this regard. We acted and did not ignore the evidence. We are very proud of the unit in the department and the inspectors who are out there making sure those who provide accommodation facilities are doing the right thing. We are cleaning up an industry that those opposite fought against every step of the way.

The member for Kawana made an extraordinary outburst in relation to a health and safety inspector in this House yesterday. It was defamatory and quite hysterical. It takes more than 10 minutes to get from Brisbane to the Sunshine Coast, which he repeated three times in this House.

(Time expired)

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I will wait for the House to come to order. I want silence for the question.

Fardon, Mr RJ

Mrs WILSON: My question is to the Minister for Police. Right now the survivor of Robert John Fardon's violent rape attack on her when she was 12 years old, Sharon Tomlinson, is watching question time terrified that her attacker is free with no GPS tracker and possibly even living right next door to her. Will the minister tell Sharon why Labor does not trust Queenslanders to know where her attacker is living?

Mr RYAN: As I said yesterday, the Police Commissioner knows where this person is and the Police Commissioner has assured me and all Queenslanders that they are safe. This government has the strongest laws in the nation when it comes to monitoring these offenders. These laws are backed up with additional funding for our police for monitoring activities.

It is terrible that those opposite want to run around scaring Queenslanders about this. Trust the police to look after Queenslanders. We trust the police. We support them with the toughest laws in the nation. We have also boosted their resources.

Housing Affordability

Mr MELLISH: My question is to the Minister for Housing and Public Works, Minister for Digital Technology and Minister for Sport. Will the minister update the House on the state of housing affordability in Queensland?

Mr de BRENNI: I thank the member for Aspley for the question. We are a growing state. Over five million people call Queensland home, with more Australians choosing Queensland as a place to raise their families. Why wouldn't you with communities like the one that the member for Aspley

represents, with suburbs like Aspley and Geebung being rated as the most affordable and livable in a national real estate survey? The fact is that in many places across Queensland people—and it is one in four people in the electorate of Aspley—remain locked out of home ownership. Whilst Queensland housing affordability rates are clearly better than they are in places such as Sydney and Melbourne, it is important that we have a plan to keep housing affordable in Queensland. It is only Labor that has a plan to address housing affordability in Queensland.

Let me give an update on the Palaszczuk government Housing Strategy by numbers. The Premier announced a \$1.8 billion Housing Strategy on 1 June 2017. Already there will be 1,385 new affordable homes by June this year. We recommitted to remote Indigenous housing to the tune of \$1.08 billion, while Prime Minister Scott Morrison turned his back on first nations Queenslanders. Our Build-to-Rent program will provide 300 affordable homes right here in the CBD of Brisbane—a plan to make renting fairer for all Queenslanders, with over 130 responses to our consultation to date. We have unlocked \$2 billion in equity for the community housing sector, with the first announcement through the Brisbane Housing Co. of 682 additional affordable homes over the next four years.

Housing affordability has to be a national issue. We have seen the federal opposition leader, Labor's Bill Shorten, deliver his plan by announcing 250,000 additional affordable houses over 10 years. Labor's plan includes winding back the tax settings that only work to increase demand amongst those who already own property. What have we seen on housing affordability from this nation's Prime Minister? One in four people in Aspley are locked out of the housing market. What did he say? He said, 'I struggle with my own mortgage too.' This is a bloke who earns 6.5 times the average wage. No-one buys it. No-one buys the Army tanks, the meat pies or the baseball caps. He has been too busy defending the banks to come up with a plan for housing affordability in this country.

It is clear that only Labor and only Bill Shorten have a plan for housing affordability in Australia. Will we ever see Scott Morrison's Queensland sidekick the Queensland opposition leader, the member for Nanango, stand up for Queenslanders? Will we ever see her call on the Prime Minister to restore funding for remote housing? Will we ever see her back Labor's plan for more affordable rentals? Will we ever see her come up with an affordable housing plan for Queenslanders? Will we ever see the Queensland opposition leader call on the Prime Minister to back Queenslanders for the first time?

(Time expired)

Gold Coast, Casino Proposal

Mr O'CONNOR: My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier reveal Labor's secret list of 11 public spaces being considered for a second casino on the Gold Coast?

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, you have two minutes.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I advise the member that that was not done by the state. I am advised that it was done by the council. Perhaps he might want to pick up the phone to Mayor Tom Tate.

Police Service, Recruits

Ms PUGH: My question is to the Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services. Will the minister please provide the House with an update on the recruitment and training of new police officers, some of which is happening just a stone's throw from Mount Ommaney?

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, you have one minute.

Mr RYAN: I want to talk about jobs for Queenslanders as well—jobs for Queenslanders who want to serve their community. Just last year we recruited 240 new first-year constables into the Queensland Police Service. We recruit them through two academies. This might be news for those opposite. We have an academy in Brisbane where we recruit generally for people in the central, the west and the south of Queensland. We also have an academy in Townsville where we recruit for the north and the far north.

It was a bit of a surprise when I heard the Leader of the Opposition complaining about no recruits from the Brisbane academy going to the north and far north. I say to the member for Nanango that maybe that is because they are trained at the Townsville academy. There might be a revelation here. We know that those opposite when they were in government wanted to sell off the academy in Townsville, so in the member for Nanango's mind she has already sold it off.

Mr SPEAKER: The time for question time has expired.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Correction of Answer to Question, Sexual Violence



Hon. DE FARMER (Bulimba—ALP) (Minister for Child Safety, Youth and Women and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (11.14 am): I seek to correct the record regarding my answer to a question in question time this morning. I referred to the shadow Attorney-General. The comments I was making were in reference to the member for Kawana. I apologise to the member for Toowoomba South for questioning his character.

Queensland Government Advertising and Marketing Communication Code of Conduct, Breach



Hon. MC de BRENNI (Springwood—ALP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works, Minister for Digital Technology and Minister for Sport) (11.14 am): I am informed that an investigation took place following a complaint in relation to an alleged breach of the Queensland Government Advertising and Marketing Communication Code of Conduct. I understand the investigation found that the distribution of a message written by me but distributed by the Queensland Building and Construction Commission breached the code. The findings of the investigation have been provided to the complainant.

The recommendations in the report are that the QBCC provide advertising and marketing code of conduct awareness training to relevant officers; they develop appropriate approval processes associated with ministerial messages in accordance with the QPS code of conduct and advertising and marketing communication code of conduct responsibilities; and the commissioner consider if any action is required in relation to the conduct of officers.

In respect of the Department of Housing and Public Works, the recommendations are that it provide advertising and marketing communication code of conduct awareness training to relevant officers; it ensure an approval process is in place associated with ministerial messages in accordance with the code of conduct; and the director-general consider if any action is required in relation to the conduct of relevant officers. There were no recommendations and no findings in relation to my conduct.

The email sent by the Queensland Building and Construction Commission outlined important changes by the government relating to changes in laws and compliance of minimum financial requirements for licensees. I understand that both the QBCC and the Department of Housing and Public Works have accepted the recommendations and have implemented improvements to ensure that administrative errors like this do not occur into the future.

The QBCC has recently issued an updated message. I urge all licensees in the industry to read this important information because the message was, and as the investigation identified, in fact true. I quote from the investigation report. The report states—

The purpose of the email was “... to announce the next steps in the implementation of new laws to help ensure that payments in the building and construction sector are made in full, on time, every time.”

The report goes on to say—

The Complainant submitted that the egregious section of the Minister’s Message stated:

“In 2014, the LNP Government made changes that weakened minimum financial requirement laws and put at risk thousands of construction jobs across the state. Under that regime the QBCC has not been able to adequately monitor the financial health of companies and this has caused widespread damage to many Queensland businesses. The Palaszczuk Government is fixing this.”

The report states—

We have assessed each of these statements by breaking them into separate sentences.

1) *“In 2014, the LNP Government made changes that weakened minimum financial requirement laws and put at risk thousands of construction jobs across the state.”*

The report states—

The Queensland Building and Construction Board made a new Minimum Requirements for Licensing policy on 20 June 2014.

For the information of the House, that was when the member for Everton was the minister. The report continues—

The new policy no longer required licensed contractors to provide financial information demonstrating they comply with the financial requirements yearly at renewal.

The report addressed the second sentence—

2) *“Under that regime the QBCC has not been able to adequately monitor the financial health of companies and this has caused widespread damage to many Queensland businesses.”*

The investigation finds—

There is an argument that this sentence is merely a statement of fact which reflects the difficulties faced by the QBCC in monitoring the financial health of licensees ...

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order, members to my left!

Mr de BRENNI: As I said, I urge all licensees to read the revised message because the message was, and as the investigation identified, in fact true. The member for Kawana, I assert, knew this as he would have a copy of the report as it was attached to the letter to the complainant. Mr Speaker, I submit to you that he has intentionally misled the House and I will be writing to you in that regard.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Thank you, members. I call the House to order.

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: That includes you, Minister.

PERSONALISED TRANSPORT OMBUDSMAN BILL

Message from Governor



Hon. MC BAILEY (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (11.19 am): I present a message from His Excellency the Governor.

Mr SPEAKER: The message from His Excellency recommends the Personalised Transport Ombudsman Bill. The contents of the message will be incorporated in the *Record of Proceedings*. I table the message for the information of members.

MESSAGE

PERSONALISED TRANSPORT OMBUDSMAN BILL 2019

Constitution of Queensland 2001, section 68

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

A Bill for an Act to provide for a personalised transport ombudsman to investigate complaints relating to personalised transport services and facilitate resolution of the complaints, and to amend this Act, the Integrity Act 2009, the Public Service Act 2008, the Tobacco and Other Smoking Products Act 1998, the Transport Infrastructure Act 1994 and the Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act 1994 for particular purposes

(sgd)

GOVERNOR

Date: 12 February 2019

Tabled paper: Message, dated 12 February 2019, from His Excellency the Governor recommending the Personalised Transport Ombudsman Bill 2019 [\[154\]](#).

Introduction



Hon. MC BAILEY (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (11.20 am): I present a bill for an act to provide for a personalised transport ombudsman to investigate complaints relating to personalised transport services and facilitate resolution of the complaints, and to amend this act, the Integrity Act 2009, the Public Service Act 2008, the Tobacco and Other Smoking Products Act 1998, the Transport Infrastructure Act 1994 and the Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act 1994 for particular purposes. I table the bill and explanatory notes. I nominate the Transport and Public Works Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Personalised Transport Ombudsman Bill 2019 [\[148\]](#).

Tabled paper: Personalised Transport Ombudsman Bill 2019, explanatory notes [\[149\]](#).

I am pleased to introduce the Personalised Transport Ombudsman Bill 2019. The bill has three key policy objectives. The main objective is to establish an independent Personalised Transport Ombudsman to help resolve complaints for the personalised transport industry. The second objective is to support the continued enforcement of fare evasion and related offences under the new smart ticketing solution. The third objective is to improve enforceability and clarifies the operation of existing provisions.

Over the last few years the Palaszczuk government has been implementing a personalised transport reform agenda to establish a modern, agile and simplified regulatory framework for personalised transport services in Queensland. The new framework ensures service safety, accessibility, affordability and accountability while also encouraging innovation and providing choice for customers and flexibility for industry participants.

This bill represents the next step in the reform journey by delivering on the government's commitment to establish an independent ombudsman to assist in resolving complaints about personalised transport services from customers, industry and other parties.

The bill provides for the appointment by the Governor in Council of a reputable and independent ombudsman. Provisions in this bill provide for criminal history checks and exclude a person with a potential conflict of interest to ensure there will be public and industry confidence in the integrity and independence of the appointee.

The Personalised Transport Ombudsman will be responsible for helping to resolve complaints relating to the personalised transport industry in a timely and cost-effective way. Consistent with industry expectations, the Personalised Transport Ombudsman will be required to perform its functions independently, impartially and in the public interest. The ombudsman's services will be provided to the public free of charge. To further reinforce the independence of the role, the Personalised Transport Ombudsman and its staff will not be subject to direction from outsiders regarding these functions. Even I, as the minister, cannot direct the ombudsman or its staff in performing its functions.

As I mentioned before, the main functions of the ombudsman are about complaints relating to personalised transport services. The range of personalised transport complaints it may consider is broad. They may include, for example, a complaint about the cleanliness of a vehicle used to provide a personalised transport service or a complaint about a personalised transport service driver's working conditions. However, where a matter is best resolved by another agency—for example, the Fair Work Ombudsman—the Personalised Transport Ombudsman will be able to assist industry by providing advice about the organisation best placed to deal with the issue.

Importantly, the ombudsman's role has clear limitations. It will not investigate certain matters, including a complaint about government policy or legislation or alleged offences under relevant transport legislation. Where the Personalised Transport Ombudsman suspects a person has committed an offence under transport legislation, the ombudsman may refer the matter to the department for investigation. Similarly, the ombudsman in its complaints oversight capacity is also well placed to identify systematic issues and may report these to the minister. The ombudsman can also provide advice to the minister, if requested, to inform broader policy considerations.

I want to be clear that the Personalised Transport Ombudsman does not replace the need for parties to genuinely attempt to resolve disputes themselves. It is still expected that service providers will work with customers, drivers and other industry participants to resolve issues directly. However, where an issue cannot be resolved, the ombudsman may be able to assist.

The ways in which the Personalised Transport Ombudsman may assist include by investigating a matter, providing access to mediation services and providing advice to parties about dispute resolution services available from other bodies. Importantly, it is not intended that the ombudsman will duplicate existing services. For example, if a person makes a complaint about workplace safety, the ombudsman will not attempt to investigate the issue but will instead provide advice about how to contact Workplace Health and Safety Queensland or the department where applicable.

Following an investigation, the ombudsman may assist parties by providing non-binding recommendations. These recommendations may guide parties in resolving issues, potentially avoiding the need for costly legal proceedings. Parties involved in disputes will be required to work with the Personalised Transport Ombudsman in good faith, noting that open and constructive participation will generally be in the interests of all parties involved. In addition, there are confidentiality provisions included in the bill that are designed to encourage open participation. However, where necessary, the ombudsman may also require a party to provide information to assist in investigating an issue. The bill also includes associated enforcement powers to ensure compliance and protections against reprisals to encourage people to use the service.

In relation to smart ticketing amendments, this bill also makes amendments to existing legislation to support the continued enforcement of fare evasion and related offences under the new smart ticketing solution. The new smart ticketing solution will give customers greater choice of payment for public

transport use. The new smart ticketing solution will allow customers to use contactless debit and credit cards, smartphones and wearable devices to pay for public transport. These options will be in addition to the existing go card and paper tickets.

Amendments to the Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act 1994 are needed to support the introduction of flexible payment options under the new smart ticketing solution. The new provision creates a head of power for making regulations about matters relating to the payment of fares. This gives greater flexibility to accommodate additional and ongoing changes to relevant regulations about fares as the new smart ticketing solution develops and is rolled out. The bill will aid prosecutions relating to fare evasion by providing for evidentiary certificates. This bill also provides for the ability to advance the objectives of the Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act 1994 through continuing the ability to recover unclaimed credit on dormant or expired accounts. Customers will continue to be able to claim unused credit on their own accounts through the varied means that are already in place.

The bill also facilitates the continued sharing of information so we can provide customers with concessions that they are entitled to. It is important that we balance customers' privacy with a process that is robust and efficient. Current legislation already restricts the disclosure and use of personal information for purposes that are not authorised, and this protection will continue to apply for the new smart ticketing solution. These amendments support the transition to a new smart ticketing system without impacting on existing arrangements for customers.

The bill also includes some minor amendments to the Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act 1994 to improve enforceability of the legislation and provide greater certainty for the personalised transport industry. Minor and consequential changes are also made to other acts.

The provisions in this bill about the Personalised Transport Ombudsman demonstrate the Palaszczuk government's continued commitment to positive reform of the personalised transport industry—reform that supports customer choice and industry flexibility without compromising accessibility, affordability or accountability. The provisions support the new smart ticketing solution which provides increased customer choice in payment methods when using public transport. The remaining amendments improve enforceability or clarify the operation of existing provisions. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. MC BAILEY (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (11.29 am): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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

Motion agreed to.


Bill read a first time.

Referral to Transport and Public Works Committee

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Order! In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Transport and Public Works Committee.

TRANSPORT LEGISLATION (ROAD SAFETY AND OTHER MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (11.29 am): I present a bill for an act to amend the Heavy Vehicle National Law Act 2012, the State Penalties Enforcement Act 1999, the Traffic Regulation 1962, the Transport Infrastructure Act 1994, the Transport Infrastructure (Dangerous Goods by Rail) Regulation 2018, the Transport Operations (Marine Pollution) Act 1995, the Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995, the Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Dangerous Goods) Regulation 2018, the Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Driver Licensing) Regulation 2010 and the Transport Planning and Coordination Act 1994 for particular purposes. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the Transport and Public Works Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Transport Legislation (Road Safety and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2019 [\[150\]](#).

Tabled paper: Transport Legislation (Road Safety and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2019, explanatory notes [\[151\]](#).

I am pleased to bring this bill to the House, amending transport acts to bring forward some key road safety initiatives and to continue streamlining legislation to improve outcomes for the community and businesses. The bill will amend the Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995, the Transport Operations (Marine Pollution) Act 1995, the Transport Infrastructure Act 1994 and the Heavy Vehicle National Law Act 2012 for particular purposes. It will also make consequential or minor amendments of acts as stated in the schedule for particular purposes.

The bill includes amendments to improve safety on our roads by providing for enhancements to the existing Alcohol Ignition Interlock Program and introducing education programs for drink-driving offenders. The bill also provides for the operation of point-to-point speed cameras on stretches of road with multiple speed limits and enables testing of passengers for intoxicating substances where the passenger is suspected of interfering with the operation of a vehicle dangerously. In addition, the bill includes minor and technical amendments for clarity or to improve efficiencies and streamline processes.

The primary purpose of the bill is to bring forward innovative legislative reforms that are designed to reduce road trauma in our state. Death and serious injuries on Queensland's roads cost Queensland over \$5 billion every year and cause devastation for individuals, families and the broader community. Queensland's Road Safety Strategy 2015-21 sets the ambitious target to reduce death and serious injury by 30 per cent by 2020—meaning we need to reduce road fatalities to under 200 and serious injuries to under 4,700 in a year. In 2017-18, 247 people were killed and an estimated 6,462 were seriously injured on our roads.

Queenslanders have supported the drink-driving reforms included in this bill. In early 2017 my department released a discussion paper canvassing a range of options to reduce drink-driver reoffending. These included education reforms and enhancements to the interlock program. It attracted over 3,000 survey responses and nine written submissions from interested stakeholder groups. All proposals received majority support.

The bill introduces the requirement that first-time drink-drivers will be required to complete an online brief intervention education program prior to them being re-licensed. This program will give people strategies to separate their drinking and driving. Research indicates that brief education programs delivered to first-time drink-driving offenders encourage participants to reduce hazardous drinking and engaging in drink-driving. It focuses on changing the behaviour of the individual drink-driver by providing the knowledge and tools to avoid drink-driving in the future. The program will target all drink-drivers. Based on the average number of drink-driving offenders over five years, approximately 15,800 individuals are expected to participate in the first year, before reducing to approximately 11,900 participants per year from the second year onwards. When we look at those figures, we know that there is a lot more work to be done in this space.

Repeat drink-driving offenders will be required to complete a more intensive multi-session education program. This program will be undertaken while the offender is also participating in the interlock program and will need to be successfully completed before the interlock condition can be removed from their licence. Queensland will be the first Australian jurisdiction to introduce these innovative approaches to educate drink-driving offenders through an online brief intervention education program. Both programs are designed to educate drink-drivers, to influence and encourage positive behaviour change and to reduce reoffending and thereby reduce risk on our roads.

The bill also includes amendments to enhance the current Alcohol Ignition Interlock Program. The bill introduces a performance based interlock program where people must demonstrate they have separated their drinking and driving to successfully complete the program. If a person fails to comply with the performance criteria, which includes having a positive breath test during the last four months of their prescribed period, they will be subject to automatic extension of the program for four months.

The amendments contained in the bill increase the current two-year interlock period, commonly known as the 'sit out period', to five years. This is important to support the performance based program. This means a person cannot drive for five years if they choose not to participate in the interlock program and establishes a consistent approach to interlock programs in other jurisdictions, such as New South Wales.

The bill will also expand the interlock program to include mid-range drink-drivers, which is a blood alcohol content between 0.10 and 0.149. Mid-range drink-drivers account for more than a quarter of all offenders and have a crash risk 20 times greater than someone who has not had a drink. Their inclusion in the interlock program is important to successfully influence those drivers with a blood alcohol content at least twice the legal alcohol limit.

Access to restricted licences for mid-range drink-driving offenders will be maintained. These licences are often referred to as 'work licences'. If granted a work licence, the amendments will require the person to participate in the interlock program concurrently. This will assist in teaching drink-driving offenders who need their licence for work to separate their drinking from their driving.

Other road safety amendments in the bill provide for the testing of passengers for intoxicating substances where the passenger is suspected of interfering with the operation of a vehicle dangerously. This amendment is designed to enhance the accuracy of information for courts. Speed is still a factor in too many serious injury crashes. This bill will enable camera enforcement of speed limits on sections of road where multiple speed limits are displayed. An example of this is when variable speed limit signs are in use on managed motorways or where speed limits have been reduced for roadworks.

These reforms will improve speed management and safety on Queensland roads by allowing point-to-point speed camera systems on roads where there is a known crash risk and where multiple speed limits are displayed. To assist with the ongoing management of camera detected offences, the bill also provides for persons issued with infringement notices to nominate the actual driver of a vehicle at the time of the detected offence via an online portal without requiring a statutory declaration.

This bill also contains amendments that are not road safety related. These include extending the existing ability of the state to recover the costs and expenses incurred in responding to a marine pollution incident beyond just port authorities and operators to 'prescribed entities' such as local governments. Minor and technical amendments will also reduce the regulatory burden, such as amendments to evidentiary provisions, which will provide efficiencies and streamline processes.

The bill will also make a number of technical and administrative improvements to the Transport Infrastructure Act 1994. The first of these will streamline the evidentiary process by introducing new matters that can be stated as fact by evidentiary certificate. This will allow evidentiary certificates to be provided to the Magistrates Court to confirm the identity of a toll road operator and to outline how a written notice was given to a person by the toll road operator. The amendments will not affect a person's ability to challenge that written notice was given under the current appeal provisions in the act. To ensure consistency, the amendments will be mirrored in the local government provisions for tollways. An amendment will also be made to clarify the extent to which a local government can exercise powers for a state controlled road in its area. A lack of clarity has resulted in the misinterpretation of this power that is inconsistent with the intent of other transport legislation.

The way the department defines and regulates ancillary works and encroachments within our state transport corridors will also be streamlined. The current definition of ancillary works and encroachments is prescriptive, inflexible and inherently difficult to administer. This definition will be broadened to include any activity, structure or thing on a state controlled road. This will allow the department to meet emerging needs by taking a proactive and agile approach when catering for and regulating innovative business practices and technologies.

A further amendment will simplify the approval process for ancillary works and encroachments constructed, maintained, operated or conducted on a state controlled road. The amendment will remove the current cumbersome and costly gazettal process, replacing it with a consent notice published on the department's website. Amendments will also enable applications for roadworks, ancillary works and encroachments or for a road access location to be made using an approved form or an online application system. This will ensure a consistent statewide approach to assessing and approving applications and clarify what supporting information must be provided with an application. All of this will ensure an improved and streamlined customer experience. I commend this bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. MC BAILEY (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (11.40 am): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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

Motion agreed to.


Bill read a first time.

Referral to Transport and Public Works Committee

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Order! In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Transport and Public Works Committee.

POLICE SERVICE ADMINISTRATION (DISCIPLINE REFORM) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

 **Hon. MT RYAN** (Morayfield—ALP) (Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services) (11.41 am): I present a bill for an act to amend the Crime and Corruption Act 2001, the Police Service Administration Act 1990 and the acts mentioned in schedule 1 for particular purposes, and to repeal the Police Service (Discipline) Regulations 1990. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Police Service Administration (Discipline Reform) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019 [\[152\]](#).

Tabled paper: Police Service Administration (Discipline Reform) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019, explanatory notes [\[153\]](#).

I rise today to introduce the Police Service Administration (Discipline Reform) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. Thirty years ago Tony Fitzgerald asked us to remain eternally vigilant so that history would never repeat itself. This bill builds on the Fitzgerald legacy.

As Minister for Police, I have had the opportunity to work with some of the nearly 12,000 police officers around this great state, a safe state. The community demands from our police officers the highest standards of professional behaviour, and I can say with confidence the vast majority—the overwhelming majority—of police officers perform their duties with honesty and integrity. However, there will be some instances where police officers fall short of these standards and do not meet the expectations of the community. In these instances, the importance of a robust police discipline system is evident. Without a comprehensive and effective police discipline system, confidence in our Police Service risks becoming eroded. Police officers may not be held accountable for their actions. Police officers may not be encouraged to behave appropriately.

During the 2015 state election, this government made a commitment to review the police discipline system and implement a new system that ensures accountability and fairness for police officers and the communities they serve. This bill delivers on that commitment. Today I pay tribute to the Chair of the Crime and Corruption Commission, Mr Alan MacSporran, for spearheading the review of the police discipline system. Mr MacSporran initiated a series of roundtable talks with all the key stakeholders: the Queensland Police Service, the Queensland Police Union of Employees, the Queensland Police Commissioned Officers' Union of Employees, government representatives, representatives of the legal fraternity and members of the opposition. The results were historic and more than 20 years in the making. The result was bipartisan support from all of those stakeholders. It was through these discussions and a united determination to make a difference that we reached this watershed moment.

The impact that this bill and the associated Police Service policy will have on the current discipline system will be profound. This will be a defining moment in the evolution of the Queensland Police Service. This bill heralds major changes—structural changes—within the Police Service and new management practices that are designed to correct, instruct and improve officer behaviour. All this is set against the backdrop of a more mobile, agile, borderless policing model which takes Queenslanders to a safer future.

Our current discipline system allows a prescribed officer to conduct disciplinary hearings into an allegation of inappropriate police conduct. The officer subject to the allegations—the subject officers—may contest the allegation and any sanction the prescribed officer intends to impose on the subject officer if the allegations are proven. The current system classifies officer misbehaviour into two categories: a breach of discipline or misconduct.

A breach of discipline is defined as a breach of the Police Service Administration Act, the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act or a direction of the commissioner but does not include misconduct. Misconduct, on the other hand, is defined as conduct that is disgraceful, improper or unbecoming of an officer; or shows unfitness to be or continue to be an officer; or does not meet the standard of conduct the community expects of a police officer.

Misconduct is not limited to conduct that occurs in an official capacity and there is no requirement for a nexus between an officer's conduct in a private capacity and their official role. Categorising misbehaviour into either a breach of discipline or misconduct is problematic. Disputes have arisen about whether particular behaviour would constitute a breach of discipline or misconduct and, as prescribed police officers from different police regions may conduct discipline hearings, there is fertile ground for

inconsistencies to arise between decisions made about similar acts of misbehaviour around the state. Further, the inherent complexities of our current discipline system are exacerbated through the avenues of review available for a discipline decision.

A subject officer or the Crime and Corruption Commission may apply to the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal to review a prescribed officer's decision about an allegation of misconduct. However, the CCC is unable to apply for a review of a prescribed officer's decision not to commence a disciplinary hearing. This could include circumstances where the prescribed officer decides there is insufficient evidence to commence a proceeding or there is only sufficient evidence to substantiate a breach of discipline instead of misconduct.

This bill addresses those shortcomings through three distinct measures. Firstly, the bill introduces a new term of 'grounds for disciplinary action'. Grounds for disciplinary action include police misbehaviour that would either be a breach of discipline or misconduct. Removing the artificial distinction between a breach of discipline or misconduct simplifies the police discipline system as the ability to review a decision will no longer be dependent upon how the behaviour is categorised. This bill will allow the CCC to apply to QCAT to review all disciplinary decisions, including a decision not to institute disciplinary proceedings against an officer. This measure strengthens the CCC's ability to monitor the Queensland Police Service handling of complaints about police officers and ensures that there is no mishandling of matters.

The third measure introduced by this bill involves establishing a central unit responsible for conducting disciplinary proceedings. The purpose of the central unit will be to deal with those disciplinary proceedings that are of such a serious nature that sanctions may only be imposed by an officer of the rank of deputy commissioner or assistant commissioner. Forming a central unit to conduct these proceedings will improve efficiencies in discipline hearings and promote consistency in the decisions that are made. Additionally, the referral of discipline matters to this unit allows other deputy commissioners or assistant commissioners from around the state more opportunity to focus on other priority policing and responsibilities in their region or in their commands.

The bill also fundamentally changes the police discipline system by making amendments that reduce delays in finalising discipline investigations; modernise the discipline sanctions that can be imposed against an officer; and formalise the role and range of management strategies that form part of the discipline process. I will address each of these facets in turn.

The bill ensures that disciplinary matters may be resolved in a timely fashion by introducing two initiatives. The first initiative involves introducing strict time frames for the commencement of disciplinary proceedings against an officer. These time frames are dependent upon when the grounds for disciplinary action arose. Generally, disciplinary proceedings in relation to a complaint must be commenced either within one year from the date the disciplinary ground arose or within six months from the complaint being made, whichever is the later. In instances where an officer is charged with a criminal offence, disciplinary investigations will often be suspended until the criminal matter is finalised. This may result in an extremely long delay in finalising any later disciplinary proceedings. This bill prevents any undue delay by imposing a time frame of six months in which disciplinary proceedings may commence from the criminal matter being finalised or withdrawn.

The second initiative that further improves the timeliness of the police disciplinary system is the establishment of abbreviated disciplinary proceedings. Where the complained about conduct is acknowledged and the subject officer readily admits to that conduct, an ADP may be used to efficiently resolve a disciplinary matter, removing the need for a full investigation to be completed. The bill authorises a prescribed officer, with the approval of the CCC, to invite a subject officer to participate in the ADP instead of participating in a full disciplinary hearing proceeding. Participation by the subject officer in the ADP is completely voluntary. A subject officer invited by a prescribed officer to participate in the ADP has the opportunity to provide submissions addressing the complaint within a period of at least 21 days and may also indicate the disciplinary sanctions or professional development strategy the subject officer would be prepared to accept. After considering the submissions made by the subject officer, the prescribed officer may propose a sanction in response to the subject officer's conduct.

The bill includes an important safeguard in this process, as any offer of a proposed sanction must be made with the consent of the CCC. If the subject officer consents to finalising the matter through the ADP, the prescribed officer must impose the sanction approved by the CCC; however, the ADP should not be considered a soft option that is only used for minor complaints. The ADP may be used in more serious complaints where the officer accepts responsibility for his or her own actions. In such a case, the sanction proposed by the prescribed officer will reflect the seriousness of the matter.

A further safeguard has also been incorporated into the ADP to ensure that its utility will extend into the future. I have earlier emphasised one safeguard to this process in that the CCC has to approve each proposed sanction. In addition to this, the bill allows the CCC or the subject officer the right to apply to QCAT for an order quashing the ADP process and outcome if fresh, additional or substituted evidence later becomes available. This means evidence that, if it had been considered by the prescribed officer, would have altered the decision to use the ADP.

The bill modernises the disciplinary sanctions that can be imposed against an officer. It is important to note that the current sanctions have not been updated since 1990, almost 30 years ago. They are limited in scope, inflexible, and do not necessarily address the cause of any deficiency in behaviour. There are also concerns about some unintended consequences of the current sanctions which reduce an officer's pay level. Such a reduction can have impacts beyond the intended sanction by reducing long-term superannuation outcomes.

The bill omits current sections affecting an officer's level of salary. Instead, it implements a range of new disciplinary sanctions including suspension from duty without pay for a period not exceeding 12 months, disciplinary probation, demotion for a specific period in addition to the current permanent demotion sanction, comprehensive transfer, localised transfer, community service, and an increase in the maximum fine from two penalty units to 50 penalty units.

In accordance with recommendations made in Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee report No. 97, the disciplinary sanction of dismissal will no longer be able to be suspended. Similarly, the new disciplinary sanction of probation is unable to be suspended. However, in the case of any other disciplinary sanction that is suspended with or without conditions attached, the suspended sanction still forms part of an officer's disciplinary history and can be considered in any future matters.

This new range of disciplinary sanctions provides more options for dealing with inappropriate behaviour and includes options to help prevent a recurrence of the behaviour and to guide, correct and rehabilitate officers. It is important to note that dismissal still remains an option to deal with the most serious instances of inappropriate behaviour. To further support the goal of preventing inappropriate behaviours from re-occurring in the future, the bill formalises professional development strategies such as mentoring, closer supervision, additional training, counselling, guidance or temporary reassignment of duties in the new police disciplinary system.

When a complaint is first received, the commissioner must consider whether to impose a professional development strategy to reduce the risk of recurrence of similar conduct, to improve the officer's behaviour or for any other purpose and to implement this in a reasonable way as soon as practicable after the complaint arises. The bill does not limit a senior officer from giving an officer guidance or taking other reasonable management action in response to a complaint. Any professional development strategies or management action taken will be considered when decisions are made regarding the finalisation of complaints.

The bill also protects the rights of officers and ensures that cooperation and consultation between key stakeholders continues. The bill enshrines aspects of disciplinary proceedings that are currently only contained in police policy. It ensures that officers have a right of reply to any allegation which a prescribed officer substantiates against them and that they have the right to submit on the appropriateness of any proposed sanction. This bill provides principles for conducting disciplinary proceedings, including ensuring that the rules of natural justice are observed and proceedings are conducted with as little formality and technicality as is consistent with a fair and proper consideration of the matter. In addition, review rights are maintained, with all matters now being heard by QCAT.

To futureproof and maintain some flexibility in the new disciplinary system framework, the bill allows the commissioner to make policy or guidelines regarding certain matters. All guidelines must be consistent with the provisions of the new disciplinary system as contained in the Police Service Administration Act or the Crime and Corruption Act, and the commissioner must firstly actively consult with, and have regard to, the views of the chairperson of the Crime and Corruption Commission and the unions that represent our police officers; namely, the Queensland Police Union of Employees and the Queensland Police Commissioned Officers' Union of Employees.

This bill contains amendments to implement a new police disciplinary system which will ensure that public confidence in the Queensland Police Service is maintained. It provides efficiencies in the investigation of complaints and the hearing of allegations. It will also ensure that officers are educated and supported in ways to improve their performance and, when required, allows for appropriate disciplinary action to be taken. This will be achieved by improving key facets of the police disciplinary

system: by reducing delays in finalising disciplinary investigations; by modernising disciplinary sanctions; by formalising the role of professional development strategies and other management strategies; and by addressing review provisions which apply to the Crime and Corruption Commission.

This bill is indeed a watershed moment for the Queensland Police Service and the people of Queensland. It heralds an historic shift in the handling of police disciplinary matters, and this bill delivers on an election commitment that this government made at the 2015 state election. I commend this bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. MT RYAN (Morayfield—ALP) (Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services) (11.58 am): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.

Referral to Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee


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

CRIMINAL CODE (NON-CONSENSUAL SHARING OF INTIMATE IMAGES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from 12 February (see p. 86), on motion of Mrs D'Ath—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Ms RICHARDS** (Redlands—ALP) (11.59 am), continuing: I restate my thanks to the Red Rose Foundation and the Centre Against Sexual Violence for their submissions on this bill. The work they do every day in my community, tackling the scourge that is domestic and family violence, is just incredible. Both of their submissions talked about how images can be used as a vicious tool to perpetrate domestic and family violence.


This legislation is excellent news as it contains really proactive steps to penalise perpetrators. It will now be an offence to distribute intimate images without consent. There are two new offences of making threats to distribute intimate images or prohibited visual recordings. There are also provisions to enable courts to make rectification orders. That will empower sentencing courts to direct offenders to remove and delete intimate images or prohibited visual recordings.

The new offence of distributing intimate images without consent prohibits the distribution of intimate images of another person without that person's consent and in a way that would cause the person distress reasonably arising in the circumstances. The maximum penalty for this offence is three years imprisonment. This is a really significant deterrent. Defences are included to provide protections for the new offence where distribution of the intimate image is for genuine artistic, education, legal, medical, scientific, public benefit or law enforcement purposes. These defences are consistent with other legislation in this space.

The new offences of making threats to distribute intimate images or prohibited visual recordings criminalise threatening to distribute intimate images of another person. Again, I think that is really important because, even though the damage is done once images are up and live, having that threat hanging over you is dreadful and causes victims terrible distress. I had a conversation with Betty Taylor in this regard and she gave me some examples.

The bill creates two threat offences: one that will apply when a threat is made to the person depicted in the image and the other that will apply where a threat is made to a person who is not the subject of the image. The latter offence would, for example, capture an ex-partner threatening a person's new partner or a person's family members with the distribution of an intimate image. The penalty for both of these offences is three years imprisonment. Rectification orders are really important. They allow the justice system to get that material down.

This is really important legislation that addresses the societal changes that technology has brought about. Technology continues to disrupt our society. It is really important that our legislation keeps up with where technology is taking us. This legislation has been designed to deal with the harm caused by the publication and sharing of intimate personal images. As we have heard in all of the contributions to this debate, significant damage can be caused to that individual. It is with pleasure that I commend this bill to the House.

 **Mr McARDLE** (Caloundra—LNP) (12.02 pm): I rise to make a short contribution to the debate of the Criminal Code (Non-consensual Sharing of Intimate Images) Amendment Bill. It is amazing how technology can be either a boon or a burden, depending on how it is utilised. It is sad to see that modern technology has been used in a manner that results in deprivation, shock and impact on the many people who have had intimate images shared without their consent.

I listened to the debate conducted yesterday. I noted reference to the RMIT survey of 4,274 people in relation to the abuse as defined within the bill. I heard that four in five Australians—80 per cent—agreed that it should be a crime to share sexual or nude images without permission. What strikes me about that figure is that 20 per cent of respondents to that survey—855 people—think it is permissible to share an image without the consent of the person who appears in that image. What development has occurred that allows 20 per cent of our society to say that it is all right to do that? What are we teaching or practising in our society, from a young age up to adulthood, that indicates it is fine to abuse a young girl or a woman in that manner? I think it was made quite clear yesterday.

In my opinion, it comes down to the simple word but complicated rollout of respect—respect for one another. The cornerstone of our society is my obligation to give respect and my right to receive respect in all that I do in a lawful way. Our children should be taught from an early age—whether it be in relation to this issue or to domestic violence—that it comes down to respecting yourself and respecting others in equal measure. If that is undertaken at an early age, we may be able to limit the number of these matters.

That figure worried me enormously. It worried me that that seemed to be acceptable. At the end of the day, we can put in place laws such as this—they are important; there is no question about that—but we need to look at how we get across to people that they should not even contemplate doing it. How do we get across to people that even contemplating this sort of action reduces self-respect and almost demolishes their respect for other human beings? How have we reached the point that in 2019 in Queensland, let alone across the globe, this is an essential component of our criminal law? I think the Attorney-General and others will agree with me that education of the population is critical in trying to eliminate this very serious matter in the future.

We have a technology boom right across the globe. I do not know what we will be seeing in three years time. I do not know what technology will develop into in three, four or five years time. I do not want to see that technology being used by people who are perverted or people who are after self-gratification with the end result being the diminishing of another human being. That worries me. I think we in this House have a very strong obligation, as contained in this bill, to deal with that matter as we go forward. In my opinion, it is sad that the bill had to come before the House but it is a necessity. Let us hope that this bill deals in part with a major problem going forward.

As I said, if we educate children on the basic tenet of respect, we will have a major advantage in eliminating or reducing this problem as much as possible. In relation to the 20 per cent who say, 'It is okay for me to send an image without consent,' what is the psychological outcome on the young girl, the woman or the male whose image is portrayed? The impact is not confined to their employment prospects or other social circumstances; there is also a psychological impact as years go by. Those images stay in the ether forever and a day. We have already seen the suicide of many young people as a consequence of bullying. We have seen young people take their own lives because of what has happened on social media. That will flow through. I suspect that has already flowed through because of this form of image projection. It has to stop. We as parliamentarians, parents and grandparents have an obligation to play our part.

If we do not instil in our children respect, this will continue. This abuse and destruction of a person will continue, day in and day out. Respect is in part the answer. I say to people in this House: we have a clear obligation in the various roles we play in society. As a parliamentarian I urge all members of the House to understand that respect starts with us. How we conduct ourselves in our dealings with each other—perhaps more so outside the House than inside the House—is an important component of changing the ethos of our society.

I support the bill but I again reiterate respect—first, second and third. Punish the offenders but teach the young the basic tenets of a good society. I support the bill.



Hon. SM FENTIMAN (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Small Business and Minister for Training and Skills Development) (12.09 pm): I am incredibly proud to stand in this House and speak in favour of the Criminal Code (Non-consensual Sharing of Intimate Images) Amendment Bill. These amendments to the Criminal Code create a new offence that prohibits the distribution of an intimate image of another person without that person's consent. The bill also prohibits threatening to distribute intimate images of another person.

The practice of the non-consensual sharing of intimate images is an insidious form of violence that disproportionately affects women, often by a trusted individual, and today we are criminalising that form of abuse—a weapon used by perpetrators to denigrate, intimidate, coerce or humiliate victims regardless of whether they chose to share intimate images with the perpetrator. These reforms will hold perpetrators to account instead of shaming and blaming victims for the actions of their abusers. We are sending a message to victims across Queensland that we support them and that the violence and threats that they have been subjected to will not be tolerated.

In 2016 a report conducted by RMIT found that one in five Australians have experienced image based abuse, with the majority of these women. Revenge porn is underpinned by the same cultural attitudes as all forms of violence against women, and that is disrespect for women. Our Criminal Code should strive to reflect the expectations of our modern society. The development of technology and the adoption of new methods of communication require new criminal offences and it is crucial that government respond to this changing reality. These amendments are overdue and bring Queensland into line with other jurisdictions that have outlawed revenge porn.

This bill in part came out of an agreement of the Law, Crime and Community Safety Council to have nationally consistent criminal offences relating to the non-consensual sharing of intimate images. An important part of this bill is to criminalise not only the non-consensual sharing of these images but also the threat to share those intimate images. The threat to distribute this material can cause severe psychological distress and, like other forms of abuse, is used by abusers to control and coerce victims. The Centre Against Sexual Violence—an organisation of which I am proud to volunteer my time—noted in its submission that the new legislation has the potential to empower women and children to speak out and seek legal and community support, knowing that they can receive legal support around the non-consensual sharing of intimate images or the threat to do so.


Despite the RMIT survey finding that 80 per cent of respondents believed the non-consensual sharing of an intimate image should be a criminal offence, women are often blamed for the creation of the image. It is an unfair position that I hope these amendments will go some way to addressing. We know that the non-consensual sharing of intimate images or the threat to do so is behaviour that is abhorrent, but now this behaviour importantly will also be illegal and anyone caught engaging in this form of abuse will be held to account. Perpetrators will face significant fines and a maximum of three years imprisonment if they are convicted of this offence. This legislation sends a clear message to the community that this type of behaviour will not be tolerated and will go some way in changing our culture of victim blaming.

I want to thank my parliamentary colleagues who have shown leadership on this issue and prioritised passing this important legislation. It is an important commitment that the Palaszczuk government is delivering on. Before concluding, I want to note the submission from Women's Legal Service which raised concerns about the potential application of the mistaken belief defence in relation to revenge porn and that it should be explicitly excluded from the bill. Its submission went further and stated also that the Queensland government should develop a sexual violence prevention plan and immediately review the laws on consent and mistaken belief to reflect modern understandings and attitudes.

I want to take the time to acknowledge the advocacy of the Women's Legal Service on this important issue. In the committee report the Department of Justice and Attorney-General outlined that such issues were outside the scope of this bill but did note the calls for a review of Queensland's consent laws and the fact that New South Wales has recently asked its Law Reform Commission to consider these issues, and I know the Attorney-General has written to stakeholders about these issues. I share the views expressed by the Women's Legal Service and the views expressed in this House by the member for Macalister in this debate and I, too, hope that this is also the start of further reform in this area.

During my time as the minister for women criminalising revenge porn and other forms of technology-enabled harassment was a key priority amongst stakeholders and many community groups. I want to thank these groups for the incredible work that they do. They fight tirelessly for reforms like

this and they continue to advocate for women in our community. I am incredibly proud to support this bill. I am proud that this bill supports victims and criminalises this awful form of abuse. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr MOLHOEK** (Southport—LNP) (12.15 pm): Today I rise to speak to the Criminal Code (Non-consensual Sharing of Intimate Images) Amendment Bill 2018. I would like to suggest to the House that perhaps a better title for this bill would be protecting our young people or our kids from themselves. As the father of four sons, I get to spend a lot of time with many young people and often have large groups in my home and some of the topics that are discussed amongst young people these days are interesting. Sadly, when you mix the enthusiasm of youth with a few drinks, sometimes our young people do not always think straight. On one occasion a friend of one of my sons shared some images on Facebook which he later came to regret. On that occasion they were not revenge porn as such, but they were stupid images of himself acting in a fairly inappropriate manner. There was a video and on that occasion the school counsellor was involved, so that is why I think this legislation is so important. We all know that prevention is always better than cure.

This bill seeks to send a very strong message not just to young people but to everyone that using the internet—using all forms of social media or other channels of media—to try to seek revenge or to try and make a point is simply not appropriate. I certainly support the objectives of this bill, and I support the need to introduce these new offences regarding the distribution of intimate images and threats to distribute intimate images or prohibited video recordings. I particularly support the objective that introduces an offence requiring some form of rectification or the power to introduce a rectification order.

One of the things that I often speak to young people about at high school graduations when I am invited occasionally to attend, and I usually score a few points with the parents, is the need to live a life of no regrets. A few years ago when I was first elected I would talk fairly openly about this topic and we would talk about the fact that your words have power and that once you have said something it is very difficult to take it back. I like to stress the importance of not being a person who lives to regret their words. Now in this era of modern technology, it is not just your words that you cannot take back. As we heard from the member for Caloundra, it is also very difficult to take back images that are shared in a moment of haste or out of a sense of revenge or anger. My hope is that this legislation will send a very strong message to young people in Queensland to take a breath and to think, to pause and to exercise due care before they rush out and do something impulsive in a moment of rage or, sadly, in a moment perhaps of passion when they have had a few too many drinks and they think it is a great idea but they later come to regret it. It is difficult to take those things back.

Like many others in this House have done today and yesterday, I want to acknowledge some of the great organisations in my community that are doing so much work not just with young people but also with victims of domestic violence and which provide support services for people who have been victims at some point. You do not need to spend too much time with Di Macleod and her team at the Gold Coast Centre Against Sexual Violence to understand how passionate they are about this subject.

In this day and age, domestic violence is not always just physical; it can be exercised through many other formats. More and more we are seeing pressure on our young people and others through pornography, revenge porn and cyberstalking. On many occasions we hear stories about predators who will make repeated requests for sexual photos. Again, I concur with the comments of the member for Caloundra. It is sad that we even have to rise in this House to talk about something that should just be common sense. It is sad that we need laws to send a message to people about appropriate behaviour. I also want to mention the great work of the Domestic Violence Prevention Centre on the Gold Coast, led by Rosemary O'Malley and the team. They, too, deal firsthand with issues of this nature and provide tremendous support to young people and other victims of all forms of violence.

As many members of this House know, I have had a longstanding commitment to Bravehearts. I have been on the board of Bravehearts for 12 years. Bravehearts also helps to prevent child sexual assault and assist victims of child sexual assault. As well, Bravehearts runs an incredible program for school-age kids to empower them by providing them with personal safety skills. It would be remiss of me not to again take the opportunity to commend Hetty Johnston and her team for their great work in supporting young people across Australia not just in regard to sexual abuse but all forms of sexual assault. Indeed, revenge porn is just a new form of sexual assault.

During my time with Bravehearts I have learned that, as a community, we are dealing with children and young adults becoming more sexualised at a much younger age than they were before. Gone are the days of pinching dad's *Playboy* magazine for an education. These days, young people can access anything and everything on the internet and some of that stuff is pretty scary. Pornography

is now becoming an unofficial sex education for many young people and it is shaping their sexual preferences. The statistics show that more than half of all 11- to 16-year-olds have seen online pornography at least once, with the vast majority having viewed it before the age of 14. Girls and young women aged between 10 and 14 years experience the highest rates of sexual violence in Australia. People aged 19 and under make up around 60 per cent of all sexual assault victims in Australia. The number of sexual assault offences perpetrated by children and young people aged between 15 and 19 years of age has been increasing steadily. Combined with the prevalence of technology and social media, this sexualisation at a younger age results in young people being peer pressured to create intimate content. Problems such as the non-consensual sharing of sexual images are not going to go away on their own. I reiterate that I welcome this legislation, which seeks to protect Queenslanders, but particularly our young people who are at much higher risk of being victimised.

A Bravehearts report refers to research conducted in 2014 by Barnes and Josefowitz which listed the following outcomes that have been seen in victims of child sexual assault and, indeed, in victims of revenge porn and other forms of assault: psychological difficulties such as depression, anxiety, sleep disorders, personality disorders and psychotic disorders; behavioural problems such as substance abuse, self-harm, eating disorders, conduct disorders and antisocial behaviour; as well as relationship difficulties, poorer physical health and poorer educational and occupational achievement. It would be fair to say that these outcomes would be relevant to young people who have been a victim of their intimate content being shared publicly.

Although I support absolutely the reforms contained in this legislation, it is a shame they cannot go further. The difficulty in life is that we can legislate for only so much. Although enacting legislation to act as a strong deterrent is an important function of this parliament—and, as I said, prevention is better than cure—sadly, we cannot legislate people's values or morals. We cannot dictate the heartbeat of a person. However, at the very least we can send a very strong message that, as Queenslanders, we do not condone revenge porn, as it is known, we do not condone the use of social media and the internet for seeking revenge or seeking to embarrass others. It is a shame that this legislation cannot go further.

(Time expired)



Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (12.25 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Criminal Code (Non-consensual Sharing of Intimate Images) Amendment Bill 2018. We live in an age where, thanks to the ubiquitous and fast-evolving nature of technology, society is more connected than ever before. The potential that modern technology presents to us—to be able to connect instantly with those on the other side of the globe, to have ready access to the world's information at a touch of a button all thanks to a device that fits into our pocket or can be worn on our wrist—is one that, for the most part, is incredibly positive and has progressed society and provided unprecedented opportunities. However, sadly, there are those in our community who seize on this potential and who choose instead to use modern technology to harm others.

Although the non-consensual sharing of intimate images—often at times referred to as revenge porn—is nothing new, what has changed is that over the past decade or more the ease and medium by which such abuse is perpetrated has continued to evolve. At this point, I acknowledge the comments of the member for Macalister about the term 'revenge porn'. Although this activity is colloquially known as that, yesterday the member made the case that, given some of the ways it can be misinterpreted, we should all be trying to avoid that term as much as possible. It is a sad fact that the same incredible device that fits squarely into one's pocket can easily be used—and has been used—to cause immense distress and harm through the non-consensual sharing of intimate images.

I note that, in Australia, in 2013 South Australia was the first state to enact specific laws regarding image based abuse. As we commence 2019, I am pleased to see this parliament enact such laws that will protect Queenslanders, particularly Queensland women, from such abuse. Before I go any further, I would like to take a moment to reflect on the nature of this abuse and echo the statements made by the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee in its report No. 20. As I have said earlier, this form of abuse is often colloquially referred to as revenge porn. The committee report noted—

It is also often labelled 'revenge porn' but research has shown that revenge is not the only motive underlying the sharing of, or making a threat to share, intimate images. Other motivations include 'control, intimidation, sexual gratification, monetary gain and social status building'.

That is the important point. Regardless of the intention, which often goes far beyond just revenge, this abhorrent form of abuse is confined to not only the non-consensual sharing of images but also a threat to share. Even the threat to share can cause immense distress and harm. It is rightly seen as a form of abuse in and of itself. Therefore, this legislation will create new offences that address specifically

threats to distribute intimate images or prohibited visual records without the consent of the persons depicted, including threats made to distribute an intimate image or prohibited visual recording of another person. As the Attorney-General's department noted, this behaviour may include, for example, an ex-boyfriend threatening a woman's new partner to distribute an intimate image of her. Importantly, this bill will also introduce a new rectification order provision that will allow the court to direct convicted offenders to remove or delete intimate images and prohibited images.


Whilst the Liberal National Party supports the objectives of this bill and as such supports any measures that are aimed at protecting Queenslanders from actual or threatened abuse, particularly when it comes to the non-consensual sharing of images, it must be noted that there are a range of concerns that have been raised with this bill by prominent and respected stakeholders. In particular, concerns have been raised that the definition of 'intimate image' will not go so far as to protect people from audio material and therefore in its current form this bill is starting from a position where it is constrained to some past technologies.

As I have said from the outset, we live in a time marked by ubiquitous and fast-evolving technology. As such, it is only reasonable to expect that our laws make every effort to at least keep pace with or, where possible, anticipate such changes. I would also like to note issues raised with regard to consent that is given. Under this bill consent is defined as freely and voluntarily given by a person with the cognitive capacity to give the consent. Stakeholders, including the Women's Legal Service, have made it clear that they believe this definition is inadequate, with submissions to the committee recommending a provision in the bill that explicitly states that consent given on one occasion does not apply to all occasions.

Debate, on motion of Dr Rowan, adjourned.

CRIMINAL CODE AND OTHER LEGISLATION (MASON JETT LEE) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

 **Mr JANETZKI** (Toowoomba South—LNP) (12.30 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Child Protection (Offender Reporting and Offender Prohibition Order) Act 2004, the Corrective Services Act 2006, the Criminal Code, the Criminal Law Amendment Act 1945, the Criminal Practice Rules 1999, the Criminal Proceeds Confiscation Act 2002, the Disability Services Act 2006, the Mental Health Act 2016, the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992, the Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act 1994, the Victims of Crime Assistance Act 2009, the Weapons Act 1990, the Working with Children (Risk Management and Screening) Act 2000 and the Youth Justice Act 1992 for particular purposes. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Criminal Code and Other Legislation (Mason Jett Lee) Amendment Bill 2019 [\[155\]](#).

Tabled paper: Criminal Code and Other Legislation (Mason Jett Lee) Amendment Bill 2019, explanatory notes [\[156\]](#).

It is for Mason Jett Lee and for all the children who have lost their lives, including, tragically, Hemi Goodwin-Burke, and for future generations of children that this bill is introduced today. Let me start by acknowledging the presence of Hemi Goodwin-Burke's parents, Shane and Kerri-Ann, and grandmother Lyn in the gallery here today and also little Tee. I would also like to acknowledge other fierce advocates for law reform of this nature: from Act for Mason, Katherine—thank you for your presence in the gallery today—together with Nicole, the local coordinator for Toowoomba.

The killing of a child is a shameful crime. Any parent or carer who has held a child in their arms knows the vulnerability, the reliance, the trust that child has for you. No child deserves to be held in the arms of evil. All too often these arms are robbing innocent children of their lives. That could be 60, 70, 80, 90 years of living in this beautiful world with all its promise and its possibilities. This evil steals life from not just these children but also from their families and loved ones, thereby inflicting a life sentence of pain and heartache and, sadly, questions: why did this happen and why does this evil not seem to be punished sufficiently by the justice system?

According to the Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council's report into child homicide, offenders sentenced for adult manslaughter received significantly longer average sentences, at 8.5 years, than offenders sentenced for child manslaughter, at 6.8 years. These light punishments do not reflect the value of the child's life but have unfortunately formed strong precedent making it almost impossible for courts to deviate from them and apply a punishment that fits the crime—our bill will.

Case after case in Queensland has highlighted the injustice. A 19-day-old baby was shaken so violently that recovery was not feasible. The baby remained alive for 10 months, crying as if in constant pain and eventually passing away. The offender had a previous conviction for assault occasioning bodily harm. That offender was sentenced to only six years imprisonment for manslaughter. An infant was subjected to repeated violence over a period of time in which the offender contrived occasions to be alone with the child. In that case the infant died due to substantial physical abuse. The offender was sentenced to only seven years for manslaughter.

A toddler age four, who was punched in the stomach by his mother, later died of abdominal injuries. His mother was sentenced to nine years for manslaughter but was eligible for parole after serving four years. An offender who inflicted abuse on his one-month-old baby girl—the child suffering injuries including a fracture to the skull, ribs and legs, an underlying brain injury and lacerations to the liver and pancreas—was sentenced to nine years for manslaughter. A three-year-old who was punched by her father died a slow painful death and the offender was sentenced to nine years for manslaughter. An offender delivered a punch to his 10-week-old son's stomach while he was in the rocker swing. In the presiding judge's words addressed to the offender—

It is sickening to imagine what occurred. The child, of course, was totally oblivious to what was about to happen. He was a 10-week-old baby and totally innocent of the world. He had no idea of life, death or the duty that you, as his father, had to protect and care for him.

The offender was sentenced to nine years for manslaughter but eligible for parole after five years.

In the case of 18-month-old Hemi, who was beaten and killed by his drunken babysitter, the offender was sentenced to 8½ years for manslaughter with parole eligibility after four years. It is too tragic for words. And, of course, there is the case of Mason Jett Lee, after whom this bill is named: 22-month-old Mason, found riddled with broken bones, ruptured organs and bruised from head to toe. He was covered in vomit, blood had pooled around his neck and ears and a bruise had swallowed his eye. The tissue between the scalp and the skull was separated, believed to be from forceful pulling of his hair. There are other injuries too graphic to place into *Hansard*. This precious boy, not much older than my own 16-month-old son, endured hell on earth. His offender was sentenced to nine years for manslaughter with parole eligibility after six years.

I am still in disbelief when I think that these offenders who committed the most sickening of crimes have all been sentenced to less than 10 years imprisonment. The system is failing our children and it is failing the families of the victims, which is why the LNP has intervened to reset the scales and see justice served for families who have lost everything. This bill is fundamental if we are to restore the public's faith in the justice system. The bill strengthens the punishment imposed for the murder of a child under the age of 18 years by requiring the court sentencing the person to make an order that the person must not be released from imprisonment until the person has served a minimum of 25 years or more. This change follows in the footsteps of other Australian jurisdictions including New South Wales and the Northern Territory.

The bill seeks to introduce a new homicide offence in the Criminal Code which will sit between the murder and manslaughter provisions. It will apply to any child under 18 years. Under the new offence, a person who vigorously shakes, punches, kicks, stamps, throws, squeezes, suffocates, strangles or engages in any violent act that causes a child's death will be guilty of child homicide and face a minimum mandatory sentence of 15 years imprisonment. A person who sexually assaults a child which causes the child's death will be caught under this offence. The abuse of a child for sexual gratification resulting in death is a crime of unutterable gravity, which is why any person who rapes a child or does any sexual offence to cause that child's death will serve a minimum of 15 years imprisonment. A person who has a duty to care for a child and fails to provide the necessities of life for the child which causes its death will be caught under this offence.

Mandatory sentencing will raise the bar and bring Queensland in line with other Australian jurisdictions that impose sentences that accord with community expectations. The bill includes defences that will operate as a partial defence in very limited circumstances. I also want to stress that people who have the misfortune of being involved in an accidental death will not be caught by the new child homicide offence. Section 23 of the Criminal Code provides that a person is not criminally responsible for an event that occurs by accident. This section is relied upon to absolve a person from criminal responsibility where an act or omission has occurred independently of the exercise of the person's will or an event that the person does not intend or foresee as a possible consequence.

Therefore, an unfortunate event such as where a parent accidentally runs over a child will not be caught under the new child homicide offence. The parents of a child who makes his or her way to a dam and accidentally drowns will not be caught under this new offence. As always, the prosecution still

has the discretion to charge a person with the offence of manslaughter if they reach the conclusion that that is appropriate. This bill is deliberately targeted towards those who act violently towards a child or who neglect a child for whom they have a duty of care.

We cannot afford to fall short in considering these laws. Some have argued that aggravating factors, already plentiful across sentencing guidelines, will be measured against mitigating factors. However, sadly it will all too often ultimately result, as it has in other jurisdictions, with the scales tipping in favour of the offender and not the victim. In contrast, the LNP's child homicide offence guarantees the families of victims that their child's killer will serve a 15-year sentence. Evil is evil and no quarter should be given.

I note that reckless indifference is also a very high threshold for the Crown to meet. In New South Wales, the definition of murder has long included reckless indifference. However, despite that, there is ample evidence of case law that shows offenders who have violently killed children entering into plea bargains with the prosecution and pleading guilty to the lesser charge of manslaughter. This is not just a rhetorical argument. There are many cases where this has been borne out in practice in New South Wales.

In one case, the defendant pleaded guilty to manslaughter after initially being arraigned on a charge of murder. That case involved a brutal attack on a seven-month-old child. The offender took the child from a pram in the lounge room into the bedroom and struck the child repeatedly, with at least one punch to the head and one punch to the abdomen. At some stage, the offender applied a clamp to the baby's toes, causing the child to vomit and die of asphyxiation.

In 2008, another horrific case involved the unlawful and dangerous act of rape of a three-year-old child, causing the child to vomit and asphyxiate. The offender was acquitted of the charge of murder but found guilty of manslaughter.

In yet another case, a man shook a child, choked the child and then stomped on the child's chest. The man had assaulted the child on previous occasions. The court called the attack on the child brutal and stated that there was no evidence of any expression of remorse by the man. The offender pleaded guilty to manslaughter on the basis that he killed the child by an unlawful and dangerous act, which was accepted by the Crown.

All of those horrific New South Wales cases resulted in a conviction of manslaughter, despite the element of reckless indifference in a murder charge being available. The same will happen here in Queensland. The Crown will accept a guilty plea for the lesser charge of manslaughter. It goes on in New South Wales and it will happen here. It is a tricky legal fix couched in good intentions, but it will fail and it will fail Queensland children. It will fail to deliver justice to the families and loved ones of those children—that is, the men and women who have lost everything.

As I conclude, the determination and strength of the many advocates who have never given up on their calls for tougher laws must be recognised. I have already mentioned Shane, Kerri-Ann, Lyn and Tee in the gallery, as well as Katherine from Act for Mason, Mason Parker's grandparents Sue and John Sandemann, who are watching from Townsville, Bravehearts, the Daniel Morcombe Foundation—the list goes on. In Queensland law, punishment must reflect the seriousness of the crime committed. The criminal justice system needs to be seen as completely intolerant of violent crimes against children.

The front line is this parliament. If we do not denounce the violent killing of a child and truly and meaningfully toughen up the law, we cannot expect the rest of the justice system to toughen up. Unless the Labor government supports mandatory punishment for this most heinous of crimes, this parliament will be falling short of our solemn responsibilities and the community will judge us for it. Human life has to be valued and at the moment that value is just not there.

In honour of the memory of the children who have had their lives stolen from them and from their loved ones who are left with a lifelong grief, I commend this bill to the House.

First Reading

Mr JANETZKI (Toowoomba South—LNP) (12.44 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.


Referral to Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee

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

**CRIMINAL CODE (NON-CONSENSUAL SHARING OF INTIMATE IMAGES)
AMENDMENT BILL****Second Reading**

Resumed from p. 146, on motion of Mrs D'Ath—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (12.44 pm), continuing: Time will tell if the government's acceptance of the definition of 'consent' is sufficient for victims of the non-consensual sharing of intimate images. However, as the committee commented on page 31 of its report—


The committee recognises that technology is constantly changing and that this may impact on the efficacy of the new laws. The committee considers that it would be beneficial for the new laws to be reviewed three years after they commence operation to ascertain whether they are operating as intended, in light of continuing technological advances.

At the very heart of this bill are concerns around the granting or lack of granting of consent. I would add that it would be wise to also further consider the definition of consent when these laws are reviewed.

I conclude by reflecting on the remarks of the Office of the Information Commissioner to the committee when it specifically noted the pervasive use of social media platforms. It is a sad reality that these platforms are increasingly being used on a daily basis to bully and harass everyday Queenslanders, often for simply having a different opinion. In the last few years, social media in all its forms has become problematic. We know that there are those who unfortunately harass, bully and intimidate others. Certainly I have seen that in a professional capacity when treating patients who have been the victims of cyberbullying experiences. As all elected members of parliament would know, there are many on Facebook, Twitter and other platforms who set a very bad standard when it comes to public debate. Many of those instances have been investigated by the Queensland Police Service and other agencies.

Unfortunately, that comes down to the standard that is being set in the public context. We all need to set a higher standard. Parliamentarians and members of the community must set high standards so that young people can look to us and to other representatives in the community and say, 'Enough is enough.' Certainly we do not want young people to be the victims of bullying, harassment or intimidation through social media platforms, because many young people do suffer consequences such as self-harm and suicide.

The Anti-Cyberbullying Taskforce, made up of members from both sides of the House, has made some great recommendations. I acknowledge the LNP member of that task force, the member for Coomera. No man, woman or child should ever be the victim of online harassment and bullying, and it is just as important that no-one should ever be a victim of the non-consensual sharing of intimate images. I am pleased that Queenslanders will be afforded protection with the eventual passage of this legislation. As the LNP member for Caloundra eloquently put it, education is the key. It is very important to foster in young people a culture of respect as far as relationships are concerned. Certainly I work with my local schools, parents, principals, teachers and other community organisations to foster that culture of respect. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (12.49 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Criminal Code (Non-consensual Sharing of Intimate Images) Amendment Bill 2018. I want to start by commending the Attorney-General for bringing this important bill before the House and all my government colleagues for making this a priority in the first week of parliament for 2019. As members of parliament, we have an obligation and a duty to make the laws of this state better, to keep up with technology and to reflect our changing society. This is a government that has unashamedly reformed the way we deal with domestic violence and family violence in this state. Since we were elected we have made it very clear that we will not tolerate domestic violence—not now, not ever.

We have opened new shelters, introduced the offence of strangulation and committed hundreds of millions of dollars to addressing this scourge on our society. Last year we reformed abortion laws, giving Queensland women real reproductive choice for the very first time, which we know is critical to addressing the growing issue of reproductive coercion and abuse.

Now, in the first sitting week of this new year, we will be changing the law so that all Queenslanders know that distributing intimate images without consent is not okay and will not be tolerated. Make no mistake, distributing these images is an act of violence—one that has been experienced by an unbelievable 23 per cent of Australians aged between 16 and 45, according to a recent RMIT study. This is about power and control and it must be called out. It is also a gendered crime with women more than twice as likely to be targeted as well as a crime that disproportionately affects first nations people and people living with a disability.

It is important that we look at the impact of having a personal image distributed without consent. The RMIT study found that those who were victims were almost twice as likely to report experiencing high levels of psychological distress. These impacts were highest for those who had experienced threats to distribute an image—something that we have incorporated in this legislation. Eighty per cent of these people reported high levels of psychological distress consistent with a diagnosis of moderate to severe depression and/or anxiety disorder. This is a very important point as it goes to demonstrating the incredible severity of harm that can come as a result of threats.

The RMIT study also showed that victims also reported they were very or extremely fearful for their safety as a result. These actions are hallmarks of abuse. They show a callous disregard for the reputation, health and mental wellbeing of the victim and point to the potential for future escalated or continued stalking, harassment and domestic violence.

To stop these things from happening we need to do more than change the law. We need to change our culture. A recent study by the Jesuit Social Services' Men's Project spoke to young men between the ages of 18 and 30 about what they thought it meant to be a man. The results, quite frankly, were shocking. Those young men who self-identified as having traits commonly associated with toxic masculinity showed a very clear difference in their attitudes towards women.

The study showed that 46 per cent of young men had made sexual comments to women that they did not know in a public place in the past month. It showed that 57 per cent went along or did not take action when witnessing guys making sexist comments or jokes. Shockingly, it showed that 22 per cent of those young men went along and did not take any action when witnessing guys verbally or physically harassing women. These are terrible statistics. They show that we must do better and set better examples. As the mother of two boys, I understand my obligation and responsibility in this regard.

It is clear to see how these attitudes are left to fester, though, when we read about the behaviour of youth organisations such as the Young LNP in their self-produced newsletter recently which hit national headlines. This included motions to repeal no-fault divorce, sending us back to the dark ages when the women were the property of men, and a move to bring back the Miss Young Liberal pageant. These are the so-called future leaders of the LNP.

We need to teach young men and boys that women's bodies are their own. We need to teach everyone to respect and believe women and to act to stop unacceptable behaviour as soon as it presents itself. Kids need to learn about consent from a very young age. Culture begets culture and these attitudes do not come from nowhere.

It is clear where they come from when we look at the example set by the LNP—a party that has covered up and made excuses for the sleazy, harassing behaviour of the member for Whitsunday for the past seven years; a party that only acted when there was a threat of going to the media; a party that thinks it is acceptable for a member of its team to prowl beaches and sexually harass young women in bikinis. Quite frankly, that is appalling behaviour. I am proud to have called it out eight months ago while every single one of those opposite remained silent.

I conclude by acknowledging and thanking the contribution of organisations in my electorate that I know have been at the coalface of fighting sexism and gendered based violence such as revenge porn. I particularly acknowledge the Women's Legal Service. It is a great Queensland organisation which I share with the member for Miller. I also thank the Nurses and Midwives' Union. It has done an outstanding job in terms of changing the gender balance in our state, in the workplace, in social policy and in legislation in this House.

I also thank Micah Projects for their significant service to the state and to women in Queensland, particularly those women fleeing domestic and family violence. I thank them for their contribution. Today I stand here as a proud member of the Palaszczuk Labor government that is continuing to change the laws in this state for the benefit of women and young girls.



Ms BOLTON (Noosa—Ind) (12.55 pm): I rise very briefly to speak in support of the Criminal Code (Non-consensual Sharing of Intimate Images) Amendment Bill 2018 as over the last two days members have covered the issues extensively and extremely well and I do not need to replicate their words. All

efforts to stop the harassment, bullying and abuse that members of our communities are being subjected to are to be applauded. Bills of this nature are essential in sending a very clear message. There is no tolerance and can no longer be any tolerance for any form of these types of behaviours, including the sharing or the threatening to share of intimate images via any means.

Our communities continue to witness and consequently have to deal with the fallout from the many forms of intimidation and their associated negative impacts. These include declining mental and physical wellbeing, increased isolation, decreasing trust, domestic violence and incidences of violent retribution. We are seeing community divisions, a loss of belief in people, the destruction of relationships and a diminishing feeling of safety. This permeates and eats into the functioning of our social fabric, and it must stop. It is important to acknowledge that much online bullying and abuse, including images that are shared, is occurring without the target even knowing nor being notified about what has taken place.

I continue to ask users of social media to reject posts that carry images that defame, harass, abuse or intimidate others and wherever possible alert friends targeted by private means, moderators of these sites and also authorities so that action can be taken. To put an end to this takes all Queenslanders to support these efforts and report offenders, regardless of the method used. The government is to be commended for bringing this bill forward that has the transitional provision for retrospectivity and includes consideration of the needs of the transgender community. Thank you to the committee, departments, agencies, organisations and all involved. I commend this bill to the House.



Mr MINNIKIN (Chatsworth—LNP) (12.58 pm): It gives me a great deal of pleasure to rise and make a contribution in relation to the Criminal Code (Non-consensual Sharing of Intimate Images) Amendment Bill 2018. Like a lot of people, at the end of last year during the summer break I took the opportunity to do a bit of tidying up at home. I had an old box of camera gear. It had in it my beloved Canon T50 camera from many years ago—the old 35-millimetre camera.

A government member interjected.

Mr MINNIKIN: A great camera. I will take that interjection. I also had an old polaroid camera. My youngest son, who is 16, was there. He said, 'Dad, I saw the old camera there with the old negative film.' He was aware of that one. He was not too familiar or au fait with the instamatic polaroid from 30 or 40 years ago. I explained to him what it was all about.

I said, 'Let's just talk about that. There's a huge difference between what you have now in your pocket and your older brother has in his pocket. That is that everything and everybody is a walking/talking journalist and photographer.' It basically gave me a prompt to talk to him and remind him about what he gets up to on his social media platform. Fingers crossed, so far so good. It was still worthwhile taking that opportunity to speak to him about it.

There have been some great speeches on both sides of the chamber. Very occasionally there are some bills that bring us together as a chamber. This is one of those particular bills. I note from the outset that the LNP will not be opposing the bill.

I note that the committee recommended that this bill be passed. Again, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to make a contribution. I read in the explanatory notes what the background objectives of the bill are. It seeks to create a new offence to protect vulnerable people from the distribution or threats of sharing intimate images or recordings without a person's consent.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 pm to 2.00 pm.



Mr MINNIKIN: Before the lunchbreak I was saying that I have read the policy objectives in the explanatory notes. I note that the key objectives of the bill are to create new offences to protect vulnerable people from the distribution or threats of sharing intimate images.

There is a new offence of 'distributing intimate images'. Effectively, any person who distributes an intimate image of another person without the other person's consent and in a way that would cause the other person distress reasonably arising in all the circumstances commits a misdemeanour which carries a maximum penalty of three years imprisonment.

There are two new offences of 'threats to distribute intimate image or prohibited visual recording'. These include making a threat to a person depicted in the image or recording or making a threat to a person to distribute an image to another person. In this modern era, as was said before, when most people carry and have at their beck and call a high-powered camera with decent audio recordings, this legislation is not only welcome but I would say overdue. I commend all of the speakers who have risen in this chamber and supported the bill to date.

There is also a new 'rectification order' provision to allow the courts to direct convicted offenders to remove or delete images or prohibited visual recordings. I think that was also a very important part of this bill.

However, there are a couple of issues with the bill in terms of future considerations. Whilst members of the LNP on this side of the chamber do in fact support the objectives of the bill, some concerns have been raised by key stakeholders about particular aspects of the bill. I would like to dwell on those in the next couple of minutes, if I may.

One of the concerns was with the definition of 'intimate image'. Some stakeholders have raised concerns that the definition of 'intimate image' will not go so far as to protect people from specifically audio material and, therefore, the bill in its current form is constrained to past technologies. Whilst it is great that this legislation will go a long way to alleviating concerns in relation to an intimate image, so to speak, there is still a concern in relation to an audio digital file. That is something that I am sure will be looked at and hopefully discussed in consideration in detail.

Another concern is in relation to the definition of 'consent'. 'Consent' is defined in the bill as meaning 'consent freely and voluntarily given by a person with the cognitive capacity to give the consent'. Some of the feedback that I believe has been given to committee members from stakeholders is that they would like to see a provision explicitly stated in the bill making it clear that consent given on one occasion only does not apply to all other occasions.

Another concern is in relation to retrospective application. The bill only has prospective application and therefore offenders will face prosecution for conduct that occurs only after the bill is passed and becomes law. Essentially, victims who are currently being threatened or who are trying to have images removed or destroyed will have no remedy. The only option that victims will have available is to invoke the Commonwealth jurisdiction and submit a request to the eSafety Commissioner to have the image or recording removed. As I say, this bill has a lot of merits, but one anomaly or flaw is in relation to the lack of retrospectivity. Effectively, for some people who are feeling very vulnerable—and this bill is trying to alleviate their concerns—this bill may not be exactly the measure in all circumstances.

Another point that I have discovered in my reading for making this contribution is in relation to prosecuting a person acting anonymously. The bill fails to reflect circumstances where a person acts anonymously to upload prohibited images or recordings. This may include instances where someone uploads material from a device that has particular anonymising qualities to it such as a phone with a prepaid SIM card. I think that is a valid point. A prepaid SIM card is very cheap to buy and readily available. This circumstance may result in the prosecution being unable to prove who the offender is. I think that that needs to be flagged in this contribution.

Also, in the case where the prosecution cannot prove who uploaded a distressing image, a rectification order cannot be ordered by the court as this order can only be made when someone is convicted of an offence. The issue is whether there will be any restorative action that victims can rely on in circumstances where a person is not convicted of an offence.

At the end of the day—and I have made this clear already, as have many members on this side of the chamber—the LNP supports any measures aimed at protecting Queenslanders from intimidating and threatening behaviour, particularly in this modern era when it involves the non-consensual sharing of images that are and absolutely should remain private. Women, men and children should never be victims of such damaging conduct. There have been some sad but I think very timely examples raised by members on both sides of the chamber as to the deleterious effect that it can have on people's lives, not just in their immediate future but also potentially for the rest of their life.

In this day and age literally everyone has access to Google and within seconds can google anything they want—and more often than not some of the things that turn up can be a surprise packet. Again, I started this contribution making reference to my two sons. One is past being a teenager—he is 22. The other one, though, is 16. He is in that prime category for making sure that front and centre, as, relatively speaking, a digital native, he knows potentially some of the traps not just for young players but for old players as well.

This legislation is well and truly overdue. The best time to live I have always said is right now. The good old days were just that, but the best time to live is right now. Inherent in living right now is making sure that we are cognisant of some of the dangers of new technology. I welcome this bill.



Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (2.08 pm): I rise to speak on the Criminal Code (Non-consensual Sharing of Intimate Images) Amendment Bill in relation to the changing times and changing technology that I have witnessed over my established period of residency on this earth. The member for Chatsworth mentioned the time when the Polaroid hit town. I remember that a lot of young blokes—it was not me—had a lot of fun with the Polaroid when it arrived in town.

Mr Nicholls interjected.

Mr STEVENS: First of all it was black and white and then came colour. I take the interjection from the member for Clayfield.

Having a photograph passed around from person to person then was a little different to today when images are passed around on the World Wide Web. That is the difference today. All of these people who have sexual images on their devices are exposing themselves to the World Wide Web. There are people out there far more experienced than I who can hack into these things. The dangers lie in the first instance in taking the images and having them on the World Wide Web.

To be frank, I have great concerns about bringing legislation into this House that is going to be ineffectual. As we have heard from speakers in this debate over the last two days, we are all supportive of legislation to assist in combatting the non-consensual distribution of sexual images, but the legislation I like to see introduced in this House has to be efficacious in all cases. I have sincere concerns, and the minister will allay my concerns in summing up, about the ability to prosecute in this changing world of technology.

I understand the minister earlier in her contribution to the second reading stage said that she took on board the committee's request for a three-year review of this legislation. I would go further and suggest a sunset clause on this legislation because the technology will change so much in that period of time. It is not enough for government bureaucrats to monitor the changes in technology. In three years time we can be guaranteed that technology far greater than what we know about today will be available for the passing of this information and these illicit photographs. Every week or two there is new terminology—whether it be Tinder, Facebook or Twitter—around which I have no hope in Hades of ever keeping up with, but the younger generation is finding new sites all the time, is pursuing the latest technology and will find a way to circumvent certain matters for prosecutions and that concerns me greatly.

The sentiment behind this legislation is absolutely spot on. The work that has been done is spot on. However, I like to see legislation brought into this House which is enforceable. I make reference to the bikie gang laws that came in under the Bligh government a number of years ago which resulted in no prosecutions whatsoever. We are all supportive of this legislation and we are all supportive of making it effective. Even my good self on my Facebook site 'Ray Stevens MP' had a very—

Mr Minnikin: Chicken dance?

Mr STEVENS: No, it was a scene with a lovely mermaid on the Gold Coast, snapped by my good wife at the Gold Coast sand-sculpting festival on the weekend. A lovely mermaid is sitting next to me—two mermaids in the picture—and one might suggest that is a picture that might draw considerable concern and ire out there in the current me-too community. We have to be careful about which images are posted to our own sites. To that end, the bullying that carries on over some of these images is of major concern.

Mr Power interjected.

Mr STEVENS: I take the interjections from the member for Logan—consistent, annoying, repetitive and ridiculous interjections from the member for Logan. However, I am broad enough and strong enough to take his bullying with a grain of salt because I am a little impervious to—


Mr Nicholls: A badge of honour.

Mr STEVENS: Thank you, member for Clayfield. When the member for Logan starts to bully me, it is a badge of honour. I appreciate that. I am impervious to those matters, but a lot of sensitive, young people growing up have concerns about images and their place in society. They do not have the same amount of hard skin that I have developed over my number of years. I would like to be assured by the minister in her summing-up that this legislation will be reviewed or something will be done to cope with the new technology and images coming through.

It always concerns me how the media will respond to these matters. Had this legislation been passed several years ago, the then member for Redlands probably would not have missed out on preselection and consequently appearing in this House. Quite clearly, the then member for Redlands had non-consensual photos of himself—and I refer to what was commonly referred to as the plonking incident—circulated to certain sections of the media. Today the person who circulated those non-consensual images would cop up to a three-year jail sentence under this legislation. However, in those days it went willy-nilly first of all, I believe, to the Labor Party and then straight off to our good friends in the media who enjoyed the opportunity to further criticise political behaviour of some politicians when it was actually non-consensual passing of images—pretty ugly images, I can assure the House; quite revolting really—which should not have been passed in the first place.

That led to the demise of that particular member of parliament through preselection processes. The greatest warning for all members of this House is that politics is all about timing. Had that particular member been a member as of tomorrow, then those images may well not have been circulated to those great responsible members of the fourth estate, the media, who with glee published them. Are there any restrictions? I understand there are no exemptions for politicians being picked on in this legislation, but are there any consequences for the media who gleefully set upon these sorts of images for different purposes to spread the word and sell a few newspapers or TV shows around the place?

I am very supportive of the attempts in the legislation before the House today to stamp out the portrayal of images. However, the only way in my view that we will achieve that is through an education process. I call upon the education minister, who is deep in conversation over there, to put in place programs throughout Queensland schools to identify the negativity involved in placing yourself on the World Wide Web with images that tomorrow may be used to your great disadvantage. Prevention, in my view, is far better than the cure that this legislation proposes here today.

 **Mr NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (2.18 pm): It is always a challenge and a great pleasure to follow the member for Mermaid Beach. I have to say that after listening to the last four minutes of that very erudite, in-depth and well-resourced and investigated contribution there has been a heck of a lot of talk about members but not a lot of action. It is always interesting to hear his contribution on matters of technology.

Mr Deputy Speaker, you also raised the issue of the changes in technology, as has the member for Chatsworth, in relation to what we might euphemistically say were the good old days—in the days when someone had to get out a camera, load film into it and take a snap. It was restrained very much by the fact—unless they were a photographer or a home expert—that one had to take the shots down to the chemist or the local film processing place to get something published. That sort of restraint is not in place these days with the speed at which photos are taken and distributed around people's social networks and those sorts of things.

The world has indeed changed for the better in the vast majority of cases, but these changes need a response as well and a response to those circumstances and to technology. Here today we have a short bill that has led to a very lengthy debate, and I think that indicates the importance that members in here place on this legislation and on the protection of the community. That is a good thing.

Much has been said about this bill over the last two days, and I have had an opportunity to look at some of the contributions that members have made and their compelling support for this bill. The members for Ninderry, Nicklin and Macalister all referred to their experience in the Queensland Police Service. They all provided their good and thorough experiences and the frustrations they felt in many cases at not being able to prosecute people and deal with charges, particularly those charges relating to children—recognising that children and young adults perhaps act more impetuously and with less consideration than those of us who have been around a little longer. Having said that, there are some of us who have been around a little longer who have been caught in photographs that they wish they were not in as well. I can say from some experience that I have been in some of those—although not of the nature of those contemplated by this bill. Let me make that abundantly clear to members of the House. It would be horrendous for anyone to receive a photo like that in any event. It is important to reflect on the contributions made by those members about their experiences.

I also reflect on the contribution made by the member for Mansfield as a teacher. I can remember visiting one of the private schools in my electorate some years ago—probably seven or eight years ago—and the principal spoke with me about the issues that she was confronting and she said to me, 'Tim, the biggest issue we are confronting at the moment is the issue of cyberbullying amongst kids who have phones.' It was not just the transmission of sexually explicit photographs, although that was a part of it, but the whole gamut of actions. As we know, kids—both girls and boys—can be incredibly cruel, not realising perhaps how cruel they can be, although there are other times when they are very much aware of what they are doing. We have seen this come through. With all of the benefits of technology, there are responses needed.

I read the member for Gaven's speech. She claimed to be one of the few people in this place who grew up with technology and went to high school with technology, and she referred to MySpace. I reckon if I asked my 16-year-old daughter what MySpace was she would say, 'I've got no idea.' How long ago did that fly out to the end of the universe? As members know, I have three kids aged 18, 19 and 16 and I can say that Facebook is old news to them. They do not want anything to do with it. They are elsewhere. I say to the member for Gaven that it does not take long in this place for time to catch

up with you and sometimes pass you by. I read the member for McConnell's comments in relation to her daughter, Ally, who I think I have met at an event somewhere, and how she brought this issue to her.

I was struck by the comments made by the member for Miller, the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, a man who I consider has some considerable expertise. He said—

Technology is amoral; it can be used appropriately and well, and of course it can be used unethically and maliciously to cause great damage and distress to others.

I thought, yes, there speaks the voice of experience. He went on to say—

Today we live in a hyperconnected world. Today's technology provides us with broad opportunities to communicate and create; however, with those opportunities come great responsibilities—

The member for Miller had the responsibility to record his emails and to maintain them in accordance with the requirements of the Public Records Act—not to communicate in contravention of the Premier's directions in regard to the use of private emails. I thought the member for Miller had finally seen the light and come through. It was an interesting contribution from the member for Miller.

Ms Grace: I think this is a bit more serious than just emails.

Mr NICHOLLS: It is very serious indeed, and I have indicated the seriousness of it—as it was serious indeed for the member for Miller to maintain proper records of his communications with organisations, particularly those ones.

Mrs D'ATH: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member has had his fun. The fact is that it is not relevant to the bill and he should be brought back to the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stevens): Member for Clayfield, could you guide your remarks back to the bill at hand.

Mr NICHOLLS: I was indeed swerving back to the right lane. I was just responding to the interjection from the member for McConnel. If it had not been raised, I would not have been able to speak about it.

Ms Grace: I told you to get serious and get back to the bill.

Mr NICHOLLS: And I responded appropriately.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members! The member for Clayfield has the call. Please stop the discussion across the chamber.

Mr NICHOLLS: As I was saying, this is a serious matter. Today we see so many opportunities for others to act in ways that offend, shock, hurt, humiliate and harm. It is not just limited to those who are less able to deal with it or who have inadvertently shared or who have been caught out in a situation that I think the Deputy Premier described as a power situation—where someone is exerting power over someone else, particularly women. Inevitably, they are the situations that have the greatest effect.


This also happens to some of the most powerful and richest people in the world. We have seen in only the last 48 hours how Jeff Bezos, the founder of Amazon, a man worth billions of dollars, has been allegedly, according to him, almost blackmailed by the publishers of the *National Enquirer*, which led to that spectacular headline that ran in the *New York Post* that said 'Bezos Exposes Pecker', because Pecker is the editor of the *National Enquirer*. It happens around the world, and it is happening everywhere now, and I think it is important to recognise that.

In my own case, I have experienced similar issues with one of my children who had extraordinarily threatening and upsetting pictures sent to them with demands that pictures be sent back to the person who sent them. The police did investigate and finally found someone hiding behind a Facebook page—an adult—who was using those services and the connections that kids make at school and through friendships to try to get effectively sexually explicit pictures from a 13-year-old. It was incredibly distressing. The police did a fantastic job in taking action immediately and I want to acknowledge that. We know it is out there and we know there are unscrupulous people out there.

Obviously, this legislation will get the support of the House. Obviously, we want to see it work. Obviously, it will need to be updated as technology updates—no-one is disputing those things. There are issues around consent and those sorts of things, and they will be dealt with.

Importantly, over and above the legislation—as important as it is, as important as the penalties are, as important as it is that the police and the courts have the powers—is the importance of education. My wife and I have attended a number of school briefings about what goes on. I went to one where the expert who was providing the training did a scan of all 1,500 kids who were at the school the day before she turned up. It is amazing what you do not know your own kids have out there on the net. It is shocking. The way they talk to each other is eye-opening, as is the way they behave thinking it is secure communication—in the same way that we might have thought it was secure communication talking to

a mate or a friend somewhere else. They do all of that over the internet. We have to bring that education up to speed. Many schools do it. The system does it. This is one part of it. Education and the parents' responsibility has to be the other part of it.

 **Ms BATES** (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (2.28 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Criminal Code (Non-consensual Sharing of Intimate Images) Amendment Bill 2018. This bill seeks to create a new offence to protect vulnerable people from the distribution or threats of sharing intimate images or recordings without a person's consent, which is colloquially often referred to as revenge porn. However, for the purpose of this speech I will be using the term 'image based sexual abuse'. It is a much better term for capturing an array of perpetrator motivations, victim harms, image content and different behaviours where images are being used in some way to cause harm regardless of whether or not the perpetrator intended to cause harm and distress.

As shadow minister for women I feel a responsibility to speak to this bill as it is women—young women specifically—who are more often than not affected by this crime, and this crime has become so pervasive. A search of the Factiva media search engine using the term 'revenge porn' shows that in 2012 there were eight stories in the international media. Just three years later there were 3,176. The rise of image based abuse has been facilitated by our ability to create content and distribute it. This ability has been multiplied by professional facilitators and technology, such as porn site hosting, which can reach much larger audiences.

In 2014, at least 3,000 porn websites around the world featured the revenge genre. A 2016 study by the US Data and Research Institute showed one in 25 online Americans has been a victim of someone posting, or threatening to post, nearly nude or nude images of them without their permission. In Australia, research has shown 23 per cent of those aged 16 to 45 has been subjected to image based abuse. These laws are absolutely necessary and will bring Queensland into line with the rest of Australia.

The Labor government has been a bit slow in bringing these laws to fruition, but I thank them for raising such an important issue that is affecting all of our young kids. I tell honourable members that I am awfully glad that my children are not teenagers and that I do not have to bring up teenagers in an electronic world such as exists today.

At this stage we are one of three states that has not already introduced new offences around image based abuse. In 2016 a Galaxy poll of 800 adults, conducted for the *Courier-Mail*, revealed 90 per cent of those polled wanted a criminal offence created to deal with people who share a naked or intimate image of another person without consent. Despite this overwhelming support and the federal government and other state governments acting, it has taken a while for us to do it in Queensland. Again, it is better late than never.

The Commonwealth government has enacted similar laws that have already achieved successful convictions, some of these in Queensland. A case in point is the example of a Queensland woman who was in a relationship with a married man. The relationship ended and the man returned to his wife after which he was instructed to destroy intimate images of the victim. The man did not, and his wife posted them on Facebook. The wife was charged under Commonwealth legislation and convicted. This is an excellent example where these types of laws are absolutely necessary. While imperfect, the laws at the very least work to remove a number of barriers for victims of image based sexual abuse, the first obstacle being that until now there has been no specific criminal offence in place. As I said, we welcome the recognition.

Firstly, there have been concerns that a significant number of children under 16 will be prosecuted even when the 'victim' actually consented to the images being distributed. The Queensland Law Society recommended education for young people from the Queensland Police Service instead of resorting to investigation and prosecution. The Queensland Law Society recommended children and young people under 18 years of age should be exempt from Queensland's child exploitation material legislation and excluded from being placed on the sex offender register. This bill has not followed the approach taken in Victoria where anyone under 18 years of age who creates, possesses or distributes an intimate image of another minor who is less than two years younger than them will not be guilty of a child pornography offence.

We believe that the legislation should recognise that teenagers who engage in consensual peer-to-peer sexting are distinct from child pornographers. This would strike the right balance by ensuring child exploitation offences are appropriately addressed and children are protected whilst not criminalising the peer-to-peer sexual conduct of children and young people. We must consider that one

in three people aged between 16 and 19 and one in four aged between 20 and 29 has been the victim of image abuse. In its current state, this bill does not consider the impact that sentencing children and young adults will have, and we know that youth detention is already an issue in Queensland.


I agree with my colleague the member for Clayfield: they need education. We support the Queensland Law Society's recommendation to focus on education through the QPS.

Secondly, in the case where the prosecution cannot prove who uploaded the photo, a rectification order cannot be ordered by the court as this order can only be made when someone is convicted of an offence. The issue is whether there will be any restorative action that victims can rely on in circumstances where a person is not convicted of an offence. The Queensland Law Society recommended that a provision be included to permit a rectification order regardless of whether a guilty prosecution is achieved. In these cases, the victim may be able to rely on legislation enacted by the federal Turnbull government, the Enhancing Online Safety Act 2015—the Commonwealth act—and report the image based abuse to the eSafety Commissioner to have the images removed.

Finally, there are competing views from stakeholders about the utilisation of the defence of mistaken belief. On one hand, it is argued that the defence of mistaken belief should be available to defendants, as put forward by the Queensland Council for Civil Liberties. On the other hand, the Women's Legal Service recommended that the defence be explicitly excluded from the bill because there is potential for the effectiveness and protection that these new provisions give victims to be nullified and for perpetrator accountability to be avoided. In this instance the bill lacks consideration of these ramifications. Additionally, I hold personal reservations about the real-world application of any of these laws. We all want to see them enacted, but we see that IT companies like Facebook and Twitter really are toothless tigers when people make complaints to them. It is very hard to even make a complaint, let alone get Facebook to remove offending images of people.

Victims of image based abuse may feel uncomfortable reporting to police and proceeding with a prosecution because they are concerned about who is going to see or have access to these images. There is also the additional barrier in relation to sexual violence in that victims are reluctant to report to police for fear of being blamed or stigmatised. They are afraid they will be asked, 'Why did you take that image in the first place?', or, 'Why did you share those images?' This might be particularly pertinent for victims from particular age groups or cultural or religious backgrounds where it might be very shameful for the victim if friends, family members or the community more broadly discovered that these images existed, even if they never had access to them. These issues represent significant barriers to the successful prosecution of this law. In my opinion steps should be taken to ensure that these barriers to reporting are torn down.

We support any measures aimed at protecting Queenslanders from intimidating and threatening behaviour, particularly when it involves the non-consensual sharing of images that are and should remain private. Men, women and children should never be the victims of such damaging conduct. Publicly sharing sexual images of another person can destroy someone's life in so many ways. It can hinder their job prospects, their family relationships and strike at a person's overall wellbeing. It is unacceptable conduct and victims need to be protected. When we consider research that shows that one in five Australians has fallen victim to image based abuse, the victims of these crimes could be our daughter, son, niece, nephew, sister or brother.

 **Mr POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (2.37 pm): I too rise to speak to the Criminal Code (Non-consensual Sharing of Intimate Images) Amendment Bill 2018. Unlike the speaker who preceded me, the member for Mudgeeraba, I am one of those parents who currently has kids growing up in a very electronic world. I have five children—three girls and two boys—three of them teenagers as we speak and two who are not too far off their teenage years. I know already not only from what I have been exposed to through the work I have to do on social media but from watching my eldest two in particular, who are in the workforce, who hang out with mates, who have things posted on social media, that you walk a very fine line as a parent in wanting to be in their pocket the whole time and domineering versus trying to help them navigate what is an increasingly difficult world. I am incredibly grateful that I never had to experience this. It was tough enough as it was when we were kids, but it is so much harder now.

I have seen images when my son has been tagged into posts that, had his boss seen them, could have meant no job. I had to quietly suggest to him that he talk to his mate about untagging him and getting rid of the post altogether. Those kinds of things are certainly happening. The fact that we are now having to have a debate and bring in laws around the non-consensual sharing of intimate images is just tragic—absolutely tragic—but so necessary given what has been occurring. I think it is important

that we have a bill that creates new offences that relate to that non-consensual sharing of intimate images and to make sure they apply to not only the sending of such images without consent but also the threat of sending those images without consent. Other speakers before me have talked about the fact that this is often labelled the 'revenge porn bill'. However, it is not just about revenge porn. Revenge does not always form the basis of these kinds of actions.

The committee has produced a great report in relation to this issue. It talks about the fact that other motivations could include control, intimidation, sexual gratification, monetary gain and social status building. The fact is that individuals who are impacted by the non-consensual sharing of intimate images do not always know the perpetrator. Sometimes it is a complete stranger. I am grateful that we are here debating this bill, although it is tragic that it is needed.

It is important to point out that we have been a bit of a slow mover in this space. Other jurisdictions arrived at this point far sooner than we have. Indeed, South Australia led the way back in 2013, when it became the first jurisdiction to create such an offence. They were followed by Victoria the following year, and since then we have seen the ACT, New South Wales and the Northern Territory introduce similar legislation. It is my understanding that the Western Australian parliament currently has a bill before it also, and it is positive to see there is a lot of commonality between the laws. It is good to know that other jurisdictions are addressing this in a similar way to ensure that these kinds of criminal acts can be prosecuted.

For the constituents of Glass House it is important that I read into *Hansard* some of the key definitions contained in the bill which will become law. The bill states—


Intimate image of a person means a moving or still image that depicts the person engaged in an intimate sexual activity that is not ordinarily done in public or, that depicts a person's genital or anal region when it is bare or covered only by underwear or, that depicts the bare breasts of a female person or a transgender or intersex person who identifies as female.

It also includes images that have been altered to appear to show any of these things and images depicting a thing mentioned above, even if that thing has been digitally obscured, if the person is depicted in a sexual way. The bill is quite comprehensive in terms of what it will capture. Similarly, a very detailed definition of consent will be inserted into the Criminal Code which states—

Consent means consent freely and voluntarily given by a person with the cognitive capacity to give the consent.

I think it is very good to know that it assumes—and rightly so—that children under 16 are incapable of consenting to these new offences. During deliberations at the committee stage the department advised that this is in recognition of the greater vulnerability of young children and is a similar approach to that taken in the majority of other Australian jurisdictions. As a father of five, four of them aged 16 or under, I think that is an incredibly sensible addition to this legislation and I welcome it.

Finally, we need to understand what the penalties are if you are caught and prosecuted for these offences. The bill proposes to increase the maximum penalty from two years imprisonment to three years imprisonment for the offences of distributing a prohibited visual record and observing or recording in breach of privacy. We are going to see a potential term of imprisonment of three years for anyone convicted under these new laws. Whilst that might not sound like a lot, I certainly hope it will become the deterrence that we expect it to be. The kind of activity that we are talking about is despicable. It is disgusting regardless of the motivation, and therefore I applaud this bill and welcome its passing later today.

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (2.42 pm), in reply: I would like to begin by thanking all honourable members for their contributions to the debate on the Criminal Law (Non-consensual Sharing of Intimate Images) Amendment Bill 2018. I would like to respond to some of the matters that have been raised by honourable members during the course of this debate.

There was some discussion from members opposite regarding comments during the committee process about the need to avoid the overcriminalisation of children. That is what we do about young people who might be engaging in the sharing of intimate images, and we all have concerns about that. This is not about trying to criminalise, charge and prosecute young children who are engaged in sexting. It is about sending the very clear message that they should not be engaging in this conduct, we do not want them engaging in this conduct, and that there are consequences if they engage in this conduct.

Currently, independent of this bill, children who engage in experimental peer sexting could be captured by the offence under section 228C of the Criminal Code, distributing child exploitation material. This offence carries a maximum penalty of 20 years imprisonment. A conviction for this offence can have implications, including a person becoming an automatic reportable offender subject to the obligations under the Child Protection (Offender Reporting and Offender Prohibition Order Act) 2004.

Following passage of the bill, children who engage in experimental peer sexting may instead be captured by the new distribution offence with its lower maximum penalty, so if we are concerned that suddenly they are all going to be charged under this offence we need to make it clear that there are already very serious consequences. When I go out and talk to high school students, this is the one topic that I make sure I talk about each and every time to make it clear that, irrespective of whether they share the image, if they are under the age of 16 then the moment they take a picture of themselves they are creating child exploitation material. The moment they share it with someone else they are distributing child exploitation material. These are very serious offences. We need to try to get the message through that it is just not worth it and they should not do it.

The existing operational response to youth sexting in Queensland, which prefers prevention and education to criminalisation—and we have heard over and over again about the importance of education—will be adopted to support the appropriate application of the new distribution offence in these circumstances. Specifically, our police and prosecuting agencies will continue, as they do now, to be guided by the provisions of the *Queensland Police Service Operational Procedures Manual*, which notes that police adopt an alternative approach to investigation and prosecution focused on prevention and education in relation to young people of similar age sexting. Further guidance on this issue is provided by the guidelines issued by the Director of Public Prosecutions. Of course, in any case where a young person distributes an intimate image in circumstances that satisfy the elements of the offence, the decision whether to prosecute that matter will be a matter for the police and prosecuting agencies to determine. Sadly, there could well be cases where the deliberate non-consensual sharing of intimate images, which the bill aims to stamp out, are committed by young people.

An important element of this new legislation is the opportunity to use it to start a dialogue with young people in our community, to educate young people about the potential long-lasting harm caused by this behaviour and to educate them about the criminality of this behaviour. That is absolutely paramount. This bill provides an opportunity to discuss with young people the danger and risks involved in sharing intimate images of themselves. This is in no way to blame victims for non-consensual sharing; rather, it is an opportunity to talk to young people about the risks of the growing trend of sharing intimate images, even with people they may currently trust.

I have 16- and 18-year-old children—a son and a daughter—and it is a conversation that we regularly have. We need to educate not just our daughters about the sharing of images and the risks but also our sons about sharing images of themselves or encouraging or requesting young females to share images with them. It is so important, because the initial sexting is happening two ways. It is not necessarily gender based. We see that the sharing of those images is very much gender based and there is much more harm being done to young females. We hear statistics in relation to teenagers over 16, but I would really like to see the statistics pertaining to under 16s. I think they would horrify all of us, not just in this place but in the community. It is happening out there and we need to be having these conversations not just with our high school students but, very sadly, with our primary school students as well.

In terms of the operation and implementation of this legislation, I have absolute confidence in the policies and procedures of the QPS and the ODPP. We are also committed to the review of this legislation within three years to see how it is working. I will shortly take up the issue raised by the member for Mermaid Beach.

An issue was raised with the committee that the 'intimate image' definition does not include audio. This issue was raised by one submitter to the committee. It is correct that the new offences in the bill will not capture the sharing of audio recordings; however, there are existing avenues with the potential to address this conduct, depending on the circumstances involved, including under the Invasion of Privacy Act 1971 and the Commonwealth Criminal Code. I have to say that the committee process did not seem to show that this type of sharing is occurring and causing harm. The bill is quite rightly focused on intimate images. The definition of 'intimate image' is quite broad and it accords with national guiding principles, agreed to by the ministerial council in 2017, regarding the prevalence of the sharing of images. This is something we have been having a national conversation about and agreeing on what those parameters should be so that we can have as much consistency as possible across the country when we try to tackle these issues.

It is important to remember that images allow the easy identification of a depicted victim. That highlights the significant breach of the victim's right to privacy which the amendments in the bill will remedy. In an audio recording it is far more difficult to identify particular individuals. In an intimate image it is much more likely that a person can be identified, causing them harm or potential harm.

Matters regarding consent and the operation of the excuse of mistake of fact pursuant to section 24 of the Criminal Code were also raised by a number of members and with the committee. As I outlined in my second reading speech, this issue is outside the scope of this bill, but I am currently undertaking a consultation process with relevant stakeholders on the issue of consent and the operation of section 24 in relation to sexual offending more broadly. I will continue with that consultation. I also note, as other members have said, that the New South Wales Law Reform Commission is presently undertaking a review of consent provisions in their interaction with sexual assault offences.

The definition of 'consent' in this bill is 'consent freely and voluntarily given by a person with the cognitive capacity to give the consent'. This definition is consistent with the approach currently taken in the Criminal Code. This consistent definition recognises the vulnerability of persons with reduced capacity and recognises that offending can arise in situations of coercion, power imbalance and duress and in a domestic and family violence context. I will touch on that briefly. A number of members mentioned that this can occur in a domestic and family violence setting. What has not been mentioned is that, when that does occur and it has been identified that the offence has been committed in a domestic and family violence setting, that will be an aggravating factor when the court is considering the sentence that should be applied. It is very important to know that the provisions this House has previously passed around domestic and family violence and aggravating factors are relevant to these offences. We do not have a stand-alone domestic violence offence in the Criminal Code because the aggravating factor applies to all offences. Every time something like this is enacted, if it is done in the context of domestic and family violence, that becomes an aggravating factor. That is the way we want it to work.

Members raised the issue that this bill requires a conviction before a rectification order can be made. It is important to note that the provisions in this bill complement what already exists at the Commonwealth level and the powers of the Office of the eSafety Commissioner. The Enhancing Online Safety Act 2015 prohibits the posting of or the threat to post an intimate image without consent on a social media service, relevant electronic service or designated internet service; establishes a complaints and objections system; provides the commissioner with powers to issue removal notices or remedial directions; establishes a civil penalty regime to be administered by the commissioner; and enables the commissioner to seek a civil penalty order from a relevant court and issue an infringement notice or obtain an injunction or enforce an undertaking or issue a formal warning for contravention. This is a civil scheme that does not require a conviction, and there are civil penalties and powers of the commissioner through the courts. Importantly, on top of that, we now have a criminal offence such that when there is a conviction there are consequences and rectification orders through the Criminal Code. They really are about complementing each other. I want to reassure members that there is not a gap whereby a victim is not to be able to seek some remedy in relation to those images without a conviction.

In relation to crossing over jurisdictions, as with many other existing criminal offences it is possible that aspects of this new distribution offence may extend into other jurisdictions, including distribution beyond the Queensland border or even Australia, especially when we are talking about electronic distribution. Chapter 3 of the Criminal Code sets out the necessary nexus with Queensland before an offence can be prosecuted under Queensland laws where offending behaviour partially occurs in another jurisdiction. At a practical level, Queensland police are experienced at working cooperatively with their interstate colleagues when investigating offences that cross into other jurisdictions.

I pick up the issue of evolving technology and members being concerned that we will have to come back and fix this up potentially sooner than three years because technology is moving at such a rapid pace and asking whether we can futureproof this legislation. I am confident that we will not have to keep coming back on a regular basis to modify this because the definition that applies in relation to the distribution of the intimate image under our bill is section 207A of the Criminal Code. That is, 'distribute' is defined to include—

- (a) communicate, exhibit, send, supply or transmit to someone, whether to a particular person or not;
- (b) make available for access by someone, whether by a particular person or not; and
- (c) enter into an agreement or arrangement to do something in paragraph (a) or (b); and
- (d) attempt to distribute.

It actually does not mention technology. It can be distributed in any way. Someone could download a photo and show you. That is sharing an intimate image. It does not matter how it is distributed. It does not matter what change happens in technology. We are not mentioning phones,

iPads, computers or anything else. We do not know what the future holds in terms of distributing that image. It does not matter. This is not about the way it is distributed; it is about the fact that it is distributed or threatened to be distributed. We are hopeful that that means it captures any sorts of changes in the future about how that image may be captured and distributed.

I certainly agree with the comments made in this House that ultimately it starts with respect—teaching our kids to respect each other, adults respecting each other, leaders in our community respecting each other. It is about leading by example—every one of us in this House, every member of parliament at all levels, every professional, every teacher and every police officer. It applies to anyone in a position of authority who can be a mentor or influence others. We have a responsibility to lead by example—to show respect and teach respect. We cannot stand here and ask for respect and lecture people about their behaviour if we cannot behave that way ourselves, if we cannot show respect to each other. That includes on social media and what we say behind closed doors. It is so important that we get that message out there.

How can kids be asked to behave a certain way when they watch their parents online making vile, offensive statements about other people, whether they know them or not? What sort of example is that setting? We have to call it out. People in this chamber have heard me say it for all the years I have been here and I will keep saying it. If we do not accept that we need to change our culture and how we interact with each other, especially online, we may as well just shrug our shoulders and say, 'This is the new norm and we just have to accept it.' No-one in this chamber during this debate has said, 'This is just the new norm. Let's just accept it.' We know that this has to stop, but we have to change our behaviour and our culture and how we look at these things, and it is not just about sexual images; it is about how we interact with and treat each other.

In conclusion, I once again thank all honourable members for their contributions to the debate. This is an important step forward for the safety of Queenslanders. I want to thank the Premier for her leadership on this important community issue, including her leadership in establishing the cyber safety task force. I know some members have talked about bullying as well and, again, it is the same thing. We cannot lecture children about bullying and educate them about bullying when they are watching their parents and they are watching adults and they are watching people in authority bully each other each and every day, and we have to change it. People's lives are being lost and people are taking their lives because of these actions.

This bill is further proof of what can be produced with strong leadership and Labor governments, and I want to very much thank the departmental officers who worked to deliver this reform. I will continue every day to thank the Department of Justice and Attorney-General for the incredible work it does, the support it gives me as its minister and the work it does on behalf of Queenslanders each and every day. I once again thank all of the stakeholders who participated in the committee process and the committee members and the secretariat and the members of the House. I acknowledge and thank all of those organisations and individuals throughout Queensland that work tirelessly each and every day to support victims and seek to educate our communities about the risks and about the need to change our behaviour. It is with pleasure that I commend the bill to the House.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1 to 10, as read, agreed to.

Third Reading



Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (3.01 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a third time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title

Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (3.02 pm): I move—

That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to.

**WASTE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING (WASTE LEVY) AND OTHER
LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL**

Resumed from 6 September 2018 (see p. 2380).

Second Reading

Hon. LM ENOCH (Algerie—ALP) (Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef, Minister for Science and Minister for the Arts) (3.02 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I introduced the Waste Reduction and Recycling (Waste Levy) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018 into the Queensland parliament on 6 September 2018. The bill provides for a levy to be placed on waste disposed into landfill with supporting provisions for payment, monitoring and compliance. The levy will be paid on waste delivered to waste disposal sites within a prescribed levy zone. The levy must also be paid when waste from the levy zone or from interstate is disposed to landfill in a non-levy zone. There will be a number of levy exemptions available, such as for waste generated from a declared disaster. Importantly, the Palaszczuk government has included explicit provisions in the bill to ensure that Queenslanders will not pay more to put out their wheelie bin as a result of the levy. The bill was referred to the Innovation, Tourism Development and Environment Committee for detailed consideration, with the committee tabling its report on 22 October 2018. The government welcomes the committee's only recommendation that the bill be passed. I want to thank the committee for its support of the bill.

For six long years Queensland has been burdened with the legacy of the former LNP government's decision to repeal the previous waste levy. This decision led to Queensland becoming the dumping ground for waste from other states—interstate dumping that is legal. Not only are we seeing interstate waste continue to rise, but without an effective market signal like a levy we have seen significant underinvestment in waste management and recycling infrastructure compared to other states. Hopefully today we will hear from those opposite about whether they intend to provide certainty of investment for the industry or whether they would again repeal the levy if they were elected and send Queensland backwards once again.

The Palaszczuk government is introducing this waste levy to underpin a new comprehensive waste management and resource recovery strategy for Queensland. The strategy and this bill will provide the waste management and resource recovery sector with the policy certainty to upgrade and expand current infrastructure and incentivise investment in new and innovative waste management infrastructure in Queensland. The waste levy will mean landfill will become a less attractive option compared to more productive, environmentally beneficial and job-creating uses of waste. It will also provide a source of funding for programs for local government, businesses and the community to reduce waste creation and increase recycling and resource recovery. Importantly, the levy will also provide a disincentive for the interstate transportation of waste into Queensland.

In 2017 the former environment minister Steven Miles appointed the Hon. Peter Lyons QC to lead an investigation into the transport of interstate waste into Queensland. Following that investigation, the Lyons report made a clear recommendation that the government consider implementing a levy on waste disposed to landfill. The Palaszczuk government is acting on that recommendation as an important component of a new comprehensive waste strategy. Again, I want to thank all of the committee members for their consideration of this bill, including conducting public hearings in Ipswich and Rockhampton.

The committee report included statements of reservation from two committee members, which I will now address. The member for Noosa has supported the intent of the bill but expressed reservations about councils not receiving a sufficient allocation of levy funds as well as the lack of certainty about the subsidisation of councils and ratepayers if there were to be a change of government. I want to thank

the member for her support and note her areas of concern. A crucial element of the bill is the annual advance payments of 105 per cent to local governments to ensure that the levy will not have a direct impact on households. These payments will more than offset the costs of the levy on household waste, street sweepings and public place maintenance.

The strongest commitment that the government can make to these annual payments is to enshrine them in legislation. While it would have been possible to manage the payments like any other grant program, the government has decided to embed a requirement in the bill and to establish the formula for calculating them in the regulation. This provides certainty for councils and means that any changes in the future would have to go through parliament. This is specifically addressed in proposed section 73D, inserted by clause 6 of the bill, as it provides that the chief executive must make an annual payment to each local government affected by the waste levy, with the formula to be prescribed by regulation.

In respect of the use of levy funds, this government's 2018-19 state budget papers clearly state that between 2018-19 and 2021-22 the government has committed to spend 70 per cent of revenue generated on advance payments to councils, scheme start-up and operational costs, industry programs and other environmental priorities. Allocating 70 per cent of levy revenue for these purposes is unprecedented in Australia. No other state or territory reinvests that much from their levies. Clause 9 of the bill inserts a provision that requires the chief executive to prepare and make publicly available by 31 December of each year a report that includes the total amount of the waste levy paid to the state and the amounts of annual advance payments made to local governments. This information will be available to be compared with funding of relevant programs so that parliament and the public will be able to scrutinise whether the waste levy revenue is being used effectively and appropriately.

On behalf of the LNP members of the committee, the member for Scenic Rim also included a statement of reservation in the committee's report. I want to allay the concerns that the member for Scenic Rim has raised in that statement of reservation. Let me make it crystal clear that the Palaszczuk government has committed that there will be no direct impact on households. There will be no extra costs for Queenslanders to put out their wheelie bin. No other state in this country has a similar commitment.

For the vast majority of households, this process will be achieved through the annual advance payments to local governments. However, some Queenslanders in a diverse range of circumstances live in a place of residence that is charged commercial rates for waste collection, such as retirement villages and gated communities that are without council waste services. I can assure the member for Scenic Rim that these people have not been forgotten. The government's commitment will cover those circumstances and arrangements will be in place to assist those people. Further, I have instructed the Department of Environment and Science to develop a model for entering into arrangements with waste contractors, business operators and households in these circumstances to ensure that there is no direct impact on any resident caused by the introduction of the levy. Let me be very clear: those households will be covered by our commitment to Queenslanders that it will not cost them more to put out their wheelie bin.

Secondly, the member has made some extravagant claims about the amount that the levy will add to some services, such as building a house. Let us remember that every other mainland state has a waste levy and the construction industry has not only been able to accommodate it but also continued to thrive. In fact, New South Wales has the highest waste levy rate in the country and also has the highest number of small businesses. In addition, the top small business industry in New South Wales is construction.

We know that significant opportunities exist to improve construction recycling and recovery rates in Queensland. The *Recycling and waste in Queensland 2018* report that I released last week shows that recovery rates for construction and demolition waste was still at 50 per cent, which demonstrates that there is real room for improvement. The industry in South Australia has already had success, with recycling and recovery levels in excess of 90 per cent. Clearly, we can do better. The Palaszczuk government is committed to working with the construction sector to ensure that they can play its part in waste minimisation, recovery and recycling. To assist, I recently announced funding of \$2 million over two years from 2019-20 to support improved waste management initiatives for the construction industry. This was just one of several new measures that will be introduced alongside the \$100 million Resource Recovery Industry Development Program and the \$5 million levy ready grants program, which was announced in the state budget.

I am happy to inform the House that funding from the waste levy will be directed towards a number of important initiatives, including \$6 million in extra funding to expand the Community Sustainability Action grants program to include waste, koala conservation and threatened species programs; \$1 million towards a resource recovery industries road map and action plan to position Queensland as a leader in resource recovery; \$6 million for a regional recycling transport assistance program, which will support regional councils and businesses in overcoming additional challenges in diverting waste from landfill; and \$1.8 million to expand the successful ecoBiz program, developed by CCIQ, to help small businesses reduce waste.

Today, I am pleased to announce that waste levy funds will also be invested in further measures, including \$25.9 million over four years for compliance work to reduce the risk of litter and illegal dumping; \$3 million over two years to encourage Queenslanders to better manage their waste; \$1 million over four years to support a school based education program to help our kids learn more about recycling; and \$1.8 million to support key actions in the waste strategy, including new product stewardship programs, plastic pollution reduction and support for regional, remote and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities. Further programs will be announced as we continue preparations for the implementation of the levy in our state.

The member for Scenic Rim also expressed concerns about the impact of the levy on regional areas. I encourage those opposite to consider the positive opportunities that will come from this bill as it will boost and create better local recycling outcomes in regional areas. I am confident that the investments that I have just outlined from the waste levy funds will go a long way to supporting regional communities through this transition. Food and organic waste, as well as the re-use of heavy construction and demolition materials, provide opportunities to build new industries, jobs and assist in limiting the sending of these materials to landfill. Nevertheless, this government recognises the additional challenges faced by regional areas that are far removed from major downstream recycling facilities. As I said earlier, we have initiated the regional recycling transport assistance program. This program will support regional councils and businesses in overcoming these challenges and facilitate increased recycling and resource recovery in regional areas.

Finally, following concerns raised by the member for Scenic Rim and other opposition members, and following discussions with the Goondiwindi Regional Council itself, I can confirm that the Goondiwindi local government area will be included in the levy zone. The zones will be updated in the final amending regulation. The Goondiwindi Regional Council is an excellent example of a council that has taken a number of significant steps to improve its waste management services over the past few years. That council is a great case study for other councils. I encourage councils to look at what they have done and see what they can learn from its work.

Before moving on from the committee report, I want to thank all of those who have made a submission to the committee or appeared before the committee in its public hearings. Submitters have been willing to detail their specific circumstances. Those insights have proved invaluable in streamlining and improving the regulatory framework. Similarly, I acknowledge the many businesses and local governments that have been engaging directly with the department about implementing the levy at their own site.

Since the introduction of the bill and the tabling of a draft of the associated amending regulation in September 2018, local governments, industry and community members have had an opportunity to comment on the details of the waste levy proposal. Submissions to the committee inquiry from many organisations, including the LGAQ, argued for the commencement date of the levy to be moved to 1 July 2019 and for annual increments to be aligned with the start of each financial year. We have listened and agreed to these proposals. Today, I will be moving amendments to the bill during its consideration in detail stage that will move the start date of the levy to 1 July 2019. This is a clear example of how the Palaszczuk government listens and how we want to make the administration of the levy as simple as possible for councils and private landfill operators. The levy increment dates are set in regulation along with the levy rates. These will be adjusted in the final amending regulation.

I also propose to move additional amendments during the consideration in detail stage of the bill that address directly a number of issues raised by stakeholders. Importantly, I will be proposing amendments to exempt three particular waste streams from the levy: waste from severe local events, such as storms and flooding; litter and illegally dumped waste collected by or for the holder of a forest plantation licence; and appropriately treated acid sulphate soils. Following representations from the LGAQ on behalf of councils, I will also propose an amendment to provide a temporary three-year levy

exemption for road scrapings—or road planings as they are also known—for regional councils outside South-East Queensland. This is another way we are helping to make a smooth transition for regional communities.

Other amendments will allow reasonable concessions to avoid excessive red tape, or unintended impediments. For example, the legislation will ensure that small unstaffed sites in the non-levy zone do not need to record waste deliveries if they have taken all reasonable steps to ensure that waste from the levy zone, or interstate, will not be delivered there. The legislation will also exclude certain landfills from levy liability if they provide only for the appropriate disposal of waste from certain resource activities, or a single type of waste prescribed by a regulation. Similarly, certain landfills will be excluded from levy liability if they are only for the remediation of contaminated land generated by an historic activity that is now appropriately operated and licensed.

The amendments will also remove the requirement to measure waste delivered to a resource recovery area in a small vehicle, which removes unnecessary infrastructure upgrades. The amendments also expand the eligibility criteria of landfill operators for bad debt credit where deliveries are made to resource recovery areas. I will also be moving amendments to clarify some provisions of the bill.

I advise the House of the significant progress being made to get ready for implementation of the waste levy. The \$5 million 2018-19 Local Government Levy Ready Grant Program has been established as a one-off grant to eligible local governments for levy ready landfill upgrades in advance of the commencement date. In total, 60 project proposals were received from 34 councils requesting \$4.99 million of the total \$5 million of funding available. Every council had at least one successful application, with grants ranging from \$6,000 to \$570,000. This will fund activities, including upgrading IT, installing or upgrading fencing, security cameras, signage, weighbridges and other infrastructure required for efficient, accurate and secure levy collection at council landfill facilities. I acknowledge the many councils who have contacted me directly to thank the government for this funding.

The \$100 million Resource Recovery Industry Development Program has been established to develop a high-value resource recovery industry in Queensland. Stream 1 of the program closed on 23 November 2018 and received 79 applications, with around 20 of these coming from local governments. This fund is being administered by the Department of State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning and the successful applicants will be announced by Minister Dick in the coming weeks. This funding is, of course, being backed in by the Department of Environment and Science's work supporting local councils and businesses to be levy ready and to get the most out of the changes.


Earlier in my speech I mentioned that the government is reinvesting waste levy funds in a new comprehensive waste strategy. I am pleased to inform the House that today I am releasing a draft of that strategy for public consultation. The previous waste strategy released by the former LNP government was woefully inadequate for supporting Queensland's management of waste. This new strategy provides important targets for landfill reduction and recycling and, importantly, it will help industry, government and Queenslanders change how we think about waste. The waste levy being introduced in this bill will underpin that strategy. I encourage members to review the strategy and promote the consultation in their communities.

While we develop this new strategy for Queensland I will continue to call on the federal government to lead a national approach to waste management. This includes a long overdue plan for the harmonisation of waste regulation such as levies and interstate transportation. State governments have been left to do the heavy lifting in this space and it is time for the Morrison LNP federal government to show some leadership, something that was raised at the last meeting of environment ministers late last year. I know that other states and territories that currently have waste levies were very keen to see the federal government step into this space and ensure that there is some harmonisation with regard to levies in particular.

Lastly, I want to say that this bill will modernise waste management in Queensland with the introduction of a waste levy. It will change how we manage waste, which is great news for our environment, of course. It will also be a huge boost to our economy; creating new jobs and driving significant economic growth as we make better use of resources and develop new industries. I have said before in this House that we know already that from every 10,000 tonnes of waste that goes to landfill only about three jobs are created. If that same 10,000 tonnes of waste is recycled, it is more like nine jobs that are created. There is an economic opportunity in ensuring that we divert from landfill and

support recycling and recovery in this state. But, of course, we must have the correct market signals to be able to do that and that is why this bill is so important for the future of Queensland and so important in terms of modernising the way that we manage waste in this state.

There is a groundswell of community support for managing waste better in Queensland. The Palaszczuk government is leading the way. Wherever I have been across this state, and I have been going to waste management facilities across Queensland over the last few months, people are very keen to ensure that we have a new, modern way to manage waste in this state. There are school communities, individuals, families, community groups and others who are absolutely passionate and have got on board in terms of this war on waste and they are calling for the right mechanisms, the right market signals, to ensure that we have a modern way of managing waste in this state. We can no longer be the dumping ground for other states. We can no longer be behind the eight ball in terms of every other state that has been investing in recycling and recovery industries. That is why this bill is incredibly important. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr CRISAFULLI** (Broadwater—LNP) (3.25 pm): The LNP will be opposing the Waste Reduction and Recycling (Waste Levy) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. We will be opposing it because there is so much wrong with it. We will be opposing it because it is a broken promise. It was not even flagged as one of the four new taxes that were dumped on Queenslanders at a minute to midnight. We will be opposing it because the reason for its implementation is so very disingenuous. I will articulate the reasons given to try to justify a new tax on Queenslanders. We will be opposing it because Queensland families will bear the cost, despite the promise from the Premier and just now from the minister. This new tax will, in fact, hurt each and every Queenslanders each and every day. We will be opposing it because it is not a levy at all, it is a tax, it is a money grab, and even with the minister's concessions today still nearly 90 per cent of funds collected will return to government in some form or another.

I will start my contribution with why this is a tax and why the new taxes of this government are so very wrong. When those opposite came into this place during the budget and announced the four taxes I made the point that it would impact everyday Queenslanders. I want to draw a parallel between those and, indeed, this tax. Those opposite have sought to somehow say that these taxes, including this one, will not affect the everyday person, that somehow it is a tax that will only be borne by in this case business and in other cases investors. That is wrong.

In the case of the car stamp duty tax, if you do not believe it will impact the person who has put everything on the line and made themselves a business where they employ people and have a car dealership that happens to sell cars that are over \$100,000, think about the young apprentice, the young girl who just wants to turn up and push a spanner and make a contribution. If you are not willing to believe it will impact the person who has worked hard and wants to buy an expensive motor car to enjoy, think about the retiree who just wants to buy a motorhome and get on with their life and enjoy what they have worked so hard for.

Another two taxes that, like this one, will impact everyday people are land tax and property tax. If you are not willing to believe it will impact the developer who every day has to try to find a way to make it work, and those opposite somehow think that people in the development industry are scurrilous people and not worthy of any kind of status.

A government member: Who said that?

Mr CRISAFULLI: My goodness! If you do not think it will impact that person, think about how it will impact the tradesman who just wants to have a job on a building site. In the case of the wagering tax—the punters' tax—think not about the stable owner, but about the apprentice jockey.

This tax is the biggest of them all. It raises more than all four of those put together, but the government made no mention of it. It was not even included in that Thursday night dump after the blackout had commenced; it happened afterwards. This is \$1.3 billion and to somehow think that that is magically going to appear without impacting Queenslanders—boy, oh boy—wait for July when the skip bins start arriving. Wait for July when the small business owner has to say, 'Sorry, my price has to rise.' Wait for July when the young couple looking to put a deposit on their first home are told it will cost them a little more. It is the biggest tax of them all, but there was not a single mention of it.

Mr Krause interjected.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I assure the member for Scenic Rim that I will get to that. The reason for the implementation has been a moving feast. It did not start with interstate waste dumping. That was the third excuse. The first excuse was because China stopped taking our rubbish. That was the reason

given as to why we needed this to start, but that did not cut it with Queenslanders. Therefore, those in the back room spun the needle around and found another excuse, which was that the Ipswich City Council—and we will talk more about the Ipswich City Council later on, as I still have 24 minutes—said that it would stop recycling because costs had increased. My goodness, didn't we see the community blow up over that. That excuse did not wash.

Finally, in a stroke as if from a political master class, they came up with the idea about being parochial Queenslanders and stopping interstate waste coming across the border. It is interesting that we did not talk about better compliance or the fact that they are not surging across the border and going to the Gold Coast dumps, which are closer. We did not talk about the fact that there is not a whole heap of builders from Lismore driving to the Smithfield Transfer Station in Cairns to save a few bucks. That is not really happening, either.

Mr Krause: Or Beaudesert.

Mr CRISAFULLI: Not even Beaudesert. Somehow, because half a dozen dumps in Ipswich were approved with the consent of those opposite and promoted by a council that many of those opposite have political allegiances with, interstate dumping became that excuse, without any mention of why compliance should not be looked at. The argument that you are going to tell a builder in Cairns, Townsville, Mackay or Rockhampton that they are going to be asked to pay more because someone from Sydney might be looking to use the same facility that they use is an absolute absurdity.

I move on to the Premier's comment that families will not bear the cost. I will take that comment at face value and I will accept that the Premier was not in fact attempting to mislead, but that she believed that because of the kerbside offset that makes up a large portion of the revenue raised. However, if that is the case, the Premier's complete and utter lack of understanding of how business operates is very sad and very disappointing. Businesses cannot absorb the cost. That is not how business works.

I must briefly take the minister to task for saying that it was the opposition that talked about the impact on house prices. The opposition was responding to feedback from reputable organisations. The Master Builders said that the impact will be a four figure increase on the cost of building a new home. The Housing Industry Association said that it will add about \$1,500 to the cost of building a new home. Therefore, to say that other places have a waste tax and a strong building industry does not change the fact that that cost will be put on businesses that cannot afford to absorb it. I can tell the House that at the moment not many builders carry \$1,500 in fat and are able to absorb that added cost. Things are really tight. I can assure the House that if someone tells a builder, particularly in a regional city, that they can absorb \$1,500 with no problems and without increasing the cost of building a new home, that person would probably be given a lesson in economics.

The Local Government Association of Queensland has said that there will be impacts on rates because they cannot absorb the cost. We heard that feedback from the Noosa council, and the member for Noosa is here. We heard that feedback from councils that do not have a political axe to grind with the government. The Townsville City Council said inevitably there would be an impact on rates. They gave a figure of around \$15.

The council I feel most sorry for is that of Mount Isa. For some reason, Mount Isa has been included in this. I urge the minister to consider whether that is appropriate at the best of times; certainly it is not appropriate at the moment. The member for Traeger can tell us about how much pain his community is going through. The Mount Isa City Council believes that the cost will be in excess of \$300 per ratepayer. In fact, the figure that the Mount Isa City Council issued was \$320. That is a massive impost on a community at a time when they cannot afford it.

The minister praised the member for Scenic Rim, although I am not quite sure that the member for Scenic Rim was looking for that praise. The minister said that the member for Scenic Rim had campaigned to include the Goondiwindi Regional Council. I will let the good member speak for himself, but I believe he was drawing a comparison by saying that a council of a similar size to Mount Isa was not included. I am not quite sure whether or not he wants to accept that. Maybe the chairman of the committee can take the credit, but I do not think the member for Scenic Rim will. We will let him determine that later on. However, the point remains that it seems absurd that Mount Isa would be included, despite its proximity to the Northern Territory border. Not a lot of interstate waste comes from the Northern Territory into Camooweal or the Isa. However, this will create a lot of pain at a time when that community can least afford it.

There will be a three-figure increase on the cost of hiring a skip bin. That is undeniable. A lot of people hire skip bins to clean out their homes and a lot of businesses use them, as well. That pain will be felt.

In all of this, the cruel irony is that the regional centres will bear most of the cost and most of the pain from this levy. They do not have problems with interstate dumping. In fact, only one city had problems with interstate dumping. In many cases they do not have the critical mass to make commercial opportunities out of recycling. They are less likely to be able to generate new industries on the back of it. In a cruel twist, they may in fact be subsidising others for a tax that will not benefit them in any way, shape or form.

If we add the \$75—the \$70 levy is \$75 before it starts—I would suggest to members that there will be regional centres of this state that will be charging close to \$250 a tonne. That puts it right up there in terms of the pain factor for small businesses. There will undeniably be regional centres that will very shortly be charging over \$200 a tonne. I would suggest that that will be closer to \$250 sooner rather than later.

Both the Waste, Recycling Industry Association and the Local Government Association—and I place on record that both those organisations put a lot of work into their submissions—have advocated for a separate rate for regional Queensland and the south-east. The minister did not touch on that in her opening remarks, but she may later. They pushed that case very strongly because of the discrepancy, because there are fewer opportunities for those industries and because of the cruel cross-subsidisation that I have spoken about.

It will be in those regions where the populations are less, where distances are more and where the opportunity for surveillance is less that there will be a greater challenge around illegal dumping. I commend what the minister said in her opening remarks about a fund for that. I assure the House that illegal dumping will be a massive issue as a result of this legislation. It makes so much sense that people will seek to flout the law. That is a challenge that needs to be addressed.

I said in my opening remarks that this is not a levy, it is a tax. I talked about the reason for this being interstate dumping. As part of the sell those opposite said that this would be a great opportunity to do good things for the environment. Even with the extra funding the minister has announced today, it is only about one in every 10 cents of the levy that will go towards the environment. Nearly 90 per cent—it was over 90 per cent—in some way, shape or form will go to government. That is not a levy; that is a tax.

The place where I entered public life was local government. If we called something a levy we had to put it to the purpose for which it was levied. A third of this goes to consolidated revenue. That is a tax grab.

Ms Enoch interjected.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I do not, Minister. I will take the interjection from the minister who said I have the numbers wrong. I am sorry, but I do not. Whether it is a council or the state government or whether it is money to administer the scheme, it is going to government. About nine cents in 10 will make its way to a government. That is not environmental programs. That is government money. That is a tax for government under the guise of a levy.

One of the shining lights to date has been the Resource Recovery Industry Development Program. It comprises the greatest percentage of the money that is not going to government—about eight per cent, hallelujah. Would it not be great if some good could come out of that? Would it not also be good if attached to that was a real focus on ensuring planning and policy settings to avoid the pain that has been inflicted on some communities through poor planning and also revenue opportunities facilitated.

In my remaining time, I want to talk about some of the amendments. First of all, I place on record my sincere thanks to the minister for briefing me ahead of today—as she has done on multiple occasions. I say thank you for that. Included in the amendments to the act is a recognition of a disaster event. Its omission in the first place was crazy. Can anyone imagine asking communities and councils to pay a tax that goes back to government during their hour of need? That would be absurd. That is a great change. The inclusion of naturally occurring acid sulphate soils is excellent.

Following representations from HQPlantations—and many of those opposite would know HQPlantations—illegal dumping in plantations administered under the Forestry Act will be exempt. The arguments put forward by HQPlantations involved a number of things. It included them saying that illegal dumping would be more prevalent because of this tax. They are right. The government's

response says that the reason the plantations had been included is that they have to facilitate community access. That is true, but that does not take into account that HQPlantations believe that because they have large open sites spread across the state they would be subject to illegal dumping. I put it to the minister that there will be people like farmers who have blocks in close proximity to domestic scenarios who will experience similar pain and who may have to pay the levy themselves.

The things that are not included in the changes to the act the minister has flagged will be included in the changes to the regulation. There are many things that are not included that must be included. There should at least be a pointer that they will be subject to regulation. We might well trust the minister, but this parliament should be making sure that other ministers cannot, with a flick of a pen, change it.

Let me go through some of them. Municipal waste is one. This goes to the heart of my first issue with the Premier saying that it does not impact everyday Queenslanders. Waste generated from council facilities such as parks is not included in these changes. We hear that that will be included in the regulations. The minister said that road scrapings will be in the regulations for three years. What about long term and what about putting it in the act?

As I said at the committee hearing in Ipswich—the chair of the committee is in the chamber so I thank him for allowing me to appear—councils do not do roadwork on the day that people put their bins out so that they can throw their waste in their bins to save a few bob. That will be a cost that councils will bear. Beware that there is a three-year sunset on that. There are also things like fly-ash, contaminated water and biosolids. Now the big one. Those residents, everyday people, who have arrangements with private contractors for one reason or another are not included in this act we are voting on today. That is wrong.

I went to the Sunshine Coast with the member for Ninderry and the member for Nicklin. We went to a retirement home—a lifestyle village—where they have a private contractor come along and collect their waste. They are not included. Boarding houses are not included. Gated communities are not included. Unit complexes are not included.

Whilst the minister says it will be included in regulations, surely we can put it in the bill to make sure that we send the clearest of signals that this place believes that all Queenslanders, all residents, should be exempt from this tax when it comes to their front door because they are going to pay it in many, many other ways. Surely, as I said to the minister publicly and privately, there must be a way to include it in the bill to ensure that protection, in the same way that in section 73D the council payments are listed.

In conclusion, I again stress that the LNP will be opposing this bill. We will be opposing it because it is, in fact, a broken promise. We were told what the new taxes would be. I did not like them. I did not think there was sufficient time to debate them, but they were announced within 72 hours of an election—maybe less—but this one was not. That is a big breach of trust. Each and every time the big truck comes to pick up the big bin they will be reminded of that breach of trust—

Ms Boyd: Getting lectured about breaches of trust from you is a bit rich. I think there are 20,000 people who would like to talk to you about that.

Mr CRISAFULLI:—including in Pine Rivers and right across-the-board. They will be reminded of it all the time.

We will be opposing this bill because the reasons for implementation have been disingenuous. It started about China because they would not take our waste. That did not work. Then it moved on because one council—ironically the one council that has caused so much pain through bad planning and bad management—said that it would not recycle. That is when we said, ‘Yes, this will be it.’ That did not wash. In the end, the interstate dumping excuse came through with a little sweetener. The sweetener was, ‘Don’t worry. This will be a great thing for the environment.’ I would argue that putting nearly nine out of every 10 cents back to government and only one out of every 10 cents back to the environment is not good for the environment. That looks like window-dressing on a big new tax.

I conclude by saying the opposition will not be supporting this bill because it is, in fact, nothing like a levy and everything like a tax.



Mr PEGG (Stretton—ALP) (3.53 pm): I rise to speak in favour of the bill. It is interesting to follow the contribution from the member for Broadwater. He stood up here and told us in his lengthy contribution that he was going to give us a lesson in economics. I found it really interesting—quite amusing, in fact—that the member for Broadwater would attempt to give us on this side of the House a lesson in economics. Let us not forget that this is the man who sat in the Newman cabinet. In fact, he was a member of the CBRC when decisions were made by the member for Clayfield and the member

for Kawana to sack public servants, to cut funding and to attempt to sell their assets. Forgive me if we are not prepared to take an economics lesson from the 'Wizard of Id' of the Queensland parliament—the member for Broadwater. That is something that we are not prepared to cop on this side of the House.

The member for Broadwater used to be the member for Mundingburra. He used to be the minister for local government in the Newman administration. In his long march from Townsville to the Gold Coast—

Mr Crisafulli interjected.

Mr PEGG:—in the now member for Broadwater's long march from Mundingburra to Broadwater, he has managed to reverse his position on a whole heap of policies that he used to wholeheartedly support. He is still quite vocal about some of them, clearly.

I will give the member for Broadwater some credit. In relation to the waste levy, at least the member for Broadwater is consistent. I will give him that. When the member for Broadwater was the member for Mundingburra, he was the minister for local government in the Newman government. In the debate on the waste reduction and recycling amendment regulation, he concluded by saying, 'I say good riddance to bad rubbish!' He said, 'It was a despised waste levy.' He went on to say, 'I say good riddance to bad rubbish!' That was back in July 2012. I find that really interesting. He was saying good riddance to bad rubbish when, in fact, when the levy was repealed all the rubbish started coming across the border. He was saying good riddance to bad rubbish when, in fact, he was welcoming the rubbish across the border. Since 2012, over 3.5 million—

Opposition members interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms McMillan): Order!

Mr PEGG: Rather than saying, 'Good riddance,' the member for Broadwater when he was the member for Mundingburra was effectively saying, 'Welcome.' What we have seen since then is over 3.5 million tonnes of waste trucked across the border into Queensland and 1.2 million tonnes in 2017-18 alone—a shockingly high increase of 37 per cent. In fact, the *Brisbane Times* reported that, if you lined up all the trucks coming into Queensland to dump rubbish last year, they would have been stretched from Brisbane to past Mackay.

You only have to talk to all of the Ipswich members on this side of the House. I do not know what the Ipswich members who were on that side of the House back in 2012 were doing. They clearly were not standing up for their communities against the likes of the member for Broadwater, the member for Clayfield and the member for Kawana because they are shocking statistics. He was not saying, 'Good riddance.' He was saying, 'Welcome.' They should have had some photos of the member for Broadwater on the border, welcoming the trucks coming in.

I want to thank the members of the committee who were involved in the inquiry in relation to this bill—the member for Cook; the member for Jordan; the deputy chair, the member for Scenic Rim; and, last but not least, the member for Noosa. I thank them for all of their hard work in relation to the bill. I also want to mention the committee secretary, Kate McGuckin. She retired this week. We had our final committee meeting with Kate on Monday and all committee members had a chance to say farewell and goodbye and thank her for her contribution. I am sure I speak for all committee members in placing on the record my thanks for the work she did in this committee. She made a huge contribution to the committee secretariat and the Queensland parliament over many years.

I also want to thank the individuals and organisations who made written submissions and who participated in the public hearings. We had public hearings in both Ipswich and Rockhampton. I also want to place on the record my thanks to all of those at the Riverview Recycling and Refuse Centre and also at Boyne Smelters in Gladstone who hosted site visits by the committee. They were very enlightening. In relation to this particular bill, the committee did recommend that this bill be passed.

I talked about the chequered history of the now member for Broadwater in relation to this particular issue. It is a very chequered history not only in relation to this particular issue but in relation to a lot of issues in this place. When it comes to the repeal of the waste levy, there is another member who takes the cake and that is the member for Glass House. Unfortunately, when the waste levy was repealed, the member for Glass House was the minister for environment and heritage protection. In relation to the repeal of the waste levy in 2012, he referred to the idea of cross-border waste disposal as an 'old chestnut'. He called it an 'old chestnut'. He went on to say—

Cross-border trade in waste is not illegal. It has actually been undertaken for some time in a regulated manner. The reality is that some states are predisposed to dispose of certain kinds of waste. Certain states have facilities designed to receive certain kinds of regulated waste. It has been occurring. We can certainly track that regulated waste.

He went on to say—

We are always hearing anecdotal evidence of highways full of trucks bringing up waste from down south ... Does that mean that I put my head in the sand and do nothing about it? No, it does not. I do work with my colleagues down south, including the minister for environment in New South Wales.

He talks about not putting his head in the sand. He talks about anecdotal evidence. I question those opposite when, if all the trucks that were coming across the border last year would have stretched from Brisbane to past Mackay, they were clearly missing it. The member for Glass House went on to say—

Mr Krause interjected.

Mr PEGG: I am quoting from the member for Glass House. He stated—

It is a commercial business decision, surely. Even at \$90 a tonne a company is not going to constantly truck waste from Sydney to Queensland ...

The facts do not lie. The member for Glass House may claim that he could not get statistics on this, but the minister certainly has the statistics. The statistics do not lie. A total of 3.5 million tonnes of interstate waste was dumped in our state from predominantly down south, trucked across the border since 2012 and it is on the rise. We did not hear anything about that from the member for Broadwater in his voodoo economics lesson to us earlier. I wonder why that is. We can only speculate.

When it comes to the member for Glass House, he cannot help himself. He goes on and on. We talked about interstate waste. We talked about it coming from New South Wales. This is what the member for Glass House had to say in relation to interstate waste—

What it showed was that it was predominantly soil and sludge coming from other states and as far as away as Tasmania, but it was only 10,000 tonnes—hardly apocalyptic, hardly cataclysmic—of soil and sludge.

I say to the member for Glass House, I say to the member for Broadwater, I say to all those opposite: it was not just soil and sludge; it was millions of tonnes of waste being dumped into our state. That may be something they are happy with. That may be something they like: those south of the border coming here and using Queensland as a dumping ground. I can tell those opposite that this is something this side of the House will always stand against.

The member for Broadwater gave us what he purported to be an economics lesson. Then he started talking about businesses and car dealerships. This is where it gets really interesting, because there is a gentleman in my electorate who owns a car dealership. He came into my office and told me how much interstate waste he saw coming in to be taken to our local dumps. Clearly, the member for Broadwater has not spent too much time talking to car dealerships or businesses at all. I do note that for all the statistics the member for Broadwater has cited he has not provided any analysis or evidence whatsoever in relation to his scare campaign on the waste levy.

As the minister has rightly pointed out, the facts are that the repeal of the waste levy by the member for Broadwater and his friends back in 2012 set Queensland back in terms of establishing a viable waste and recycling industry by not giving it the certainty it needed to make long-term investments in jobs and growth, and this is exactly what this legislation will do. The member for Broadwater wants to talk economics. The fact is that the waste industry in Queensland estimates it contributes more than \$830 million in value adding to our economy, but there is potential to significantly grow the industry. Do you want another lesson in economics?

Mr Crisafulli: Not from you, thank you!

Mr PEGG: Do you want another lesson in economics, member for Broadwater? Investment in the waste industry creates job opportunities. It is estimated that there are 2.8 jobs for every 10,000 tonnes of waste. I say to the member for Broadwater: you have discarded a lot of other failed policies in your long march—


Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member, direct your comments through the chair.

Mr PEGG: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. Through you, Madam Deputy Speaker, I say to the member for Broadwater: you have discarded a lot of—

Mr LANGBROEK: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. May I ask you to enforce standing order 244(7), because the member is clearly, flagrantly ignoring your direction?

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have directed him once. The member for Stretton will direct his comments through the chair.

Mr PEGG: My advice to the member for Broadwater would be: in your long march, discard this policy as well.

 **Mr KRAUSE** (Scenic Rim—LNP) (4.03 pm): This legislation before us today is nothing but a tax grab based, as the member for Broadwater has said, on a series of false assertions. It has been mis-sold to the voters of Queensland and especially to the people of Ipswich. It was spun as a solution to the proliferation of dumps in Ipswich apparently all filling up with interstate waste that this law would fix. That is likely not true, because when the committee had a public hearing here the departmental bureaucrats could not give any type of guarantee that this law—this tax—would stop interstate waste being trucked into South-East Queensland.

It was sold as a recycling issue when Ipswich City Council stopped recycling. It started recycling again but we are still getting this tax here today. Then the spin doctors said it was something to do with China not taking recyclable material. Finally, it has been sold as some sort of boon for Queensland's recycling industry. The truth is this bill is all about taxing Queenslanders more. Queenslanders are being sold a con, and the Queensland Labor government and members opposite should simply fess up to the people of Queensland and say that they were looking for a reason to tax people more and forget about selling the myth that this is something to do with waste.

We need look no further than Ipswich to see that this waste levy is having no impact on dumps and interstate waste. There are several proposals around right now for huge mine voids to be filled with rubbish. There are two around Willowbank, which I represent—one in with council at the moment from Lantrak and another in the pipeline from another company—and at least one in the Bundamba electorate as well. Has the prospect of a waste tax deterred these dump companies from investing in new dumps or going through the process? No, it has not. In fact, they were aided and abetted in the planning process by the Labor government sitting opposite.

If we go back a couple of years, it was the Labor government and the Labor aligned Ipswich City Council that put in place a lot of the problems that we have in Ipswich when it comes to dumping. They had a council that encouraged the waste industry to come to Ipswich. What we have here is another Labor tax that was sold as fixing a Labor problem, but it fails on all counts for the people of Ipswich. These proposals for new dumps around Willowbank will see this area become another dumping ground for Ipswich. The dumps will be only a few hundred metres from people's homes. People who have put up with mining for 30 years or so will now have to put up with dumps for another few decades if they are approved.

Our community rejects these dumps. The government could, if it wanted, stop fooling around, stop misleading people about what this tax will do in terms of reducing waste and dumps, and stop the dumping on Ipswich. That is what it could do. It has the power. It is there in the planning act. But, first of all, the minister for planning should take a drive out to Ipswich and find out where Willowbank is, because it seems that he does not even know. That is right—when he was quoted in the *Queensland Times* online on 28 January 2019 he said that it was an issue for the Scenic Rim Regional Council and its planning scheme. Here is a newsflash for the minister: Willowbank is in the Ipswich City Council area—the same council that was run for years by Labor aligned councillors who marketed the city as a great place for companies to bring their waste and to start dumping in Ipswich.

Let the people of Queensland and, in particular, the people of Ipswich be in no doubt: the dumps issue in Ipswich is a Labor problem, 100 per cent created by the Labor Party, that was allowed to go on by this hopeless Labor government. They may not care about the people of Willowbank, Ebenezer and surrounds which will cop the full impact of 50 years of dumping if these new proposals go ahead, but I do and I will not stop standing up for my community about this. Labor should stop dumping on Ipswich. If it is not going to stop dumping on Ipswich, maybe it could get on board with the federal government and commit funding to improve the Cunningham Highway in this area. It is already taking 20,000 vehicles a day, especially around the Amberley interchange. If these proposals go ahead, there will be hundreds more vehicle movements through that area, particularly through the dangerous Amberley intersection. It is beyond time for it to be done, but TMR has not even started the detailed design works. Why not? Because the state government has not funded the project and so no design works can be carried out. Yet it will sit back and allow more and more pressure to be put on that road by allowing these dump proposals to proceed.

I was a member of the committee which inquired into this legislation, and there was an overwhelming amount of evidence provided about the negative impacts of this new Labor tax—a tax that was not promised or even mentioned before the last election. We heard time and again evidence about how this new tax will of course impact Queensland families and Queensland councils.

In Rockhampton at the public hearing representatives from Rockhampton and Livingstone councils outlined how they already face higher costs to dispose of waste than councils in South-East Queensland. They gave evidence that not only was a \$70 per tonne rate too high for this tax—it is \$75

now—but it was adding to a cost of \$145 a tonne already, on a cost recovery basis, that is incurred to deal with waste in those council areas. That is compared to about \$35 per tonne in South-East Queensland.

This tax adds insult to injury for councils like Livingstone and Rockhampton—in fact, for all councils across regional Queensland. What is more, one might think that such a high cost for ratepayers might mean they would actually change their behaviour about the disposal of rubbish to reduce costs and reduce waste. However, both councils indicated their waste and recycling profile is similar to every other council in South-East Queensland. The numbers that have come from these councils completely blow apart the idea that a higher cost on waste automatically reduces waste and increases recycling.

Some waste is unavoidable. Councils have expressed a great deal of worry that this waste tax will be payable by them on some waste and that there will be no rebate for some of those costs. Road shavings was an example they used in many situations, and there are other types of waste as well. That is going to be passed on to ratepayers. That is just one example of how the new tax will impact everyone in Queensland.

As the member for Broadwater said, the HIA spoke about the impact when constructing a new home and said that it will be passed on to homebuyers. The minister referred to this cost in her second reading speech, saying that other states have a higher waste levy and that the building industry manages to go on. We should not be aiming to be the highest taxing state in Australia or even up there with the highest taxing state in Australia. We should be aiming to be a lower taxing state and ease the burden on our building industry and people who are building a home and trying to achieve the ultimate Australian dream of owning their own home. We should not be the highest common denominator when it comes to tax. This new tax simply makes it even more difficult for people to buy their own home—all to fill the coffers of Labor's Treasury so they can spend the money elsewhere.

As I said, some waste is simply unavoidable when doing business. This tax will put more costs on business. I spoke with a local vegetable processing and packing business in my electorate which estimated it would cost at least \$14,000 more per year as a result of costs incurred by this waste tax. They are costs that cannot be passed on. They cannot be recovered in any way. Primary producers are price-takers and vegetable processors are in much the same position. They are at the mercy of the market. It is \$14,000 that they cannot reinvest in wages for our local employees or in equipment and purchases to keep their business growing and thriving. It is \$14,000 that will simply disappear into Treasury for waste that cannot be avoided. Personal protective equipment, for example, and other by-products of manufacturing processes cannot be avoided and, I dare say, are never recycled. They are a by-product of business, and businesses of all types will be impacted. The vegetable processors and packers are just one example of a business that will be impacted by this tax. The tax will impact local government, small businesses and individuals all down the line.

I think I heard correctly that the minister also spoke about the decision to now include Goondiwindi in the waste levy zone. The minister is mischievous at best or misleading at worst if she suggests that it was my questioning of that zoning process that indicated Goondiwindi should be included in the tax zone. I certainly was not suggesting that. We were questioning the footprint and the reason why Mount Isa was included as a similar sized council and Goondiwindi was not. We do not want that tax footprint expanded. In fact, this bill should be rejected.



Ms HOWARD (Ipswich—ALP) (4.13 pm): I rise today to speak on the Waste Reduction and Recycling (Waste Levy) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. As the member for Ipswich, I support this waste levy. I thank the Minister for Environment and the Premier for their work in reintroducing this sensible policy to Queensland. The Newman LNP government's reckless removal of the waste levy in 2012 had a disastrous impact on this state. It resulted in Queensland becoming a cheap dumping ground for interstate waste, and it diverted investment away from Queensland's recycling industry. Evidence from other Australian jurisdictions and from countries overseas shows that introducing a waste levy has resulted in better management of waste resources and, importantly, the development of new waste recovery industries.

This bill has great significance for the Ipswich electorate. The 2017 investigation into the transport of waste into Queensland by the Hon. Peter Lyons reported that the majority of interstate waste coming across our border since 2012 has ended up in Ipswich waste facilities. Here in Queensland, we are also generating record amounts of waste, with no incentives in place to divert it to recycling and recovering processes. Waste facilities in the Ipswich local government area are accepting the bulk of this rubbish. The Remondis landfill at Swanbank and the Ti Tree landfill at Willowbank both accept in excess of half a million tonnes per annum of putrescible waste, accounting for around one-quarter of

the total waste disposed in Queensland. Two other major landfills in Ipswich that accept inert waste—the Cleanaway landfill at New Chum and Lantrak's Swanbank landfill—together accounted for another quarter of the total waste disposed in Queensland. South-East Queensland's landfill capacity is rapidly being consumed. If we continue on as 'business as usual', then our inert landfill capacity in South-East Queensland could run out by 2022 and the putrescible landfill capacity could run out by 2034.


Queensland has one of the lowest rates of waste recovery in Australia. Only 45 per cent of our waste was recovered in 2017-18. This is an alarming figure considering that in the same year Queensland generated a record 10.9 million tonnes of waste—an increase of 11 per cent on the previous year. The amount of waste we are generating in this state is actually increasing at a faster rate than our population growth. We have also seen a shocking 37 per cent increase in interstate waste, with 1.25 million tonnes crossing the Queensland border in 2017-18. In fact, since 2012, 3.5 million tonnes of waste has crossed our border, with most of it ending up in Ipswich landfill.

When the waste levy was removed by the LNP government, Queensland became fair game for interstate, profit driven waste operators and transporters. New recycling and recovering facilities that were set up when the Bligh government introduced the waste levy in 2011 were either mothballed or scaled back after the levy was scrapped in 2012. Businesses that invested in recycling and recovery suffered financially, and our rates of recycling across Queensland flatlined. Removing the levy in 2012 meant that Queensland missed out on a great economic opportunity to grow our recycling industry and in the process create more jobs in Queensland. As we heard from the minister, more than nine jobs are created for every 10,000 tonnes of waste that is recycled—whereas fewer than three jobs are created for the same amount of waste sent to landfill.

The removal of the waste levy by the LNP government has also had a demoralising impact on the electorate of Ipswich, with constituents telling me that they are concerned by the concentration of waste activity in the Ipswich area and the proposed expansion of waste facilities in New Chum, Swanbank and Willowbank. Constituents are worried about negative impacts on the local environment, air quality, their health and quality of life, social equity and property values. The need for a waste levy in Queensland cannot be understated and can no longer be ignored. We need it to stop the interstate trucks coming across our border, and we need it to kick-start investment in the recycling industry in Queensland.

The levy will form part of a comprehensive waste strategy for Queensland which includes a suite of initiatives to stimulate growth in the sector, including our government's own \$100 million Resource Recovery Industry Development Program. Considering the substantial amount already invested in Ipswich by the waste industry, I believe this waste levy presents a golden opportunity for Ipswich to become the centre of a thriving recycling and resource recovery industry in Queensland. This would be an industry that Ipswich people can feel proud of.

I commend the Minister for Environment and the Premier for reintroducing the waste levy to Queensland and for coordinating a broader waste management strategy for this state. Everybody I talk to in my electorate is managing their own household waste differently. It is incumbent on government to act and to move with this cultural shift that we are seeing in our community. I am really proud to be part of a government that is acting on this cultural change. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Ms BOLTON** (Noosa—Ind) (4.18 pm): I would like to commend and thank the government for introducing the Waste Reduction and Recycling (Waste Levy) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. It is time for Queensland to join most other jurisdictions in Australia which have a waste levy. This policy sends a powerful price signal to divert waste away from landfill, and this is so important.

More importantly, it also sends a price signal that Queensland is no longer to be used as a dumping ground for other states' waste. It is also important to highlight that this is an example of Queensland needing to play catch-up with other states on environmental issues. Queensland had a well-functioning waste levy until 2012, as we have already heard, when it was repealed. This type of regulatory seesawing on environmental issues creates uncertainty for our communities and business, is detrimental to our environment and diminishes Queensland's credibility as an attractive destination for foreign and interstate investment. The transitional arrangements contained within this bill are reported as sufficient to help our councils comply with the requirements of this bill from both a financial and practical perspective.

The work of the Innovation, Tourism Development and Environment Committee through its public consultations and inquiries identified and addressed areas of concern for councils that were not in line with best and successful practice in other states. That is not to say that more work needs to be done. However, as outlined in my statement of reservation and referred to by the member for Broadwater,


there has not been the inclusion of the full hypothecation required by councils for waste management, diversion and recycling initiatives so that they may rapidly achieve the performance of other states in this arena. Denying this will slow the transition process. I would like to see further clarification on this during debate.

There have been assertions that this levy is going to impact the bottom line of household budgets for Queenslanders. The bill directly contradicts this assertion by providing levy offsets for councils. My only concern, as outlined in my statement of reservation, was that a change of government can lead to a change of policy which could impact ratepayers through a lack of subsidisation from state government. However, I am pleased with assurances from the minister this afternoon that any change will need to come before parliament. I thank the government for listening to us on this.

Ultimately, my core reservation with this bill as it stands is where all revenue is spent. If our government is to deliver lasting, sustainable environmental outcomes for Queenslanders, there needs to be a permanent ring fencing of the significant revenue that will be generated by this levy for environmental initiatives exclusively. This should be done through the primary legislation to prevent future governments from rolling this protection back without a debate in parliament. Putting money from this revenue into general revenue weakens the credentials of this bill and opens it to criticism. Allocating proceeds exclusively to environmental initiatives would demonstrate unparalleled environmental leadership and help fund initiatives that will improve Queensland for all of us and for future generations.

Some may criticise this suggestion as unrealistic. The reality is that ring fencing revenue from this levy would function similarly to the way that proceeds from corporate green bonds are ring fenced. Major global and Australian corporates are already raising capital through bonds whose proceeds must be used to fund environmental initiatives. Green bonds are part of mainstream debt markets here and overseas. This is a fantastic opportunity for Queensland to take a leadership position on environmental issues and model our efforts on tried and true results from the corporate sector.

In closing, I thank the government for bringing this bill forward, the departments for their assistance, the many stakeholders who submitted and attended the public hearings, the ITDE Committee chair, my fellow committee members and the secretariat for their diligent efforts. Of course, I thank MPs from both sides who are delivering really good debate today. Thank you.

 **Ms LUI** (Cook—ALP) (4.23 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Waste Reduction and Recycling (Waste Levy) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018 and amendments to the Waste Reduction and Recycling Act 2011 to fulfil this government's commitment to modernise waste management in Queensland through the introduction of a waste disposal levy.

The bill was introduced to parliament on 6 September and was then referred to the Innovation, Tourism Development and Environment Committee of which I was privileged to be a member. In saying that, I would like to acknowledge the Minister for Environment, Minister Enoch, for all her hard work; the committee secretary and the assistant committee secretary; and committee members: the member for Stretton, member for Scenic Rim, member for Jordan and member for Noosa.

To put this bill into perspective, Queensland is the only state in Australia that does not have a waste levy in place. When the former LNP government repealed the waste levy in 2012 they did not stop to consider how this decision would impact Queensland. As a consequence of this reckless decision, the former LNP government made Queensland a cheap place to dump interstate waste. Since 2012 over 3.5 million tonnes of waste have been trucked across the border into Queensland, including 1.2 million tonnes in 2017-18 alone.

Landfill is a common means of disposing of solid waste, as we all know, which is either buried or left to pile in heaps. It is just appalling to think how the former LNP government repealed the waste levy in 2012 and supported tonnes and tonnes of rubbish being trucked from interstate to landfills in Queensland to be either buried or left to pile. Without the waste levy, it is obvious that Queensland had no way of controlling the amount of rubbish crossing the Queensland border. Having a build-up of waste in our landfills has serious implications for the environment, particularly in the breakdown of different waste matter into toxins and gases that are highly damaging to the land, biodiversity and water quality of our natural environment. I am passionate about this issue because of the need to protect our environment for future generations.

During my first year as the member for Cook I made an extra effort to visit some of the landfill sites in different communities throughout the Torres Strait and Cape York. Although Cape York and the Torres Strait islands sit in the non-levy zone and there are no issues of waste being transported to

these communities, I want to share my personal observations of crowded landfills in some of my communities. This is only a small reflection of the bigger issue that we are dealing with when discussing the issue of waste management on a state level. The waste levy is critical in addressing the issue of overcrowding landfills for Queensland moving forward.

Queensland is ready for a change, and the Palaszczuk government is behind Queensland every step of the way. Since the bill was introduced, the committee has received 37 submissions from stakeholders and the inquiry included a public briefing and two public hearings in Ipswich and Rockhampton. There has been an outpouring of community support for alternatives to landfills. This means there will be a greater scope for better waste management practices in the state.

Since the introduction of the bill and tabling of the associated draft amendment regulation in September 2018, local governments, industry and community members have had an opportunity to scrutinise the details of the waste levy proposal. The government listened to their advice and 55 changes to the bill are proposed to facilitate smooth implementation of the levy. The Palaszczuk government fully understands that we must take the necessary steps to support the smooth transition to a waste levy in order to achieve sustainable outcomes. Moving the commencement date of the levy to 1 July 2019 to better align with council budgeting gives a strong indication of this government's willingness to work in collaboration with local governments in the levy zone. The decision to move the commencement date of this waste levy will allow local government more time to get levy ready.

The Palaszczuk government made a commitment that there will be no direct impact on households associated with the introduction of this levy and, as such, will provide financial assistance through annual payments to council to offset the cost of the levy on municipal solid waste. At the same time it is allowing a number of levy exemptions to be available on application. It is important to note that if council reduces the amount of household waste that it disposes to landfill such as by providing new recycling options, any difference between the annual payment and the actual levy cost would be retained by the council for further investment.

Additionally, in the 2018 budget the state government allocated \$5 million in funding for the 2018-19 Local Government Levy Ready Grants Program to assist local governments prepare themselves in terms of waste disposal infrastructure upgrades. To date, 34 councils applied for funding and all 34 council were successful in their application with grants ranging from \$6,000 to \$570,000. I am pleased that the Douglas shire in my electorate qualified for the Local Government Levy Ready Grant to assist with infrastructure upgrades to their Killaloe site, the largest waste facility in the region. The upgrade to the Killaloe site will include the installation of security lighting, a CCTV camera, barrier at the landfill access, upgrading traffic control, additional signage and software upgrades.

The bill provides for the levy to be paid on waste delivered to landfills in a levy zone, which includes 39 out of 77 local government areas. In the Cook electorate there are two local government areas with landfill sites that fall within a levy zone: Mareeba Shire Council and Douglas Shire Council. It is reassuring to know there is strong support from the Palaszczuk government to ensure that appropriate strategies are in place to support the two local government areas in my electorate—and all of the other local government areas in the levy zone—to become levy ready.

It is expected that councils will be positively impacted by the levy if they seize the opportunities provided by the new strategy and the levy and take a forward-looking approach to waste management. The Queensland government will work closely with governments in the levy zone to assist with its implementation. Further funding from the levy will likely be made available in future years to assist councils with activities, including waste disposal infrastructure upgrades and recycling and resource recovery efforts. Diversion of waste from landfills by the levy will also reduce councils' operating costs and extend the life of their landfill assets.

Changing how we manage waste in Queensland will create jobs and drive significant economic growth as we make better use of resources and develop new industries. As it stands now, every 10,000 tonnes of landfill waste supports fewer than three jobs, but if the same amount was recycled it would support more than nine jobs. The levy will create a funding source for programs to establish better resource recovery practices, improve overall waste management performance and sustain Queensland's natural environment. I am proud to represent a government that not only stands up against interstate dumping but also prioritises protecting our natural environment for future generations. I commend the bill to the House.



Mr MANDER (Everton—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (4.31 pm): I stand to speak on this bill. As has already been stated by the shadow minister, the LNP will be voting against this bill. The first thing I want to do is express my utmost sympathy to the member for Broadwater for that absolute

savaging by the member for Stretton. I can just imagine that when the member for Stretton stands up at one of his branch meetings they all go, 'He's on his feet again.' He is more than a factional war lord, that is for sure.

It is hard to go past what has already been said by the member for Broadwater and the member for Scenic Rim. When we talk about this levy all we are talking about is a con and a sham. The Queensland Labor government is once again duping the Queensland public. Of course this is not for the environment: this is simply a tax grab. This is not a bill that originated from the Minister for Environment: this is a bill that originated from the Treasurer. Why is that the case and why is that necessary?

The Labor Party has a problem. Because they put on around 25,000 to 30,000 extra public servants in the last four years, we have an extra \$7 billion recurring expenditure year after year and they simply do not have the money to pay for it. What do they do? They do not introduce one or two new taxes or even three or four: they introduce five new taxes. They announced four of them a couple of days before the last election campaign, and this is the one they did not announce. The waste tax was brought in after the election without any mention of it whatsoever. In fact, there were some who denied beforehand that it would happen, but of course that is what this government does.

They brought in the grey nomad tax, which will tax those hardworking Queenslanders who have saved up to pay for their around-the-country holiday, and that is going to bring in \$100 million. They brought in the wagering tax, which will bring in \$367 million. They brought in an extra land tax for another \$311 million and the foreign acquirer tax, which will bring in another \$132 million, but the tax that really brings home the bacon is this waste tax: \$1.3 billion over the forward estimates will be brought in due to this—not levy—tax.

In a rare admission they have said that at least 30 per cent of this tax will go into general revenue, so all of this talk about this being an environmental levy is a total con job. This is money that is required by this government to pay for their election commitments. When you do not have money—when you are heading towards a debt of \$83 billion—you have a problem and you have to find a solution, and the only solution is to increase taxes.

They also have a second problem: how do they justify bringing in this wagering tax? This is where they get very, very creative. They go to the disgraced Labor Ipswich City Council, which has now been dissolved—a council that has in some ways promoted these dumps in their area—and they say, 'We have a problem, and we have to solve that problem,' which is a localised issue that no other council in the state has other than the Ipswich City Council. Then they looked for another excuse to bring the implementation date forward, and what was their excuse? It was a 'recycling issue' in the council. We now have a recycling issue, so we need to bring the tax in earlier to deal with this recycling issue. The issue was dealt with about four days after it was first highlighted because of an uproar from the public. Then the planning minister said that he could not interfere with the planning processes of the council, so the government could not intervene in those things. Then a couple of weeks later he changed his mind and said, 'No, we can do that,' but again that was tinkering around the edges. The only solution was a levy. Guess what? Because we have a localised problem in Ipswich—

Ms Leahy: Mount Isa has to pay!

Mr MANDER: I will take that interjection from the member for Warrego—Mount Isa has to pay; Everton has to pay; Broadwater has to pay; Bonney has to pay; the Gold Coast has to pay. Right across the state has to pay for a problem that is localised in the Ipswich area. The problem could have been resolved if they were fair dinkum about solving that local issue in other ways.

Mr Millar: Western Queensland has to pay!

Mr MANDER: That is exactly right; I will take that interjection. We now have a new tax that will bring in \$1.3 billion. The minister is at pains to assure us that this will not be passed on to everyday Queenslanders. It is really important to note the language of the minister when she emphasises the fact that there will not be a direct impact on everyday Queenslanders. That is questionable, but even if that is correct there will be an indirect impact on everyday Queenslanders. That is not what the LNP is saying: that is what industry groups are saying.

Master Builders has come out and said that this levy is nothing but a tax on construction, and they think it will add at least \$2,000 to the cost of building a new home. Garry Sharman from the Housing Industry Association estimated that the levy will add \$1,500 to the cost of building a two-storey detached home. Is that a direct cost or is it an indirect cost? It does not really matter what it is: it is an extra cost.

Luke Hannan from the Local Government Association of Queensland says its analysis found that the waste levy would cost councils about \$12 million for key services such as sewerage, road maintenance and facilities. These are the lobby groups that have come out, but I can assure you that when this tax is introduced Queensland consumers, when they get their car serviced every six months, will be paying extra because of the cost that will be imposed on mechanics and garages.

I have already mentioned what happens with new houses and local government services. Who knows whether the price of fish and chips will go up because of the extra cost of the shops ridding themselves of the waste? Of course those costs will be passed on, because small business cannot absorb them.

Let us call this what it is. This is not a levy. This was not brought in for environmental reasons; this was brought in because the government needs cash badly, despite the fact that it has benefited from unexpected coal royalties and the boom that has happened in the past 12 months. It has had a lucky break. The extra money that has come in from coal royalties is not enough, so the government has to find another way of raising money. We now have five new taxes.

This stands in contrast to the LNP. We have stated already that if we get a chance to be in government we will not introduce any new taxes. We understand how these taxes impact on business and business confidence. When you dampen business confidence, you dampen the job opportunities that can come through business and through people who have confidence in the future of this state. We will call this tax what it is. Once this tax is introduced, we will be reminding people as they use different services of the negative impact of this tax on them.



Mrs GILBERT (Mackay—ALP) (4.41 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Waste Reduction and Recycling (Waste Levy) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. This is an important piece of legislation. We need to fix the unacceptable situation created by the former Newman government stripping away Queensland's waste levy, making our beautiful state a cheap dumping ground for rubbish from other states.

This morning here at Parliament House, at UQ Future Conversations, we heard from eminent scientists and researchers about the need to protect our planet and put a stop to temperature rising. This summer all records for high temperatures have been broken. In my region there were bushfires that we had never imagined. To the north of Mackay we have just watched a one-in-500-year flood unfold, while over the past years we have been supporting those to the west through drought. We are no stranger to cyclones in Queensland, but the nature of them is changing. They are getting more frequent and larger. In my region, no-one could recall a cyclone that behaved like Tropical Cyclone Debbie and no-one could recall when our beautiful Eungella rainforest had ever burned. In fact, in the lead-up to the fires reaching the rainforest locals were saying that the fires would stop once they reached the rainforest because rainforests do not burn. In our changing climate, I am sad to report that this is no longer the case.

Professor Brendan Mackey this morning sent a message: we need to reduce our emissions so that our global temperature can stabilise. We need to plan to get our emissions to zero so that we do not reach the 1.5-degree increase that would have a massive impact on our world.


At present, we are dumping rubbish that we can recycle. We need to stem the amount of rubbish we are generating. Simply put, rubbish going into landfill is no longer a solution. The waste levy is an incentive for people and businesses to reduce the amount of rubbish they produce. We have an opportunity to be creative and generate jobs from recycling.

Anything Environmental, a local Mackay company owned by locals Jason and Jo, have one of two contracts in my area for Containers for Change recycling of drinking containers. They were not expecting the support and take-up from the community when the opportunity for recycling began. They started their brand-new business with four employees to manage the collection and sorting of and payments for drinking containers. After the first week, when the flow of containers increased and did not slow—they thought they would be hit with a barrage of containers at first because people would have been hoarding them—the number of containers just kept on increasing. By Christmas they were needing 16 employees to keep their heads above the flow of containers. As a company they also need to build larger buildings for sorting, buy additional trucks and train forklift drivers. At the same time, they are delivering a service with a smile to our community. There is an appetite for recycling by my community, so hopefully those others that are not finding it in their communities will get on board.

In general, it is estimated that for every 10,000 tonnes of rubbish that goes into landfill three jobs are created. For the same amount of rubbish recycled, nine jobs are created. We have proven that in my region. Anything Environmental is a testament to these figures. Anything Environmental is not going to stay with just drink containers to recycle; it is moving into all types of plastics and cardboard.

We know that change is never easy and there needs to be a transition into the levy. The Palaszczuk government has committed that there will be no direct impact on households associated with the implementation of the levy. There will be annual payments made to councils to offset the cost of the levy on municipal solid waste. Households will see information about the annual payments on their rates notices, so there will be no misleading or false information in the community about the payments.

This bill will help Queenslanders better manage their waste, improve resource recovery and transition to a zero-avoidable-waste economy by 2050. After the summer of natural disasters we have just experienced, it is time to be serious about the footprint we are leaving for our children and grandchildren. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr BOOTHMAN** (Theodore—LNP) (4.47 pm): Late last year the Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef, Minister for Science and Minister for the Arts introduced the Waste Reduction and Recycling (Waste Levy) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill to the Queensland parliament. Throughout history Labor has always enjoyed adding a new tax to offset its lack of fiscal management. Taxing families by stealth through increasing electricity, water and vehicle registration costs was not enjoyable enough for those opposite; they had to go back to their core values—tax, tax, tax. No matter how Labor spins it, this is nothing more than a tax grab from average mums and dads. Labor's excuse was interstate dumping of rubbish in Queensland. Those opposite love to blame the LNP for everything, but the government's own report found that interstate dumping dramatically increased under Labor yet decreased during the LNP years of government.

It should be noted that the LNP incorporated effective compliance measures that controlled and limited the interstate waste coming into our state. In addition, Labor allowed the free-for-all dumping of waste in Ipswich by developing superdumps—a quick and easy revenue stream for the Labor Ipswich City Council. These superdumps in Ipswich—Cleanaway New Chum and Lantrak's Swanbank landfill—together account for one-quarter of all waste dumped in Queensland landfill. It is interesting to note that these dumps were approved by a previous Labor government. This was not enough for the Labor Ipswich City Council. It wanted to set a new benchmark with a new sump dump facility at New Chum. If this facility was allowed to be built, it would take up to 1.1 million tonnes of waste each year. To make matters worse for Ipswich residents, this facility would be built in close proximity to suburbs.


I have memories of a green waste recycling facility in the former Albert electorate that caused extensive concerns for local residents. This facility had been approved some time before I was first elected, yet the locals were continually reminded because of its daily impacts. As I said, it was a green waste facility and if the wind was blowing in a certain direction residents would have to close all of the windows in their houses to stop the odours coming in. The local business tried to limit it by putting a deodoriser on the hill so that when the wind blew through there was a deodoriser smell, and this deodoriser had a Cherry Ripe smell. Just imagine a Cherry Ripe smell and a green waste leachate smell going over your house—I can tell members that I do not think the local service station sold a single damn Cherry Ripe. I am serious. It stunk!

Therefore, it is critically important that these facilities are built some distance away from housing developments to ensure a quality of life for residents and workers alike. One resident from my former electorate contacted me when he heard that this bill was brought forward asking whether this would increase the likelihood of these facilities popping up locally and in unfavourable locations. One would hope not, because I would hate to see another community suffer the way that these individuals did. Furthermore, local governments have the power to rein in accepting this waste for landfill from outside their council boundaries. There is no better example than the Gold Coast City Council which has increased its facility fees for waste coming in from outside the city.

Therefore, this bill does not fix the problem. It just proves that this is a tax grab for revenue raising. This tax will have real, tangible impacts on individuals who can ill afford it, especially first home buyers given the leftover rubbish resulting from building a new home and even renovations, making that dream of owning your home that little bit harder to obtain. Another serious concern is the increase in illegal dumping activities in bushland or a quiet cul-de-sac. In recent times in my electorate there has been a spike in illegal dumping. We live in the most beautiful place on the planet, yet it is disgusting

that these individuals are doing this. These individuals see it as a cop-out in order to not pay the additional fees, because unfortunately there are those in our society who will do that. The councils then have to send out teams at their cost to clean up these messes.

As I said, we live in truly the best part of the planet, yet this is nothing more than a \$1.3 billion tax grab while less than 10 per cent will be spent on environmental outcomes. I certainly do feel for the poor people of Ipswich who have to put up with these dumps and these proposed dumps which will impact their day-to-day lives. I hope that this government takes that into account and gives a damn about its own voter base in Ipswich and says no to these superdumps which are being proposed.

 **Mrs MILLER** (Bundamba—ALP) (4.55 pm): I rise to speak in support of the waste levy bill before the House. In fact, I was here when the original legislation was brought into this parliament. It was removed by the Newman government and at the time we were absolutely gobsmacked that the Newman government did not renew it. It was right back then years ago for the then Labor government to bring in the legislation and it was wrong for the LNP to get rid of it and it was a mistake for this government to take so long to bring this legislation back into this parliament. It is here now, so at least it is here.

My people—the good people of the electorate of Bundamba and right across Ipswich—have been suffering because of these disgraceful dumps and now proposals for superdumps and incinerators in our city. I want to let everyone know here today what it is like to live in my area. When the LNP removed the legislation trucks came thundering back into my electorate. They came thundering back in along the Ipswich Motorway and the Cunningham Highway on to the local roads and the local roads are filled with dirt and debris and when it rains the cars and trucks slide across the road. I do not know how many times I have contacted TMR and also the Ipswich City Council in relation to that, because it is dangerous. It is dangerous at Dinmore, it is dangerous at Riverview and it is dangerous as well at Swanbank, and the dust rose and of course the smells stank.

Dumps do not deliver jobs. That is a furphy. Let us just get that out of the way right now. It is a nonsense and hogwash to suggest that dumps deliver jobs. In fact, I went to one of the meetings of the dump operators. I was there with members of the community and I asked each and every one of them who sat around the table where they lived, because it is a furphy for other MPs in this parliament to say that it produces Ipswich jobs. I asked every single one of those people where they lived and they lived in the western suburbs of Brisbane, so they lived at Graceville or they lived at Mount Ommaney or they lived at Kenmore. They work in Ipswich, but they do not live in Ipswich and their money is taken out of Ipswich to go into the western suburbs of Brisbane.

Let us talk about the rehabilitation of old mine sites. It is not our fault that Bjelke-Petersen did not have the wherewithal to make the mine operators fill those mines back in. I have been on the record in this parliament since the year 2000 talking about mine rehabilitation. In fact, I will give the government a bit of advice here: with all the billions of dollars coming to the government in mining royalties, it should let some of that money come into my electorate to properly rehabilitate the old mine sites. That is what we need to do.


People in my electorate want no more dumping. They want it stopped now. They have also put together a proposal where they can have environmental parks like there are at Penrith. I think that is excellent. Let us get some of that mine money that is coming from Central Queensland as well as New Hope and use that to rehabilitate the old mine site so that the people of my area can live in peace.

In relation to delivery to the local economy—that somehow dumps deliver to the local economy—that is also a nonsense. Dumps cause too much angst in my community. I will tell members what the dumps deliver. They deliver health and respiratory issues for my community.

Debate, on motion of Mrs Miller, adjourned.

MOTION

Bushfire Prevention and Preparedness, Inquiry

 **Mr MILLAR** (Gregory—LNP) (5.00 pm): I move—

1. That the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee inquire into and report to the Legislative Assembly by 6 May 2019 on the effectiveness of the Queensland government's bushfire prevention and preparedness activities leading to the 2018 Queensland fires.

2. In undertaking this inquiry, the committee should consider:

- (a) analysis of fire reduction practices conducted on state owned land and national parks including the maintenance of strategic fire breaks and fire access trails and the reduction of fuel loads;
- (b) examination of the appropriateness of funding provided by government to implement fire reduction practices on state owned land and national parks and provide for overtime for QPWS officers when they are needed to assist with the response to a fire in a national park;
- (c) the effectiveness of the government's native vegetation and land management laws and practices in managing fire in the Queensland context;
- (d) the reduction in the QFES hazard reduction burns in 2017 and 2018 compared to previous years;
- (e) the effectiveness and timeliness of government issued fire reduction permits needed by landholders to conduct fire preparedness activities;
- (f) the failure to implement any of the Auditor-General's recommendations from *Bushfire prevention and preparedness* (report 10:2014-15);
- (g) consideration of the appropriateness of penalties for those deliberately starting fires; and
- (h) analysis of communication practices undertaken to provide information to affected communities before, during and after bushfire events.

This motion calls for a full public and independent parliamentary inquiry into the recent bushfires crisis and the part played by the Queensland's bushfire preparation regime.

The bushfires we saw at the end of 2018 were not business as usual for Queensland; they were unprecedented in their ferocity, destruction and scale. Their locations were also abnormal. To see the lush splendour of the Eungella rainforest reduced to ashes, to lose ancient rock art in the Carnarvon Gorge, and to see large fires travel out of Mount Etna Caves National Park, threatening bats that the park was created to conserve, was heartbreaking. Worse still were the threats to towns. Sadly, we had one death fighting these fires and I pay tribute to my constituent the late George Bird. The loss of this fine young man was felt not just in Rolleston but across the highlands to the Arcadia Valley.

Queenslanders have paid a price. Their concerns must not be taken lightly, or we will come to regret it. There is one widely observed fact: the majority of these fires started on government owned land. The key question is whether the Queensland government's own fire preparations are correct, or need improvement. It would seem that the Queensland government is now a dangerous and undesired neighbour—a neighbour that does not pull its weight and then expects volunteers to risk their lives fighting the very fires its own neglect has led to. Neighbouring landholders and communities quite rightly deserve more than a market research survey and an internal review.


Under the government's own terms of reference, the Inspector-General Emergency Management will not even look at the issues of fuel management, maintenance of fire access trails and strategic firebreaks. The review will not look at fire preparations in the lead-up to the crisis. The IGEM review will look only at the quality of the emergency services response to the fires, which we know was excellent. What we really need to know is: what preparations would have improved the situation the emergency services officers faced?

In mid-October 2018, the media was reporting that, since August 2018, QFES had already attended 3,000 vegetation fires. We were still only in spring and the bureau was predicting heatwaves. What could we have done then? That is what we need to know. This is why the Rural Fire Brigades Association has described Labor's internal review as not a real bushfire review. The LNP is proposing a real review with public hearings. Committee members from all parties could talk directly to the affected landholders and communities in regional Queensland.

On Saturday, I was talking to volunteers who fought fires in Expedition Range and the Lonesome and Carnarvon national parks. Their stories were equally horrific and inspiring. Volunteers were in unfamiliar terrain that was rugged and heavily timbered. They were in the dark on dozers trying to locate an old trail to make a firebreak so that they could back-burn and try to contain the fire front. Why had Queensland's Parks and Wildlife Service not maintained the fire access trails and put in place strategic firebreaks before the fire? A strategic firebreak in the Carnarvon National Park may have protected the rock art. Strategically located firebreaks and well-maintained fire trails give firefighters more options to contain and control a fire on any fireground. Why do they seem to have all but disappeared from the national parks?

Since 2015, more than a million hectares of land has been added to the Queensland protected estates. This is reckless if the state does not expand the staff and the budgets that are necessary to safeguard that land. Volunteer fireys say that the Parks and Wildlife blokes are great, but they also say that there are not enough of them, their budgets are short and their bosses have them operating under an eight-hour rule. When they reach eight hours, they must knock off and go home, taking their knowledge of the terrain with them, and sometimes the key to the dozer.

I heard a case where hazard reduction has not been carried out in 40 years. Why were there fewer QFES hazard reduction burns in 2017-18? Let us hear if all Queensland firebreaks should be only eight metres wide. After the Crown fires, some would like to see 30-metre wide firebreaks around national parks. Let us hear if we can get a clearing permit for those firebreaks. Why has Labor not implemented any of the recommendations from the Auditor-General's 2014-15 report on preparing our communities for bushfire disaster? To get answers we must get serious and support this motion.

 **Hon. CD CRAWFORD** (Barron River—ALP) (Minister for Fire and Emergency Services) (5.05 pm): I rise to oppose the motion. We know that when the sun rose on 22 November 2018, it was the beginning of 14 days of what was then an unimaginable bushfire ferocity that relentlessly swept across parts of Queensland. During that period, 1.4 million hectares of land was burnt. Three thousand Queensland Fire and Emergency Services personnel worked around the clock. One hundred and thirty-nine rural fire brigades were called into action along with their fire and rescue counterparts. They were joined by 1,200 interstate personnel deployed from across Australia. I want to put on record my thanks to those interstate counterparts who reacted so quickly.

Fifty-nine aircraft water dropped water and suppressants as well as conducted surveillance. At one point, 47 of those aircraft were airborne at the same time. For the very first time, a trio of large aerial tankers were used in Queensland. Eleven million litres of water was dropped from the sky. Five hundred and seventy-one bushfire community warnings were issued. More than 50 emergency alerts reached more than a million devices. At its peak, we had more than 200 bushfires burning at the same time. All up, we dealt with more than 1,200 bushfires.

Those figures are unprecedented in Queensland's history. Never—not ever—have we had to muster our resources on such a scale to fight such severe, savage and unpredictable fires that were fuelled for months, weeks and days of high temperatures, low humidity and strong westerly winds coupled with extremely dry conditions. It was relentless. As Queenslanders, we stood strong. Were we ready? You bet we were. To suggest otherwise is to denigrate the thousands of men and women who put their own lives on the line, who left their families and their homes behind to go and help others.

Here is a challenge from those opposite. I say to them to do some research, do some reading, and contemplate the Bureau of Meteorology's special climate statement No. 67 where it says that we were experiencing an extreme heatwave in the tropical Queensland coast. That is right: our rainforests were on fire.


In Rockhampton, I watched as temperatures nudged 35 degrees. The mercury kept going north for another week, hitting 44.4 degrees on Wednesday, 28 November. For 3½ hours on that day parts of Central Queensland centred around Rockhampton recorded catastrophic fire conditions—a first for the region, a first for Queensland. Seven hundred thousand Queenslanders received a text message that said, 'Unprecedented fire weather affecting your area today and in coming days. Stay updated about fires in your area.' Seven hundred thousand Queenslanders then had to decide their next move.

I will rewind the clock for a second. The window of opportunity between the burn season when we do our fuel reduction and mitigation burns and the actual fire season is determined by the weather. It is always determined by the weather. It is always a very fine line. If it is too wet, nothing burns. If it is too dry, too much burns. In mid-2018, a core focus of Operation Cool Burn was the dry debris that was left over from cyclones Marcia and Debbie. QFES teams worked their guts out completing prescribed burns along the coast to ensure the safety of Queenslanders' lives and property. In that same year, throughout the state more than 20,000 permits to burn were issued by QFES fire wardens. That is more than were issued in 2017.

The science tells us that it is the quality of the burn, not the quantity of hectares that burns, that really matters. In 2108, 68 per cent of high or very high hazard exposures were mitigated. That is up from 41 per cent in 2016, because we now do strategic burning. The weather beat us. The window of opportunity closed and here we are today.

Who best to oversee the review of these fires? Who best to determine if we have done everything in our power to prevent them in the first place and be prepared when they hit? The same body that was established by the LNP, the very body those opposite established with the proviso it be independent, the same body that reviewed Seqwater, SunWater and Cyclone Debbie. It is IGEM. Which is why I tasked IGEM to conduct the review into the Queensland 2018 bushfires.

I am here to tell members that every single Queenslanders, with our boots on the ground, with our hearts in our mouths and with our trust in our training and our preparation, went into battle on those 14 fateful days and we won.

 **Mr BENNETT** (Burnett—LNP) (5.10 pm): It is disappointing to hear the statistics thrown back at us. We have to get to the root of the issue. These were clearly unprecedented fires, but doing the same things over and over again is a recipe for disaster. I support a parliamentary inquiry into Queensland bushfire preparedness on behalf of those who have been excluded from the process and those who have lost so much.

I hope those opposite will not oppose a heartfelt call for bipartisan support to make our state as prepared as possible. It is good public policy that we review these devastating fires to ensure the effectiveness of our future practices. This parliament needs to investigate why these fires occurred in the first place and to the extreme levels experienced. The extremely dry, hot and windy weather was, we agree, a major contributing factor, but despite the government's dismissive narrative and media claims to the contrary, we have experienced heat waves before and will do so again so let us get on and change those outdated practices. Unfortunately we knew these fires were possible when earlier in the year there were 3,000 vegetation fires. A million hectares of land was burnt. For those opposite still sitting back wondering what this is about and for the inner city and Brisbane elite let me use an analogy that I read over Christmas: it is the equivalent of two million Suncorp Stadiums that has been burnt. In spite of that fact, we get dismissed and we are not going to get support tonight.

There is no way that anybody looking at the current state of the burnt out national park areas can say that there is responsible management of these areas at present. Some of these fires burnt so intensely that it destroyed 1,000 years of biodiversity in the Eungella ranges—it is gone. The large, black, hot plume of smoke has killed everything. I feel that my community and those affected have earned the right to comment to a parliamentary inquiry.

We must acknowledge that a great majority of the serious fires started or were allowed to develop in national parks or other government controlled protected areas where fire hazard reduction burns are not done appropriately. The state government is a landowner like everyone else, with perhaps more obligation to the residents who sit beside them, and it must protect these estates. The fires in the Deepwater and Eurimbula national parks are examples of the poor management of these areas over many years. For years these areas have not had controlled burns. It used to be open grassland, not thick, overgrown scrub as it is now. Over the years since these areas came under government control they have become hugely overgrown with lantana and giant rat's tail grass. We have a failed policy agenda when eight million hectares of national park is added to our protected estates without bushfire prevention and preparedness activities to reduce vegetation fuel loads.

Who can forget Labor removing the opportunity for managed grazing in selected national parks in times of drought to manage grassland, or the ongoing savage removal of stock grazing permits. No wonder we have a problem. At a time when the damage caused by these fires is still very much in the minds of all involved, it is time that we give consideration to what we can do in relation to prevention in the future.


There are many critics of the government and its handling of vegetation, fire and national park management in Queensland. What we get from this arrogant government is an internal review that will not achieve anything. The savagery of the Labor government's legislation agenda fails in many areas. We must deal with feral animals and adhere to the good neighbour policy. This has all come about as a result of Premier Beattie's deals with Brisbane Greens to convert managed lease country into national parks.

I have read many stories of devastation. There is one account I would like to bring to the attention of the House. This person had a lease that was one of 72 leases across the state that was impacted—a total of one million acres. There were 72 rural families locked out of land they had managed for generations on the ideologically driven notion that by removing humans from the environment it will return it to a Garden of Eden. What a mistake that was. The reality is infestation of lantana and feral pigs.

Labor has invested nothing in resourcing the protection of our protected estates and given nothing to those neighbours who have been dealt a cruel blow. One family has described a fire that burnt and destroyed an entire 4,000 acres of their lease along with the majority of the Bulburin National Park. They commented—

Some would blame climate change. I blame incompetence. If we had been allowed to safely back-burn as we did with our freehold country there would have been no need for the carnage.

We have a chance tonight in the House to do the right thing and review the policies of successive governments, to show leadership, maturity and better protect those who have given us their trust to better manage Queensland.

 **Mr BUTCHER** (Gladstone—ALP) (5.14 pm): I rise to oppose the motion presented by the member for Gregory. I would like to start by paying tribute to all of our great firefighters in this state, particularly those firefighters who fought the fires in my region, our volunteer rural firefighters, our police, the many, many volunteering groups like the SES and Red Cross, water truck drivers who were on the scene and local regional council and their staff. These people worked day and night to help protect Queensland lives and their property. I was proud to be part of a team that was on the ground at the time delivering information to local people to get them out of harm's way.

Together with the mayor of Gladstone I saw firsthand the challenges that many people were faced with during the recent fires in the Gladstone region. I was on the front line with Superintendent Paul Smeath and the mayor of Gladstone seeing what our firefighters and volunteers were seeing on the ground. It was tough seeing the work that was being done by those volunteers, particularly the hard task that the police had trying to remove people from their properties because they thought that they could fight the fire with the gear that they had.

It is good that the Inspector-General Emergency Management is conducting a review in relation to this fire. I note that the member for Callide on his Facebook page has called for people to put in their submissions. He also commented that there was a Queensland state review that has a longer time for submissions. It is great to see that the opposition is certainly engaging in the process to understand what happened during this fire and the processes that took place.

I note that point (h) of the motion is about communication and the practices that were undertaken. I can tell the member for Gregory that the community hall meetings, which were held pre, during and after and at which the member for Burnett was present, were certainly of the highest quality. There is no need for point (h) because the processes that QFES and the local councils put in place certainly were of the highest quality in relation to communication.

During the fires the Premier visited the region to make sure that everything possible was being delivered to put out the fires and save lives. It was after one of the meetings that she attended that we had extra personnel from New South Wales, Victoria and the ACT. Without her support I do not think that would have happened.

During the bushfire, Queensland Fire and Emergency Service deployed over 3,000 people throughout the state who were assisted by 1,200 interstate staff and 59 aircraft. It was an absolute pleasure and honour to meet the volunteers as they came through Gladstone airport and thank them for taking time out of their lives to give us a hand when we sorely needed it. This government has every confidence in QFES Commissioner Katarina Carroll and her department to keep Queenslanders safe. This confidence was shown to be well placed when Queensland faced unprecedented bushfire conditions in November and December last year.

Bushfire management continues to evolve in line with scientific and technological advances. With the shared objective of best practice, the Palaszczuk government and the Queensland Fire and Emergency Service is committed to continuous improvement in this field. During this tragic event QFES provided excellent information to the community before and during the events in Agnes Water, Mount Larcom and Miriam Vale. I take this opportunity to personally thank officers Paul Smeath and Craig Majic for their continued service in tough times.

During the events of the November and December fires, QFES issued more than 570 community bushfire warnings to those affected. QFES is continuously conducting research into better ways of informing Queenslanders during such events. Queensland Fire and Emergency Services has demonstrated significant progress in addressing issues covered in the QOA report. It is not true that they are not doing anything about it, as has been said.



Mr BOYCE (Callide—LNP) (5.19 pm): It is wonderful to hear that the member for Gladstone follows my Facebook page. Unfortunately, I have never seen his.

I rise to support the motion put forward by my colleague Lachlan Millar, the member for Gregory, calling for a parliamentary inquiry into the Queensland government's bushfire prevention and preparedness activities. In late November and early December last year, we saw Queensland set alight as devastating bushfires completely burnt out over one million hectares of state owned lands, private lands, national parks and forests. It was a catastrophic event with extensive loss to property, infrastructure, grazing land and the environment.

The bushfires highlighted the fact that the management of our state owned lands, parks and forests has been lacking. For many years there has been little or no maintenance of firebreaks and access roads to and in those places. There has not been enough managed maintenance burning to reduce fuel loads in our Crown lands and parks, which added to the ferocity and devastation that the fires caused. We have much to learn from these events, which is why we must have this inquiry.

I have toured many of the affected areas in the electorate of Callide. I made a short video with a local landholder, Mr David Marland, whose grazing property adjoins the Bulburin National Park near Gin Gin. In the video, Mr Marland speaks of the devastation that the fires caused in his local area. The forest is now a blackened and charred ruin. When you see it firsthand, the most overwhelming thing you notice is the eerie silence. There is nothing. There is no birdlife. There is no grass. There is absolutely nothing. All of the creatures have perished.

In the video, Mr Marland points out that he has made repeated attempts to get permits to implement controlled burning practices to reduce the build-up of fuel loads on his leased country adjacent to the state owned park and forest. Those applications have been rejected or ignored by the relevant government departments. That is an outrage. It shows the indifference and total disregard that the government departments have for a lifetime of knowledge gained by people who live on and manage that land.

Our short video went viral on social media. It reached over 600,000 people and had 323,000 views. It was the catalyst for the federal government inquiry. Recently I also learned that the Rural Fire Service has used the video as a training tool to highlight the importance of local practical knowledge. Those opposite need to watch the video. They will learn more in four minutes than in four hours of bureaucratic meetings. This morning I heard the Premier tell the House that she takes advice from experts. She needs to listen to Mr Marland; he is an expert.

There have been some practical results. Local graziers who have leases in the Barakula State Forest north-west of Chinchilla in the Callide electorate have told me that the fire trails and access tracks are now being graded. Some of them had had no maintenance for up to 35 years.

Fire is the most important tool we have to mitigate against catastrophic fire. We must implement a strategy of regularly burning our forests at the appropriate times to reduce the fuel loads that they carry. That will help stop the damage caused by huge firestorms in forests that have not been burned for many years.

Mr Butcher interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Please resume your seat, member for Callide. Member for Gladstone, I ask you to return to your seat if you wish to interject. I remind all members that if the member is not taking interjections I will cut all of you down and I will hear the member's contribution.

Mr BOYCE: On behalf of the people of Callide, I take this opportunity to extend my gratitude and thanks to the rural fire brigades and all the volunteers who do what they can to manage and fight devastating fires throughout Queensland. I urge the House to support this motion so that, through an inquiry, we may develop better ways to mitigate and plan for such events when they happen.



Mrs GILBERT (Mackay—ALP) (5.24 pm): It is a shame that the member for Callide had to start his speech with a put-down. I do not think those opposite have a positive bone in their bodies. They always come into this House looking for someone to blame and they do their blaming prematurely. There is no chance that any of them would ever wait for anything official or for an outcome such as we all need to have. Now is the time when we should wait for the advice of the experts, that is, those who know the science and who can give us advice with a level head. Instead of sensationalising everything for five-minute grabs, members opposite need to wait for the advice of the experts and then listen to it. We cannot let the facts be blurred by all of the negativity from those opposite. In direct contrast, the Palaszczuk government—

Mrs Frecklington: We're actually trying to help you out by offering a solution.


Mrs GILBERT: The Leader of the Opposition should listen. In contrast, the Palaszczuk government is a consultative government. We do not make decisions lightly. We like to talk to all of the stakeholders and experts, and we make informed decisions based on the facts. I have chosen to stand here today and speak in this debate because I know the information that we will get will be good, solid information.

Queensland's responsible vegetation management framework includes measures that ensure that landholders can protect their properties from bushfires, including through firebreaks and fire management lines. Those laws, on which there was significant consultation, are clear and easy to understand. A firebreak is a strip of cleared land that is intended to allow firefighting vehicles to access bushland and for prescribed burning operations. It may slow or stop low-intensity fires. A fire management line can be used to access water for firefighting, divide a property into subunits to allow fuel reduction burning programs to be carried out and/or to divide a property into subunits to allow for back-burning in the event of a wildfire.

No approval or notification is needed to clear necessary firebreaks or fire management lines. I will say that again: no approval or notification is needed to clear necessary firebreaks or fire management lines. Specifically, the landholder may clear to establish or maintain a firebreak to protect infrastructure, other than fences or roads, up to 1.5 times the height of the tallest adjacent vegetation or 20 metres, whichever is wider. It is clear that the opposition leader does not understand this, because she is asking for advice from people behind her. The landholder may clear a fire management line of 10 metres width and a clearing up to 10 metres wide to establish or maintain a fence, thus providing a fire management line on the boundary of the property. In non-coastal areas, a landholder can clear a firebreak up to 1.5 times the height of the tallest adjacent vegetation or 30 metres wide, whichever is the greater, provided that they make a notification to the DNRME. The notification is free. It can be done quickly and easily online.

In an emergency landholders can do any clearing required by an authorised officer. The bottom line is—and it is worth reiterating for those opposite with selective memories—that responsible measures have always been permitted. These regulatory exemptions under the vegetation management framework have not changed in 20 years. Should a landholder consider they need to clear a wider firebreak or management line than provided by the above measures, they are able to make an application for a development approval.

(Time expired)

 **Ms LEAHY** (Warrego—LNP) (5.29 pm): I rise to support the motion moved by the member for Gregory. Thank goodness he has moved this motion because those members opposite do really need a lesson when it comes to fire management.

There needs to be a parliamentary inquiry into the Queensland bushfire prevention and preparedness activities leading up to the 2018 Queensland fires. Landholders and Aboriginal people cannot continue to suffer losses as a result of the mismanagement of this Labor government. I am pleased to see the Minister for Environment is here to hear this.

Families cannot continue to suffer losses. I extend my sympathies to the family of the man who was killed in the Carnarvon National Park fire. We cannot afford to keep losing the young people in our communities like this. We cannot allow this Palaszczuk Labor government to continue to destroy Aboriginal art and private property with their lack of fire preparedness. The decision-makers need to be held accountable.

At a fire last year in the Carnarvon National Park, which is well known for its Aboriginal paintings which cannot be replaced, Aboriginal paintings were destroyed. Indigenous people have every right to be outraged at this loss. It is their heritage. The Baloon Cave was the only location available in this park for viewing rock art for the elderly and infirm. I table for the information of the House the photographs of the bushfire destruction at the Baloon Cave. One shows the cave beforehand. The other shows what it looks like now.

Tabled paper: Photograph, undated, depicting Baloon Cave, Carnarvon National Park [166].

Tabled paper: Photograph, undated, depicting Baloon Cave, Carnarvon National Park damaged after a bushfire in 2018 [167].

It is absolutely blackened—absolute shame. How much more irreplaceable Aboriginal art has to be destroyed by this Labor government before they will listen.

There was another bushfire that was caused by a lightning strike before Christmas Day in the Lonesome National Park. It is neighboured by commercial grazing properties. National park staff walked away from this active fire over the Christmas period. Consequently, it burnt out the neighbours' properties. One neighbour lost 15,000 hectares to this fire.

Bridget Price and her mum, Janet Behan, worked frantically to get help from friends and neighbours around the Injune and Arcadia Valley area. These volunteers went willingly to help them and their neighbours. Bridget Price has made it public on a number of occasions that the areas burnt would not have been so great if national parks back-burned earlier and employed more controlled burning strategies in the cooler months. Some of the Lonesome National Park has not been burnt for 20 years.


There is also a cultural problem in national parks. The attitude is that once it burns out of the national park it is no longer their problem; it is the private neighbour's problem. We unfortunately had parks staff who were saying that to people in the community. It is further disappointing that the Labor government stopped the national parks staff from attending the fire debrief that was held on 8 February. They would not let them go. I thank the member for Gregory for attending that meeting. Thank goodness he actually went because the government did not allow their staff to attend. It would have been valuable for that community to have the national park staff in attendance.

Local landowners and their families battled this fire over Christmas. They did not get a break. They did not have fatigue breaks like the national park staff, who walked away leaving no replacement personnel, did. Everybody had gone on leave and left. It was the local volunteers and the landowners who had to manage the fire and prevent it from destroying their private properties during the Christmas and New Year break.

There is nothing wrong with a fatigue management policy provided the government has provided the financial and staffing resources to fulfil their duty of care. On this occasion the Palaszczuk Labor government did not fulfil their responsibilities around that fatigue management policy.

This is difficult terrain. The region needs clear, wide firebreaks—narrow breaks are dangerous. At one stage there was a 12-kilometre firebreak that had to be back-burned to try to contain this fire. That firebreak is longer than some of the electorates in Brisbane are wide or long.

We need this parliamentary inquiry to look at the Palaszczuk Labor government's backyard and hold the decision-makers to account. This has to happen. I urge members to support this motion, because families like the Price family and many others do not want to see a repeat of the mistakes during 2018.

 **Mr O'ROURKE** (Rockhampton—ALP) (5.34 pm): There is very little about Wednesday, 28 November that makes me smile. My electorate of Rockhampton takes in the town of Gracemere. We knew there was a bad fire in Stanwell, just west of Rocky and Gracemere. It was hot and gusty and I could smell it as well. Then I could see it. At lunchtime there was a glow on the horizon. There was a glow in the middle of the day. It was coming our way—towards Gracemere. The smoke, the heat, the wind—I have never heard or felt anything like it and I never want to again.


I listened to the updates coming from the Queensland Disaster Management Committee. It was quickly becoming evident that the risk to life was real. By this time this part of my electorate had been declared catastrophic. This is the highest rating for a bushfire. A catastrophic bushfire can be extreme, erratic, fast moving and cannot be contained or controlled. A catastrophic categorisation—the highest and most critical of the six fire danger ratings in Queensland—means: the fire may be uncontrollable, unpredictable and fast moving; the flames will be higher than rooftops; there is a potential for many people to be injured and homes and businesses to be destroyed; well-prepared and well-constructed homes will not be safe; and leaving is the only option for survival.

Then we have the LNP misleading the community by saying that fires are being caused by the change in vegetation management legislation. I have fought fires as a young fella and I have fought alongside my brother to save his property outside of Gympie. I know what a fire can do and what fire is capable of, but I have never witnessed what I saw on Wednesday, 28 November last year.

For the LNP to say it is poor management makes me really angry. Poor management does not factor into the state-of-the-art technology used to predict where this fire was going. Poor management does not factor into the development of the Phoenix bushfire simulation program. Poor management does not factor into the QFES development predictive software known as Sabre. That was foresight. That was progressive. That was brilliant management.

At 3 pm on that day residents in Kabra, Gracemere and the surrounding areas were told to leave immediately—to leave their homes and their properties and head to family and friends in Rockhampton. An evacuation centre had been established at the Rocky showgrounds for those who needed somewhere to stay. Nearly 11½ thousand people evacuated their homes and businesses. Hand on my heart, that is 11½ thousand people in my community whose lives were saved.

Our community of Gracemere is tough; it is resilient. I am incredibly proud to be their local member. I cannot thank the QFES staff and volunteers enough for their help, their dedication and their support. Funnily enough, that does make me smile.

 **Mr LAST** (Burdekin—LNP) (5.39 pm): I rise to support the private member's motion moved by the member for Gregory. I say at the outset that I have the utmost respect for our firefighters, including our rural and auxiliary firefighters, and I want to acknowledge their efforts in responding to the devastating bushfires which impacted our state late last year.

Yesterday I spoke about the natural disasters that have affected north and north-west Queensland in recent weeks. I mentioned that our great state offers generous gifts but is brutal in its cruelty. That cruelty extends to the devastating bushfires which ravaged large parts of our state in November and December last year—bushfires that destroyed life and property, bushfires which brought into question fire prevention and preparedness activities. It is right and proper that the spotlight should fall on these activities and the role of government, not only in fire reduction practices conducted on state owned land and national parks but how the government deals with native vegetation and land management laws and practices in managing fires in the broader Queensland context.

The bushfires late last year burned more than one million hectares, including 800 hectares of sugarcane crops in the Pioneer Valley and Blue Mountain areas near Mackay—1,500 people were displaced and up to 600 homes evacuated. Surely the government's first priority is to ensure the safety of residents and the protection of their property. For that reason, it is imperative that a full and frank inquiry be conducted by a parliamentary committee that examines all aspects of those fires.

I distinctly recall after those fires having a conversation with a well-known grazier at Sarina who made the statement that the worst neighbour that you can have if you are a landholder in Queensland at the moment is the state government. I asked him why and he went on to describe how fire reduction strategies in terms of firebreaks and access roads were non-existent on state owned land, be that state forest, conservation areas or national parks. What that means is that when a bushfire starts on state controlled land there is nothing to stop it from entering neighbouring properties. Landholders have nothing to back-burn to in terms of firebreaks and that makes it extraordinarily difficult to fight fires.

I also had a call from a grazier at Nebo who, whilst fighting the fires on his property with his neighbour, was forced to seek shelter underneath his dozer as the fire went over the top of them. He lost almost 70 kilometres of fencing, livestock and other infrastructure, not to mention thousands of gallons of fuel that he used in his station vehicles fighting those fires.

There is no question that clearing vegetation for the purpose of firebreaks needs to be included in this review. When you have a bushfire coming at you fanned by high winds, you want to be standing on a firebreak at least 100 metres wide and not some skinny, 20-metre strip of land that you were unable to clear appropriately because of bureaucratic red tape and restrictive vegetation management laws. That brings me to my next point, which is hazard reduction burns. We should be talking to and listening to our landholders. After all, they have in many cases been undertaking hazard reduction burns for generations. The process of obtaining permits needs to be overhauled, along with the process of accessing government staff and equipment.

I recall when I was living in Cape York assisting national park rangers at Lakefield national park to undertake controlled hazard reduction burns involving areas of land up to 250,000 acres. That might sound almost incomprehensible to many members in this place. However, with proper firebreaks, favourable weather conditions, experienced personnel and the proper equipment, this is what you can achieve in a safe and responsible manner. They had a plan: each year they burnt a different section of the national park so that over a period of time they had a mosaic pattern across the park of reduced fuel load.

As a landholder, the state government has a role and, more importantly, a responsibility to manage state controlled land in a manner that does not impose a danger to neighbouring landholders. In fact, I would go so far as to say the state government should be a role model when it comes to bushfire prevention and preparedness. For that reason, it is imperative that this inquiry be undertaken by a parliamentary committee without fear or favour. We owe it to all Queenslanders.



Mrs LAUGA (Keppel—ALP) (5.43 pm): Firstly, I would like to address some of the comments made by those opposite and reaffirm that I rise tonight to speak against this motion. I think it is quite interesting that tonight is the first time I have ever heard those opposite talk about the importance of biodiversity and the importance of our national parks. If the member for Warrego and those opposite want to save national parks, they could pick up the phone and talk to their federal colleagues and get them to stop the closure of the Charon Point Conservation Park near Shoalwater Bay—the same national park that the federal government wants to acquire to allow for the expansion of the Singaporean-Australian military training expansion. Stand up and fight—

Mr Millar: Speak to the motion.

Mrs LAUGA: I am talking about national parks. You want to talk about national parks; I am talking about national parks. Those opposite can stand up and fight for our national parks by picking up the phone today and talking to their federal defence minister and saying, 'We want to save some national parks.'

If those opposite want to talk publicly about the value of our firefighters and volunteers, why not include something to that effect in this motion? All this motion talks about is ways in which they are being critical of our rural firefighters and of our processes. There is actually nothing in the motion that supports our firefighters. That is what I am getting up here today to do. While we are talking about landholders and consulting with landholders, it is landholders who are often the rural firefighters—they are the ones doing the hazard reduction burns. To say that the rural fireys do not consult with landholders is outright ludicrous.

I see no need to hold a parliamentary inquiry when I witnessed an outstanding and absolutely fantastic response from Queensland firefighters to catastrophic bushfire conditions in our community—unprecedented catastrophic bushfire conditions. I saw the local permanent and volunteer firefighters, backed by colleagues from other parts of Queensland and interstate, do a wonderful job at protecting the people and their property in Keppel. They are incredibly brave men and women who put their lives on the line to protect our community. The Rural Fire Service volunteers from Bungundarra, The Caves, Keppel Sands, Cawarral, Tanby and Adelaide Park brigades within my electorate all rose to the occasion. The fire and rescue stations at Emu Park, North Rockhampton and Yeppoon played an incredibly important role too.

I saw a system that worked. I have seen it before in Central Queensland after Cyclone Marcia in 2015, after the Fitzroy floods in 2017 and again in 2018 after the Queensland bushfires. Sure there are ways in which we can improve the way we respond to and recover after natural disasters, but I can assure you that the people leading the charge in response and recovery to natural disasters in Queensland, and those who review the whole process, are world-leading experts.

What we are witnessing here tonight is those opposite trying to use every opportunity to politicise natural disasters in our state—trying to use every opportunity to blow the disaster up into a political storm. We saw those opposite yesterday and again today preying on the devastating floods in North and Far North Queensland to try to turn this into a blatant political point-scoring exercise. We see it again tonight. Those opposite are trying again to turn unprecedented bushfire conditions and huge firefighting operations into a political firestorm—no pun intended. The people of Queensland can see through their shallow plan.

There is no need for a parliamentary inquiry when we have the Office of the Inspector-General Emergency Management, IGEM. IGEM was in fact established by those opposite in 2014 under the Newman government to independently review and assess disaster management arrangements in Queensland. The minister of the day, Jack Dempsey, in his ministerial statement on 26 November 2014, said—

Yet another first for Queensland is the establishment of the Inspector-General Emergency Management, whose independent oversight maintains world-leading standards in emergency and disaster management.


The member for Everton in a speech on 30 August 2016 supported the establishment of the Office of the Inspector-General Emergency Management, which was tasked with reviewing and assessing the effectiveness of disaster management in Queensland. In speaking on the bill which established IGEM in 2014, a number of members opposite spoke in support including the member for Broadwater, the then member for Mundingburra. He said—

I rise to make a contribution in steadfast support of the Disaster Management Amendment Bill and I commend the minister for the bill.

Even the member for Toowoomba North backed in the bill. He said—

From my point of view, I think this is a good bill. I think that the minister is to be commended for introducing it. It simplifies the emergency management structure.

(Time expired)

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (5.48 pm): I rise with pleasure to support the motion moved by the member for Gregory. The ignorance of those opposite is evident when we hear their speeches. They misunderstand what the opposition is trying to do here by offering a solution to the Palaszczuk government when they are obviously in dire need of one.


What we are moving here tonight is for a parliamentary inquiry into what happened in relation to the bushfires. Why did it happen and how can we ever prevent it from happening again? Each and every one of us on this side of the chamber have thanked, and will continue to thank, our hardworking QFES workers, our rural fireys, our volunteers, our police officers, our ambulance officers and our park rangers because they worked within the confines of what was given to them by this Palaszczuk government.

When the Rural Fire Service says to the people of Queensland, 'The internal review by the Palaszczuk government simply will not cut it,' I know who I am going to listen to. I am going to listen to the hardworking men and women who protect our communities. For those opposite who have no clue what rural fireys do, they are volunteers. They are out there saving us each and every day on the front line. So when those good people say to me, 'An internal review into the disastrous fires—catastrophic fires—does not cut it,' I am going to listen to those men and women rather than the Palaszczuk government which has obviously missed the boat in relation to this.

There are serious concerns around staffing levels in our national parks. At a time when we see over 26,000 extra public servants, we have fewer police and national parks are screaming out for help. And guess why? Because the jobs are not in Ann Street. The jobs are where they should be: on the ground. That is the problem with this Palaszczuk government, and we need to get to the bottom of it. We need to hear from everyone. We need to have a parliamentary inquiry so people can come and sit in front of people and discuss what went wrong.

My heart and my thoughts go out to the Bird family for the tragic loss of their son George from Rolleston. People from regional Queensland have lived and worked on the land. When they know they need to get a permit and when they have been screaming out for a permit for 12 months, people need to listen to them and that, in this case, is the Palaszczuk government. We have a good neighbour policy in this country, and when the state government is our neighbour we expect them to be a good neighbour. If the state government is a national park and the other neighbour, the freehold landholder, is saying to their neighbour, 'Please tidy up your patch,' and 'Let us put in some fire breaks because the government will not give us a permit,' there is a problem.

What we need is a review into what has been going wrong in our national parks. It is not a simple fix of saying, 'Let's protect our rainforests.' It is embarrassing that those opposite in the Palaszczuk government—those who aspire to be ministers in this government—seriously use the word 'rainforests' when we are talking about areas like Baffle Creek. That comes from being out of touch. Why has the Palaszczuk government not implemented any of the recommendations of the Auditor-General's review into the preparation of our communities for bushfire disasters? That is another question that we need answered, but it is only the LNP that appears to have a plan to protect the future of regional Queensland in this great state.

 **Hon. LM ENOCH** (Algeria—ALP) (Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef, Minister for Science and Minister for the Arts) (5.54 pm): I rise to oppose the motion. Not long after it was made safe, I visited Carnarvon with about a dozen rangers who are based out there and with traditional owners. I saw firsthand the catastrophic situation that we had been dealt on those days of unprecedented weather. What we saw were unprecedented events.

When I was there the traditional owners were very clear about the next steps in terms of how we tell the story of what is going on there. Unfortunately, the member for Warrego has completely disrespected and disregarded their wishes with her comments tonight. I feel disgusted by what she has done. The traditional owners made it very clear what steps should be next, and she has completely disrespected that. Why has the member for Warrego done that? Because she is after cheap political shots, using a situation where traditional owners have been very clear. The member for Warrego has absolutely disregarded that and it is absolutely disgusting. As a traditional owner myself, I find it absolutely disgusting.

When I met with the rangers at Carnarvon, they were absolutely exhausted. They were emotionally exhausted, they were physically exhausted and they were spiritually exhausted from what they had been dealing with during these unprecedented events. They are based there. They had been working tirelessly to ensure they were prepared for fire season and they had been dealt with an absolutely unprecedented set of events. Every day our QPWS staff work really hard on national parks, and I find it so insulting and disgusting to hear the kinds of comments coming from the opposition about our incredibly hardworking staff.

The member for Gregory made comments about where the majority of fires started during these unprecedented events. I am advised—and I can now pass on this advice to the House—that in 2018 less than 10 per cent of bushfires in Queensland started on QPWS managed estate and 70 per cent of that 10 per cent was contained within that estate. It is completely untrue to say that the majority of fires started on the protected area estate. It is completely untrue.

In relation to our protected areas, when those opposite were in government they showed us how they really feel about protected areas and the staff who manage them, and we are seeing it on display again tonight. The former LNP government slashed around \$10 million from the QPWS salary budget after they were elected in 2012. What that meant is that QPWS had 60 fewer rangers as a result of their \$10 million cut to the salary budget. The non-ranger workforce, who support the work of front-line staff, was reduced by 25 per cent. The LNP slashed funding to things they did not care about, and unfortunately QPWS felt the brunt of that.

Our government has been rebuilding the capacity of QPWS following the irresponsible and disastrous cuts by the LNP. QPWS's budget for fire management in 2017-18 was almost \$10 million. They now have a trained fire crew of 537 staff members across the state. They put their heart and soul into protecting our estate and they physically put their bodies on the line when they were fighting fires during this unprecedented event. I find this absolutely disgusting, and we will be opposing this motion this evening.

(Time expired)

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

AYES, 40:

LNP, 36—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

KAP, 2—Dametto, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 47:

ALP, 46—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, 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.

Pair: Furner, Perrett.

Resolved in the negative.

WASTE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING (WASTE LEVY) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 181, on motion of Ms Enoch—

That the bill be now read a second time.



Mrs MILLER (Bundamba—ALP) (6.04 pm), continuing: I was talking earlier about the health and respiratory issues of residents in relation to these dumps. Many people suffer from asthma and sinus problems as a direct result of these dumps in my electorate. They also suffer from a degradation of their lifestyle through the smells. These smells are absolutely ridiculous; it stinks to high heaven. There

is also dust. Many people in the area have to wipe down their outdoor furniture at least once a day, sometimes twice a day. There is light pollution, particularly at night in winter, because the machinery has lights on when they work at night. There is also noise pollution.

People are vomiting in their own homes because the smell is that bad. They cannot eat anything and they are vomiting because of the smell. Some are also in a situation where they have to lock themselves up in their hot houses in the middle of the Ipswich summers. If you have air conditioning, it is not that bad because you are able to put the air conditioning on, but if you do not have air conditioning it is like living in a hellhole.

There is also degradation of our environment and risks to the waterways. As I said before, there is increased traffic and worn out, dirty, absolutely filthy local roads, particularly along the Ipswich Motorway at Dinmore, on Aberdare Street, through Riverview, up the Cunningham Highway and along Memorial Drive at Swanbank.

There is also increased pollution. Let me talk about the smoke from the fires. Holy! We had a situation before Christmas I think when one of the dumps caught on fire. Those of us who have asthma, including me, were woken up in the middle of the night because we could not breathe as a result of the smoke coming off the dump fires. We did not have the situation where we got text messages because there was some disaster happening, but to us it was like that because we could not breathe. There have also been breaches of environmental laws and development conditions which have been found by the odour busters task force. There are also concerns over the old mine workings and safety for workers on site and the environment.

There are impacts on the lifestyles of families. For example, when the smells are there, you cannot have a barbecue so you cannot plan for a barbecue at all. Normal people are able to say, 'We're going to have a barbecue this Saturday or Sunday,' and then invite people over. We cannot do that because if the dumps are smelling you cannot have a barbecue outside so it affects our lifestyles as well.

I table my objection to Austin BMI's application for a material change of use—application MCU/1149/2018.

Tabled paper: Letter, undated, from the member for Bundamba, Mrs Jo-Ann Miller MP, to the Chief Executive Officer, Ipswich City Council, objecting to an application for material change of use by Austin BMI [168].

I would like to ask every other member in this parliament whether or not they have had the guts to object as well.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Member for Bundamba, that is unparliamentary language.


Mrs MILLER: I withdraw that—the ticker to actually do that.

Ipswich City Council has allowed development of homes to creep closer and closer to these dumps, including at Redbank Plains, Ripley and Blackstone. What happens is that people spend money to buy a new home—and it is up to half a million dollars, particularly in Ripley—and then they do not feel comfortable in them because they cannot actually live there in peace and tranquillity. This is not right, and when it is not right we stand up and we say 'enough is enough'. These activities are far too close to people's homes in an area that should really become the heart and lungs of the city by being an environmental park.

If the LNP were to say that there should be more dumps or dump mountains up to 300 feet high in the air—and this is what these dump operators are talking about—Labor Party members and the unions would be out in the streets because it is so wrong. Just because some Labor members or so-called Labor councillors—who are now sacked, thank God—support dumps and incinerators, that does not make it right. In fact, it makes it doubly wrong. Why? It is because they are not listening to the community who do not want these dumps, and that was very clear at the town hall meeting that the Premier had last year. What it means is that they are walking away from the very people who they are supposed to represent, which is the working class, the poor, the elderly and the sick. In an absolute contempt of the people, they are supporting multinational companies to make massive profits whilst working-class people suffer, including their basic right to breathe clean air.

The sentiment in the community is like when the previous Labor government sold assets—the people rose up and they voted accordingly and they are going to do it again. They have made that very clear to me. Ipswich people want people who represent them, who are members or councillors of conviction, who will do what is right for them. My suggestion for this government is: do what is right for

our community in Ipswich. I suggest that this government has specific legislation called something like the 'Ipswich City Council (No Dumps and No Incinerators) Planning Bill'. I suggest that they consult with our local community. Ipswich is at the crossroads. When it comes to dumps and incinerators, we say no, no, no.

 **Mr LAST** (Burdekin—LNP) (6.10 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Waste Reduction and Recycling (Waste Levy) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. I say at the outset that I oppose this bill. Once again members on this side of the House are sticking up for Queenslanders while this government continues to peddle illusions. The waste reduction and recycling legislation is just that—an illusion. I cannot in all good conscience stand by while families, businesses and even the elderly are punished because this government cannot work out where a truck is coming from.

Let's be clear and call this for what it is. It is a \$1.3 billion tax grab. It is confirmation that this government in its desperation to find funds has resorted to implementing a tax under the guise of protecting the environment when it is clear it is nothing short of a blatant money grab from Queensland residents and businesses. It is yet another occasion when Queenslanders have been sold out in the name of Greens preferences and it is proof that this government does not understand that Queensland actually extends beyond the south-east corner of the state.

We know what the legislation is, but it is important to understand what it is not. It is not about protecting our environment and it is not about creating a new industry for Queensland. This legislation is nothing but an excuse, an ill-thought-out attempt to address a problem that exists in the south-east corner of the state.

Let's go back just over one year. The minister announced the strategy, a strategy to increase recycling. There is nothing wrong with that. The minister announced a strategy to increase resource recovery. There is nothing wrong with that either. According to the minister, this strategy would also create a new industry and create jobs. Then we had the Premier assure Queenslanders that they would not be burdened with the cost. It sounded like magic. In reality, it was nothing but a fantasy—a fairytale and nothing less.

Queensland has become the dumping ground for New South Wales. That is right: we have an endless stream of trucks coming across the border dumping their rubbish in Queensland dumps—dumps located in the south-east corner of the state, predominantly around the Ipswich area. No doubt it sounded like a good idea at the time but, as they say, chooks always come home to roost, because the volume of rubbish continued to rise and the groundswell of opposition to this practice started to grow.

I oppose this bill for the fundamental reason that residents living in the Burdekin electorate—living in North and Far North Queensland—should not have to pay for a problem which originated in the south-east corner of the state. It is not a problem of our making and it is not a problem for which North Queensland residents should foot the bill in order to rectify this disaster.

Let's focus on the reality, not the fantasy world that those opposite want us to believe we live in. The reality is this: this legislation is about punishing all Queenslanders for a problem that started in Ipswich. This legislation confirms that this government would rather burden every Queenslanders with this tax than admit that their Labor mates in Ipswich got it wrong. They would rather introduce a new tax than identify and fix a simple problem.

The Burdekin electorate is over 1,300 kilometres from Ipswich. The dumping of rubbish from New South Wales in that locality and in other places in the south-east corner is not the fault of the people of the Burdekin electorate. We did not create the problem, but this government wants us to pay for it. Families building a new home or renovating a home in Townsville or Cairns did not create the problem; small business operators in Bowen did not create the problem; the elderly in homes for the aged in Ayr and Home Hill did not create the problem, yet this minister wants them to pay for a supposed solution. By burdening families, small businesses and the elderly the minister is not fixing the problem; she is shifting the blame.

This is not a levy; it is a tax. This minister expects us to sit here tonight and believe it will not cost us anything, that the fee paid by all the people throughout Queensland will create jobs and industries. Wait, there is more magic! Ninety per cent of the fee—and do not call it a tax, remember—will vanish. It will not go to those new industries; it will not go to creating jobs; it will vanish; it will go straight into the big bucket held by the Treasurer. Guess what will not vanish? What will not vanish is the unemployment queues. What will not vanish is the inept economic mismanagement that this

government has shown. What will not vanish is the increases in the cost of living. This problem can be fixed without punishing every Queenslander. This problem can be fixed by enforcing current laws to prevent waste from New South Wales being dumped in Queensland.

If this government were serious about recycling and resource recovery we would not be expected to support legislation where less than 10 per cent of the levy collected goes towards that purpose. The only thing this government is serious about is burdening the people of Queensland with a new tax—\$1.3 billion of burden, \$1.3 billion ripped out of the Queensland economy. What do we get for that? We get less than 10 per cent spent on developing industries and actually improving our environment.

If the minister and this government want this legislation, they should explain to young families why the cost of building their new home will increase. The minister should speak to the operators of aged care facilities and tell them what programs to cut in order to pay this levy. Of course, the minister should also explain to small businesses how they can recoup the extra expense without passing it on to customers, because remember Queenslanders were promised they would not bear the cost.

For the minister to stand in this place today and attempt to sell this legislation as a saviour for the environment is misleading. It has become simply too convenient to hide legislation like this under the environment umbrella, and Queenslanders will not be hoodwinked into believing this spin. It is not just the members on this side of the House who have not fallen for the fairytale; local governments throughout Queensland know someone has to pay. The building industry and the housing industry know that this levy will increase the cost of new homes. Even the waste industry knows the claims do not stack up.

This legislation is not about the environment. If it were, we would not see 90 per cent of the levy collected vanishing into the government's coffers. If this legislation was about the environment, the minister would enforce the existing laws. Unless honourable members believe in fairytales, they cannot support this legislation. Those on this side of the House will not support this legislation. It is bad legislation disguised as an environmental initiative. I call on the minister and the Premier to stop the introduction of this new tax.



Mrs MULLEN (Jordan—ALP) (6.17 pm): I am pleased to speak in support of the Waste Reduction and Recycling (Waste Levy) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. As our population in Queensland continues to grow, how we manage waste in this state has become an imperative. It is something the community wants us to confront, particularly in finding alternatives to landfill. We are not unique in this situation as all states are struggling under the weight of their rubbish. However, we have an opportunity to change the way we manage waste, to look at waste as more than a burden but as an opportunity to create jobs and drive significant economic growth, to make better use of resources and develop new industries.

We also need to deal with the terrible policy decision of the former LNP government who repealed Queensland's waste levy in 2012, making us a cheap place to dump interstate waste, and the proof is there. As the Minister for Environment highlighted only last week through the release of *Recycling and waste in Queensland 2018*, in 2017-18 we saw 2.1 million tonnes of waste trucked across the border into Queensland. I am particularly conscious of this as a significant part of my electorate is within the Ipswich City Council area, which has faced the brunt of this interstate dumping.

The Palaszczuk government understood that this situation could not continue, which is why the former environment minister appointed the Hon. Peter Lyons QC to lead an investigation into the transport of waste from other states into Queensland. The final report on the transportation of waste into Queensland, the Lyons report, was clear that the reimposition of a landfill levy would be likely to discourage the movement of interstate waste to Queensland and recommended that the Queensland government consider implementing a general levy on all waste disposed of at landfill in Queensland.

The legislation before us seeks to introduce a waste disposal levy to be set at \$75 per tonne from 1 July, requiring operators of leviable waste disposal sites to pay the state a levy on waste delivered to the site. The bill has also established a simple zone system whereby your local government area is either in a waste levy zone or in a non-levy zone. The waste levy zone will cover 90 per cent of Queensland's population, where the majority of waste is generated. However, we also want to make sure that those in the non-levy zone are not disadvantaged by having waste generated in a levy zone dumped in a non-levy zone to avoid paying that levy. If the waste is generated in a levy zone or interstate, you still have to pay the levy in a non-levy zone.

The Palaszczuk government understands that reintroducing a waste levy is a big change for the community, particularly for local governments, many of whom will have key carriage of the waste levy administration. It is clear that the reintroduction of the waste levy and its ongoing management will be

a big change. In fact, the Local Government Association of Queensland's submission on the legislation considered that the bill will herald the biggest change in the governance of waste management in Queensland in decades. However, this legislation will also herald more than just an issue of administration and governance: it is a fundamental change in the way we think about waste strategy, with a comprehensive waste and resource recovery strategy.

In their submission the Waste Management Association of Australia summed up why we need to act. They say that at present Queensland continues to be one of the largest generators of waste but one of the poorest diverters of waste from landfill. The absence of a comprehensive strategy has resulted in Queensland maintaining a 'take, make and dispose' approach to waste and resource recovery, when the remainder of Australia and the developed world has moved further towards a circular economy. Our communities certainly agree. Last year the then Ipswich City Council announced that rubbish collected in the yellow topped recycling bins would be heading to landfill. The decision, following China's import ban on recycling and the rising level of contamination of non-recyclable rubbish, meant that the council believed it had become too costly for the city to recycle. The community response was swift and decisive, and the council was forced to reverse its decision very quickly.

As a member of the Innovation, Tourism Development and Environment Committee, we received a number of detailed submissions from stakeholders and participated in public hearings in Ipswich, where we heard directly from local governments, the waste management industry and other key stakeholders on the bill. It is clear that the government has listened to the feedback from stakeholders, many of whom will be at the front line of the waste levy, and has made changes to the bill to support its smooth implementation. This is very important because we are a government that listens, takes feedback on board and responds accordingly to stakeholder concerns, which is a feature that was sorely lacking when those opposite were in charge and legislation was implemented that proved to be flawed and unworkable. We know that we need to get this right—to set in place a long-term and sustainable strategy for waste management and resource recovery—and to ensure that we re-invest the collected funds into programs that will help reduce the amount of waste and boost the recycling and resource recovery sector in Queensland.

I would like to challenge something that the shadow minister earlier asserted in his speech, which the member for Burdekin repeated, when he said that 90 per cent of the levy funds are coming back to government, meaning that only 10 per cent is being reinvested. This is simply not true. I challenge the member for Broadwater to table the maths and the calculations that he is using to make this assertion because, from what has been announced so far, we know that already over 50 per cent will be reinvested into the industry.


One of the concerns raised by stakeholders was the initial start date of 4 March 2019. I am pleased that there is recognition that a start date of 1 July 2019 will support current financial time frames, particularly for local governments. I was also pleased to see the take-up rate from local governments for the \$5 million Local Government Levy Ready Grants Program, which will see 60 project proposals from 34 councils successfully receiving funding to assist them with their waste disposal infrastructure upgrades prior to the introduction of the waste levy.

The short-sighted and politically motivated decision by the LNP to remove the waste levy also robbed us of years of investment in the waste and recycling industry, as we now find ourselves trying to catch up. Unfortunately, the current linear approach has deprived Queensland of the opportunity to create new jobs, making it difficult for resource recovery industries to invest. What is clear is that the Queensland waste avoidance and resource productivity strategy developed by the former LNP government did not deliver opportunities for the resource recovery sector to grow and prosper. It was a dud strategy that should have gone straight to landfill. This is largely because the strategy was unfunded, relying on the development of voluntary action plans and not underlined by a market mechanism to encourage behavioural change. The disposal of waste into landfill without an incentive to recover resources has been a lost economic opportunity and, as we now know, creates avoidable environmental problems such as additional greenhouse gas emissions.

We also have a burgeoning biofutures industry, and I believe that Queensland does have the opportunity to learn from international experience and ensure that, through modern infrastructure, technology and innovation, we can provide viable domestic and local processing of waste. I am also of the view that as legislators we have an obligation to seriously look at waste-to-energy technology—not by playing into people's fears and lack of information regarding this technology—but through proper and thorough investigations, research and analysis.

I recently read a report by the New South Wales Legislative Council which was tabled in March last year regarding energy-from-waste technology. They presented a comprehensive assessment which acknowledged the significant concern amongst stakeholders about energy from waste, and in particular whether the specific combustion technology posed an undue risk to human health and the environment. However, the committee also acknowledged the importance of working towards energy recovery as being preferable to disposal and that the current dependence on landfill is simply unsustainable. Ultimately, waste-to-energy technologies may be one component of a comprehensive solution only after a significant shift up the waste hierarchy to avoid, reduce and re-use waste and the issues of social licence, air pollution impacts and health risks have been addressed.

What is clear is that Queensland will finally have a way forward in relation to waste—not only minimisation but investment in the resource recovery industry, including the \$100 million Resource Recovery Industry Development Program and \$6 million for a regional recycling transport assistance program, supporting regional councils and businesses in overcoming additional challenges. In conclusion, and returning to my opening comments on this bill, Queensland is growing and, along with it, our waste. As leaders within our communities we have an obligation to address this pressing issue, and the Waste Reduction and Recycling (Waste Levy) and Other Legislation Amendment bill 2018 is an important start.

 **Ms LEAHY** (Warrego—LNP) (6.26 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Waste Reduction and Recycling (Waste Levy) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. This bill amends the Waste Reduction and Recycling Act 2011 and makes minor transitional amendments to the City of Brisbane Act 2010 and the Local Government Act 2009. I understand there are now some changes that have been made to the date of commencement of this legislation due to the amendments.

Before I speak in detail about the provisions of the bill, I think it is important to acknowledge that a number of local government areas in the north and north-west of this state have faced record floods, devastation, damage to their communities, homes, businesses, livestock, roads and other local, state and federal government infrastructure. The mayors and councillors of the north and north-west, from Townsville on the east coast to the Northern Territory border, should be commended for their tireless work during this unprecedented disaster. These are very difficult times and the effect on the regions has been devastating, but we have seen community leaders rise to meet the challenges that are ahead of them.

When this bill was first proposed by the government it was portrayed as a response to an interstate waste problem at Ipswich. If we cast our minds back, there were a few issues with the Ipswich council and the government had a few problems with—

An opposition member: With the Labor Ipswich council.

Ms LEAHY: I will take that interjection from the honourable member—the Ipswich Labor council, and this Labor government had a few problems removing that council from office. Then we heard that this was all about a recycling issue; then it was because of some international trade development with China; and after that it was to develop Queensland's recycling industry. Well, talk about excuses for a new tax! This tax will raise the most income of any of the five new taxes. It is also a tax that Queenslanders were not told about prior to the last state election. For the record, let's be clear on the real reason that the government dreamt up this waste bill: it was a tax grab, pure and simple.

Mr Crandon: \$1.5 billion.

Ms LEAHY: I will take that interjection. There is nothing clever about it. It is just an ongoing reminder of Labor's love of taxing Queenslanders at every opportunity.

While I acknowledge the desirability of progressing towards a zero-waste goal, this legislation has been rushed and is poorly constructed. Hence there are some 51 amendments—a further example of lazy Labor. This bill will not be the vehicle to deliver zero waste. It will not be the bill to deliver help to local councils or the environment. It has been designed to deliver consolidated revenue to the state government directly from the pockets of mums, dads and businesses. We heard from the member for Broadwater the estimates in relation to Mount Isa City Council, which expects that this will cost each and every one of its ratepayers an extra \$320.

We need no further evidence of this taxation intent than to recognise that less than 10 cents in the dollar of the estimated \$1.3 billion raised will go towards environmental programs. Where does the over 90 cents in the dollar go? It goes to the government. Let us call it what it is. It is not about dealing with waste, as indicated previously. It is all about siphoning millions of dollars into Labor government coffers from mums, dads and businesses in the levy area.

Many practical issues were raised by Queensland local governments. They were overlooked or ignored in the original bill. Even the March 2019 start date for the waste levy was not originally aligned with the financial year. I acknowledge that there are some amendments, but the added burden falling to local councils had to be pointed out. After a good deal of pushback from local government and the LNP, the start date was eventually deferred to July 2019. What a nightmare it would have been for council budgets if the levy had commenced in March and the increments were levied in March in every year thereafter. It would have been an absolute nightmare for councils. This is a Labor government we are talking about, so the earlier date was understandable in the government's rush to extract higher taxes as soon as possible.

Many legitimate concerns were originally overlooked, so councils and industry had to fight to get exemptions. I acknowledge that there are some amendments, but it would have been horrendous to tax people for cleaning up after the recent weather events. I refer to exemptions for wastewater used for irrigation from coal seam gas plants. Now I know why Maranoa Regional Council is included in the levy area: a deliberate attempt to tax the use of that wastewater. I refer to exemptions for weighbridges and road scalplings. The road scalplings exemption is for only three years. Three years is not good enough. If this exemption is not ongoing, the cost of road repairs for local government will skyrocket.

By way of further example, Maranoa Regional Council has not been subjected to the levy before. It is concerned it will bear considerable costs. It has a network of nine waste facilities over some 63,000 square kilometres, with travel distances of 100 kilometres or more and populations of individual and urban areas ranging from 10 to 700 people. The council estimates that the cost to install a weighbridge at each of these sites is in excess of \$200,000. To compound this issue, these smaller sites are not eligible for the waste levy readiness funding. I am sure that Maranoa Regional Council would appreciate a clarification in relation to the amendments that have been foreshadowed and whether these amendments will provide exemptions to the sites to which they refer and at which they believe they will have to install weighbridges. I am sure they would like to hear that in the minister's reply to the second reading debate.


This bill is one of the biggest changes in governance of waste management in Queensland in decades. Given this, and the collective and individual impact to 38 councils—now 39 with the inclusion of Goondiwindi Regional Council in the levy zone—and many more impacted indirectly, it is incredibly disappointing that only nine business days was allowed for consultation. You would think that if you were going to raise \$1.3 billion you might have allowed a little more than nine business days for consultation.

In the time remaining I will outline some further legitimate concerns and reservations that local councils have expressed about the bill. One is the inclusion of Maranoa Regional Council and Mount Isa council in the waste area. They have never been included before. It is not well reasoned that both councils be included. They have strongly objected to their inclusion. The inclusion of Mount Isa City Council in the waste levy zone is based solely on a population level—a highly arbitrary policy basis ignoring other relevant factors such as remoteness, high transport costs for waste, the already high living costs, and those costs will probably go higher, given recent disasters—and the almost certain inability, due to low volumes and high transport costs, of the Mount Isa City Council to successfully bid for funding under the Queensland government's announced \$100 million Resource Recovery Industry Development Program. Placing Mount Isa in the waste levy area produces no benefits to Mount Isa residents and businesses. It is simply another remoteness tax on their community.

True to form, I have a feeling that placing Mount Isa in the levy zone was about capturing more tax from Mount Isa Mines for state Labor government coffers. The new remoteness tax will raise \$320 from each resident. It is ridiculous to include Mount Isa City Council. They actually do not have an issue with interstate dumping from New South Wales because they are on the Northern Territory border.

In its submission Brisbane City Council referred to section 73D and the requirement to see the annual payment as needing to be transparent to the community. The council raised concerns about placing this information on rates notices. They estimate that it will cost them \$100,000 per annum to include that. That is something that the ratepayers of Brisbane will have to cover.

A number of councils raised the issue of misinformation in proposed new section 73D(4). I am sure that councils would appreciate some further guidance and clear examples from the government about what is considered acceptable in relation to misinformation. They are quite concerned about that situation. They have suggested that the information required would be better placed on council websites and adopted council revenue statements.

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning) (6.36 pm): I am very pleased to rise in the House this evening to provide my strong support to the Waste Reduction and Recycling (Waste Levy) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. Most debates in this House are political. Some are ideological but by far the most meaningful involve differences in policy. Of the litany of the LNP's policy failures in government, the abolition of the waste levy is surely one of the most egregious and destructive and certainly the one whose consequences are the most enduring. That is the legacy of Campbell Newman. With that one decision he managed to turn South-East Queensland into the garbage dump capital of the eastern seaboard. All of those opposite are complicit in that decision—in particular, the member for Broadwater, who was the minister for local government and was such a strong and ardent supporter of Campbell Newman during his destructive reign as the Premier of Queensland.

Their complicit action in that decision is reinforced by the position they have taken on this bill. This debate demonstrates that not only have the LNP learned nothing; they also have no shame. They are like the boy who gets caught chopping down a tree whose only regret is that he did not destroy the entire orchard. The LNP's garbage policy turned Ipswich into a garbage dump, and those opposite have the temerity to come back into this House and shamelessly attempt to re prosecute their case.

It has been said that those who fail to learn history are doomed to repeat it, first as tragedy then as farce. The LNP has a happy knack of reversing that process. Its abolition of the waste levy began as farce and has turned into tragedy for Queenslanders, who have been left quite literally with the mess.

As soon as the levy was removed the trucks started rolling, hauling rubbish all the way from Sydney to dump in Queensland. And they have kept coming—1.3 million tonnes last year, as the minister has reported to the House. That is a 37 per cent increase on the previous year. There are mountains of it, building on the mountains already there as a result of the Newman government's arrogant misjudgement.

The only comfort that can be taken from the destructive term of the Newman government was that it was mercifully brief. That record majority secured in 2012 was lost in 2015—blown away by the hubris of a government that thought it could do what it wanted to whomever it wanted whenever it wanted, regardless of the consequences. We saw it again this week with QCAT's judgement of their treatment of their former party member and former assistant minister Dr Chris Davis.

Mr Power: Shame!

Mr DICK: I take the interjection from the member for Logan. Not only was it a shame; it was a disgrace. We are seeing it again in this debate in terms of trying to defend a policy whose failure is so manifestly apparent it beggars belief. I cannot wait to see what they throw up tomorrow. Maybe Strong Choices will make a return! Fortunately the government of Queensland has changed and Queensland has a Premier, a Minister for Environment and a Labor government that puts the interests of the people of this state first.

The proposal to introduce a waste levy, which will commence should this legislation pass, has already sent a strong message to industry and will provide funding to support the development of new industries that will help us deal with vast stockpiles of waste that is the dividend of the LNP's policy vandalism. The government has committed \$100 million, as the minister and other members in this House have commented on, to the resource recovery industry development fund to provide support and incentives that encourage business capable of converting waste into a more useful product and create jobs for Queenslanders along the way.

These initiatives not only help with the massive rubbish piles plaguing Queensland by turning garbage from a liability into an asset; they will create new opportunities for new industries that will generate new jobs—new, sustainable, long-term jobs for the people of our state. That is a foreign concept to those members opposite because it is what good policy looks like. It takes a problem, finds a solution, adds value to it, creates industry and generates jobs.

Because it is good policy, naturally the LNP wants to unwind it. In all other things it is a confused and divided rabble except in this one area, this one thing that binds it together—the opposition to good, effective public policy. This is a story that can be told in numbers. As the minister said this morning, the jobs dividend for recycling is triple what it is for landfill. What do we hear from the LNP? Howling it down, shouting into the wind, fighting for another chance to reincarnate another appalling policy. Those three dark years of the Newman government that the Queensland people have consigned to history—to the political garbage dump—will not die. It is the poison that just keeps giving from the LNP.

Queenslanders deserve better than the constant reheating of twice rejected policies that continue to infect the opposition's agenda. At a time when our state requires bold thinking—when the voters quite rightly look to politicians who have a little moral courage and govern in the interests of the people they have been elected to serve—the LNP jalopy continues down the road with a flat tyre, the fuel tank on policy empty and not delivering what the people of this state deserve. The rubbish it has inflicted—

Mr Crisafulli interjected.

Mr DICK: I think we have heard enough from the member for Broadwater, but he keeps going. There is one person in Queensland of course who will take comfort from the member for Broadwater's contribution this afternoon. If that was an audition for the leadership, the member for Nanango will be resting quite easily tonight. After listening to the member for Broadwater I did not hear leadership on public policy in this state in no way, shape or form—a reheated bunch of clichés and platitudes straight from the morally bankrupt LNP policy playbook, appealing to the constituency, appealing to his base but not appealing to the people of Queensland.

Fortunately for the people of this state, they have a Premier and a government that have their back. That comment is nowhere more evident than in the reintroduction of the waste levy and our plan to turn back the trucks. This debate is a reminder in stark terms of the policy gap that exists between the government and the opposition—a gap between the vision of a leader who believes in the people of her state and in doing the right thing for the people of Queensland and, as I have said, a morally bankrupt opposition when it comes to good public policy in this state.

In conclusion, I acknowledge and congratulate the Minister for Environment on her work in not only shaping the policy framework around this legislation but bringing this bill to the House. The Minister for Environment, Minister Enoch, has shouldered a very significant workload since she has become the Minister for Environment in this state and will leave a very proud legacy because of the contribution she has made and the achievements she has been able to deliver.

We need to move away from the vandalism of the past. The economic, social and environmental vandalism that came from the removal of the waste levy was one of the worst public policy decisions in Queensland for many years, aided and abetted, as I said earlier, by those members opposite such as the member for Glass House, my shadow spokesperson, when he was the minister for environment. Could members imagine a minister for environment taking pleasure in removing the waste levy and the consequences that it caused for our state? When the member for Broadwater was the minister for local government he was taking pleasure in making those decisions that made life harder for people in our community, as members in this House said earlier.

This legislation needs to be supported. It is good public policy. It is the right thing to do for Queensland. It is our plan to stop the trucks, to create a new resource recycling and re-use industry in Queensland. It is part of the platform for our state and part of our plan—

Mr Lister interjected.

Mr DICK: I do not know what the member for Southern Downs said, but whatever it was it is not worth listening to. This is a proposal that will generate more new sustainable jobs for Queenslanders.



Mrs STUCKEY (Currumbin—LNP) (6.46 pm): On 6 September 2018 the Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef introduced the Waste Reduction and Recycling (Waste Levy) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, with a reporting date of 22 October last year. I want to commend the shadow environment minister, the honourable member for Broadwater, for his contribution which was well reasoned and made clear the LNP's stance on this bill. The explanatory notes state—

The primary purpose of the Bill is to introduce a waste levy that will:

- act as a price signal that encourages waste avoidance and resource recovery behaviours, and discourages disposal to landfill as the first option
- provide a source of funding for programs to assist local government, business and industry to establish better resource recovery practices, improve overall waste management performance and sustain Queensland's natural environment
- provide certainty and security of feedstocks for advanced resource recovery and recycling technologies and processing, and
- facilitate industry investment in resource recovery infrastructure.

These goals sound remarkably similar to the 2011 Waste Reduction and Recycling Bill where witnesses at public hearings from various affected industries said that the bill would not achieve the stated objective and instead would send businesses to the wall. We on this side of the House know

how much Labor hates small business. It did not tell Queensland small businesses before the election that it had a sneaky fat tax to lump on them, did it? It wants to bleed them dry. In my 2011 speech on the abovementioned bill, I said—

This government estimated that the additional cost to a regular business would be \$101 a year and between \$118 and \$227 for businesses generating regulated hazardous waste. However, after consultation with members, CCIQ believes that these costs are grossly underestimated.

I continued my speech of 2011 by saying—

To put it in some perspective, CCIQ estimates that the waste levy will cost the average restaurant an additional \$3,120 a year just for their waste collection. How can the average struggling small business be expected to survive this new 'Scrooge' tax?

How can the Premier be believed when in 2018—seven years later—she said, 'Queensland families will not face the cost of this levy.' Who does she think run our small businesses? Robots? It is yet another example of how little Labor understands, let alone wants to support Queensland's 400,000-plus small to medium sized businesses, and now thousands of them in regions are suffering hardship like never before after fires and floods.

Minister Enoch and her Labor comrades were all over the shop trying to explain the need for this levy. First it was outrage over interstate dumping in Ipswich. Mind you, I have it on very good authority that Ipswich needed clean fill for the high amount of construction that was going on. It was not all contaminated waste coming from over the border, but let us not talk about that. Then there were Labor ministers like Steven Miles who stated pre-election, 'Our commitment stands that we won't be introducing any new taxes, fees or charges.' He is no longer the minister for the environment, so apparently his word does not count. Mind you, I doubt it ever did. The *Courier-Mail* labelled his comment as worthy of the porky of the year award. This minister's word has never been sincere. He is the guy who ran to a safer seat when redistributions were imminent. We in the Currumbin electorate call those types cowards.

This bill almost earned the nickname the 'flip-flop' bill as one Labor minister after another failed to articulate clearly to the people of Queensland how this tax will affect them. As they bumbled their way through unbelievable explanations, some ministers told blatant untruths and others showed how incompetent they are. Almost 12 months ago the minister for planning in Queensland, the honourable member for Woodridge, told parliament that he could not act on the situation at the Ipswich dumps, but just a couple of weeks later he advised that he had issued a notice to Ipswich City Council to suspend part of its planning scheme. If he were serious about stopping waste coming from interstate, he would close the dumps and the trucks could not bring their waste. If he did that, where would all the construction material and clean fill required for all the projects approved by the Labor-dominated Ipswich council under the leadership of then mayor Paul Pisasale have come from?

Despite all of the flip-flopping, perhaps the 'deceit' bill is the more appropriate name for this bill. Let us call it out for what it is: just another Labor tax grab—a greedy, grubby tax grab. Labor is hopeless at managing the economy or creating real jobs. Look at our state debt. It is over \$80 billion and climbing. Those opposite resort to lying to everyday Queenslanders in order to get elected. Time and again they coat the truth with false facts. Remember Anna Bligh and her no asset sale promise, which in reality was a fire sale of Queensland's assets, flogged off at bargain basement prices. There are some in this House who were ministers then and who flogged off our assets.

In 2011, the waste levy was \$35 a tonne. In 2018, it was up to \$70 per tonne and it goes up \$5 per year. Here we are in 2019 and it has already gone to \$75. Industry sources say that this new tax will add \$3,650 to the cost of a new four-bedroom home. Mind you, that does not seem too bad when we consider the whopping extra cost of units and apartments if the unions are involved in the project. Media reports have suggested that the cost jumps around \$30,000 or \$40,000 per unit.

Earlier today, I listened to the environment minister's waffle, pathetically disguising this tax as a levy that will pave the way for a better future. An amount of \$1.3 billion is expected to be raised in the tax grab, but only \$100 million or so is going into environmental initiatives. That is just 10 cents in the dollar that will directly benefit our environment. The word 'hypocrite' comes to mind—described as the contrivance of a false appearance of virtue—

Ms ENOCH: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence to the member's contribution and I ask that she withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order! Member for Currumbin, the minister has taken personal offence. I ask you to withdraw.

Mrs STUCKEY: Could I ask the minister what I said that was personal?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is not to be debated. The minister has taken personal offence. I ask that you withdraw.

Mrs STUCKEY: I withdraw. The contrivance of a false appearance of virtue or goodness while concealing real character or inclinations is what we have here. The *Recycling and waste in Queensland 2018* report, which was released last week, revealed that, under this Labor government, interstate waste has increased by 37 per cent in the past year. What frauds the members opposite are to say that they care about the environment? What phoney they are revealed to be when the facts are presented such as this. I note one of the bill's objectives is to improve—

Government members interjected.

Mrs STUCKEY: Goodness me, this muttering from up the back! Honestly! I note that one of the objectives of the bill is to improve overall waste management performance. Just like Labor's waste levy, the container refund scheme also has the potential to hit ratepayers in the hip pocket. Not only do residents pay more for items in recyclable containers, they may also face council rate hikes as councils need to rebalance their budgets if yellow bins are not returning as much recyclable material from which councils get a revenue stream. I listened to the minister's attempted explanation for this. However, that is not how people believe the situation will be.

The new container refund scheme, which has been very successful in my home state of South Australia for decades, got off to a dismal start in my electorate with no fixed deposit sites. The implementation date of the scheme was postponed from 1 July 2018 to 1 November 2018, so it should have worked efficiently. But it did not. There were still a lot of details about its implementation to be worked out, but Labor forged ahead regardless.

I would like to commend Narelle Anderson, the CEO of Envirobank, for her genuine efforts to try to find suitable sites in the Currumbin electorate so that the residents of my electorate do not have to travel many kilometres to trade their empty containers. We are working together to find solutions. However, if we are to be successful, we need support from everyone in the community.


One of the major issues at my electorate's smart pod and elsewhere is people taking the bags as soon as they are delivered to the pod. I am told that some individuals are waiting at the container sites for the bags to be delivered so that they can grab the lot. I urge those people to please show some consideration and take no more than three at a time.

Once again, we have a Labor scheme that has not been thought through properly. There are not that many industrial sites for large facilities on the Gold Coast and people will not drive for half an hour for \$5. Then there are pensioners: \$5 means a lot to them. They deserve local facilities for their refunds.

I will turn to the bill. On 5 October 2018, the *Courier-Mail* editorial summed up this legislation by saying—

If you want a master class in how politicians lose the public's trust so easily, have a look at the way the Labor administration of Annastacia Palaszczuk has handled the multi-million dollar waste levy it is imposing despite hand-on-heart promises never to do such a thing.

Now, this incompetent, untruthful government is postponing this job-destroying waste tax from 4 March to 1 July, but the charges will still increase as we speak. The LNP will be opposing this bill.

 **Mr KELLY** (Greenslopes—ALP) (6.56 pm): There are many reasons to support this bill. Perhaps the first reason is that it is another step in unravelling the destructive legacy of the Newman government. I thought that, after four years, I would get tired of being part of a government that unravels a destructive legacy, but I am enjoying it even more. Perhaps even more importantly, I am proud to be part of a government that has committed to jobs as its No. 1 priority. We know that recycling creates three times the number of jobs than dumping waste in landfill. We know that this change will be implemented without direct impacts on the community.

As a proud Queenslanders, I think that we should all stand in this place and be proud that we are stopping businesses and people from interstate using our state as a dumping ground, using our state to avoid the efforts of their own states to create a recycling culture. I support this bill because, for Queenslanders, it will be an avoidable levy, but it will require a change.

Those of us who took the time to go to the UQ Future conversation this morning were told that we have to look at all means of decarbonisation and that includes going down the recycling path. During the presentation I laughed because one of the presenters said, 'There is no argument anymore among right-minded people about climate change and what is causing it.' I thought that that presenter needs to come into this place for a few moments, because there are plenty of arguments in this place about that. Plenty of those opposite do not support or believe in climate change.


This bill asks fundamental questions. What type of society do we want to be? Do we want to be a society that continues to use resources with no care for the future, or even the present? Do we want to be a society that ignores the evidence and continues to use and discard resources as though they are unlimited? Do we want to be part of a society that refuses to change, because that change might be hard, or that we might have to learn to do things, or just because we do not like change?

The people of the electorate of Greenslopes have answered those questions with action. They support these changes and they are prepared to make the changes. They make them every day in big and small ways. They join in on Clean Up Australia Day. They pack plastic-free lunches for their kids to take to school. They are putting in solar panels. They are supporting and using public transport. They are stepping forward to make the container deposit scheme a success. Let us look at the figures: 102 million containers recycled; \$15 million back into the community; and 500 jobs created. The plastic bag ban has been a success, with an 80 per cent reduction.

Debate, on motion of Mr Kelly, adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

Hervey Bay Electorate, Health Services

 **Mr SORENSEN** (Hervey Bay—LNP) (7.00 pm): The Minister for Health is sick and tired of me fighting for my constituents in Hervey Bay. He is about to get more sick of me. Someone else who is sick of this government's poor health management is poor Carole. Carole is bleeding from the bowel when resting in bed. Carole needs urgent surgical repair of her bowel prolapse. Carole claims that she had been to the Hervey Bay Hospital A&E who really tried hard to look after her. The doctors and the nurses in the Hervey Bay Hospital do a great job. There is a lack of support for the doctors and nurses at that hospital. Carole needs urgent surgery in Brisbane. The staff can only say goodbye to her with no surgical date in sight. Carole's GP could not make her referral any more urgent than it was. Carole is still waiting. Carole was treated like she was in a Third World country and allowed to bleed at home. Carole received advice that she should be on suicide watch.

It is very hard to pick which constituent has had the worst time in my electorate in the last couple of weeks. What about poor Yvonne? Yvonne has been on a category 2 waiting list for a TOT tape bladder repair since June 2018. I am pretty sure Yvonne's category 2 is now a category 1. Yvonne was booked for surgery in October in a metro hospital, fell ill and could not make the appointment. She gave two days notice to the hospital. She was rescheduled for 12 December 2018, however, this was cancelled by the hospital. She was told to go back to the doctor and get put back on the waiting list. They took her off the waiting list. What is happening is ridiculous.

Then there is Mark. Mark tells me that he is sick of the lack of support from the government for our doctors and nurses.

Mrs Frecklington: Shame!

Mr SORENSEN: It is a shame. I wish I could read the rest of my contribution. I am sick and tired of it.

Government members interjected.


Mr SORENSEN: You can all laugh! How would you like to be sitting there bleeding?

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Hervey Bay, your comments will come through the chair.

Mr SORENSEN: It is not fair that these people are treated like they are in a Third World country. It is a shame and a disgrace. I have many more stories. I am sick and tired of it.

(Time expired)

Hawker Pacific

 **Mr HEALY** (Cairns—ALP) (7.03 pm): Last year I had the great pleasure of accompanying Minister Cameron Dick to the opening of Hawker Pacific's upgraded aviation hangar at Cairns airport. Hawker Pacific, owned by Jet Aviation, a wholly owned subsidiary of General Dynamics, is a leading integrated aviation solutions provider with locations across Australia, the Asia Pacific region and the Middle East. Its facility at Cairns airport has been in operation for more than 10 years. They have actually had a presence at the Cairns airport for over 30 years. They specialise in aircraft maintenance, repair and overhaul and they employ—which is very important—130 permanent staff. Their \$4.5 million expansion project, supported through the Palaszczuk government's \$150 million Jobs and Regional Growth Fund, will increase their hangar capacity at the Cairns facility by 50 per cent to 4,000 square metres. This will


allow Hawker Pacific to target niche maintenance repair and overhaul work as currently there is no heavy maintenance capability within Australia for Fokker 70 or Fokker 100 aircraft fleets, necessitating at this stage work to be done offshore.

The hangar expansion project included facility construction, acquisition of special tooling equipment, mobilisation and training. The project will allow Hawker Pacific to add to its current permanent workforce with an additional 39 highly skilled jobs by September 2021. The expansion will also result in a high number of contractors being employed to cover peak periods. Many of Hawker Pacific's new staff will also be graduates of the Cairns Aviation Skill Centre which is training the region's future workforce for the thriving aviation industry. Hawker Pacific also currently employs 19 contractors on average at any given time.

The expansion will enable further opportunities for the development of avionics courses and new apprenticeships providing a valuable career path which will enable Cairns to retain young men and women with the valuable skills that we will be able to provide. The proximity of Cairns to Asia obviously is a major competitive advantage in attracting international business. The industry in Far North Queensland is expected to continue to grow over the next 10 to 20 years. The Cairns aviation sector is important to Queensland with private project funding totalling an estimated \$1.35 billion over the next five to six years.

The Palaszczuk government is committed to developing this industry, one that in 2015-16 generated approximately \$1.2 billion in revenue, contributed \$565 million to Queensland's economic growth and supported 4,200 jobs across more than 300 enterprises. The new hangar is a great example of the private sector successfully working with government to produce high skilled jobs in our region. I thank you also, Mr Speaker, for your contribution to that positive outcome.

Nuffield Scholarship

 **Mr BOYCE** (Callide—LNP) (7.06 pm): I rise to congratulate three rural constituents from Callide, winners of the prestigious 2019 Nuffield scholarship. Agriculture in Queensland contributes over \$19 billion to our economy. The importance of this industry cannot be discounted. Lord Nuffield, the scholarship's founder, was originally William Morris, a self-made entrepreneur who invented the Morris Minor car. He was himself a visionary and had considerable engineering skills. He was gifted the title of Lord Nuffield in 1938. The foundation was his original idea to allow farmers to study agricultural developments which had occurred during the war in very testing times. This year five Queenslanders were fortunate to receive the coveted Nuffield scholarship, three of them from the Callide electorate.

I congratulate these forward thinking, innovative rural producers. Tamara Uebergang from Miles recognises the effects of high energy prices on the rural industry. Tamara will travel to Brazil and India researching alternative fuel and energy solutions for agriculture production. She hopes to find more economically viable energy sources for farmers. Her focus is to reduce the reliance on high-cost diesel and synthetic fertiliser.


Rebecca Comiskey is a young beef producer from Monto who will be exploring beef production methods around the world, researching genomics in cattle. Her aim is to increase genetic gain in the beef herd, producing more beef using the same amount of natural resources. She will be exploring modern technologies to enhance fertility, ultimately improving production and profitability.

Alistair Corr is a typical beef producer who believes in the benefits of animal wellbeing. He will be researching better ways to prepare our cattle to cope with the stress of handling and transport. Alistair plans to investigate the links between animal wellbeing and the production outcomes of cattle. He has set himself the daunting task of putting a number value on the wellbeing of cattle.

I believe the real environmentalists are the farmers and graziers, like these three innovative rural ambassadors. All of these talented researchers have a goal of improving profitability in agriculture. It is a well-known fact that the cost price squeeze is just one of the many challenges agricultural businesses face today.

Those three ambassadors for the Australian agricultural industry will travel the globe to study the world's best management practices in their chosen fields. I congratulate all three Callide winners, Tamara, Rebecca and Alistair. I thank them for their commitment to the future of our rural industries.

Redlands Electorate

 **Ms RICHARDS** (Redlands—ALP) (7.09 pm): The year 2018 had a pretty rough end for many in Central Queensland and 2019 has had a really tough start for those in North Queensland. On behalf of my community, I say to communities throughout Queensland that our thoughts are with you as you go through the recovery process.

The year 2018 also had a tough ending for one of our Redlands families. We lost beautiful little Tom Beattie, who was taken at the age of eight years by the insidious disease that is brain cancer. Last year, our community did a lot of work to fundraise for brain cancer. Our high schools and primary schools all came together to work for the cause. To Andrew, who was vice principal at Victoria Point State School, Trish, Shannah, Owen and all of their family and friends, I offer my sincere condolences and the condolences of all of our community on the loss of Tom. He touched many people.

In exciting news, at the end of November governing from the Redlands provided a fantastic opportunity to celebrate our spectacular region. I thank Premier Anastacia Palaszczuk and the entire cabinet for governing from our beautiful region. Unfortunately, we had to scale back some events and activities due to the bushfires.

In our area, Minjerribah or North Stradbroke Island was impacted by bushfires. I congratulate the Premier and Minister Crawford for their leadership throughout all recent devastating events across Queensland. During the bushfires on North Stradbroke Island, the Indigenous rangers did a fantastic job in terms of their guidance and stewardship. Their knowledge of the land and custodianship helped to make sure that we managed the bushfires in a way that protected our communities, aided by the Rural Fire Brigade and Redlands SES units, which are currently in Townsville helping out. They all did a fantastic job during the emergency events of late last year. Our QAS and local ambulance committees were fantastic in terms of sharing their knowledge and making sure that our communities had planned and were prepared and ready for the worst case.

During governing from the regions, Minister Miles visited the Redland Hospital. We announced our plan for the hospital car park, which will be critical to future upgrades of the hospital. We also looked at the sites where emergency and maternity ward upgrades are about to get underway.

With the Premier and Minister Bailey, we announced that the state government will fund free inter-island ferries for my communities on the Southern Moreton Bay islands, which do it tough. That was really fantastic news. We visited the Anita Street intersection on Cleveland Redland Bay Road. I am really excited that that work is happening for us.

Minister Fentiman worked with our small businesses, which was great. On the domestic and family violence front, we did some really great work around crisis accommodation. We had a really fantastic time governing from the Redlands.

(Time expired)

Bruce Highway and East Feluga Road Intersection



Mr KNUTH (Hill—KAP) (7.12 pm): I rise to bring to the attention of the House information about a dangerous intersection in my electorate. Recently I met with a large group of concerned residents at the intersection of the Bruce Highway and East Feluga Road, 10 minutes north of Tully. If you turn left at the intersection, you will pass the Feluga Hotel and the primary school. It is a dangerous intersection that has claimed lives and caused serious accidents, as well as numerous close calls and near misses. In 2014, residents erected a sign to alert drivers to the danger. Residents also presented a 600-strong petition to the previous main roads minister. I table a copy of that petition.

Tabled paper: Nonconforming petition regarding Feluga intersection [169].

At that time, media coverage and letters written to TMR outlined residents' grave concerns. I will quote from an email sent to residents by TMR—

Thank you for your email of 5th October 2014 about safety concerns at the Bruce Highway-East Feluga Road Intersection. There is merit in the installation of dedicated right turning lanes at a number of intersections on the Bruce Highway, including the East Feluga intersection, and at locations across the far north region but, unfortunately, there is no funding available to carry out these works. If and when funding becomes available, a review will be carried out.


I table a copy of that email.

Tabled paper: Email, dated 21 December 2018, from Mr Ross Threlfall regarding Bruce Highway/East Feluga Road intersection [170].

Since that response, in December 2018 the tragic death of an 18-year-old woman has devastated her family and the local community. That could have been avoided if residents' safety concerns were addressed. Residents have forwarded a video from a security camera showing a rear-end accident at the same intersection, which occurred only one week before the recent fatality, to the Minister for Main Roads. It has been four years since this issue was acknowledged by TMR, yet no funding has been allocated to fix the dangerous intersection. Residents in the region are fearful for the public's safety, especially as parents turn at the intersection to take their kids to school. This puts lives at risk. To put it bluntly, how much is a life worth?

TMR installed overtaking lanes north of the intersection. However, according to residents it has created a bottleneck at the intersection, increasing the danger and the potential for more accidents. The intersection requires a far better safety solution, such as turning lanes. We call on the state government to commit funding to fix the dangerous intersection before more lives are lost and families are destroyed.


Weather Events, Bushfires

 **Mr O'ROURKE** (Rockhampton—ALP) (7.15 pm): I put on record my thanks to all Queensland Fire and Emergency Services and Disaster Management staff and volunteers involved in the recent response to the unprecedented bushfires that burnt across Queensland. As members will know, in late November and early December we witnessed horrendous fire conditions in Central Queensland. From standing in my backyard, I know how incredible the wind and heat were. I do not how to describe it, other than to say it was like standing in front of a fan-forced oven that was operating at full speed. The sky was full of smoke. Everything was so dull that it was surreal.

An unprecedented weather event, never seen before in Queensland's recorded history, contributed to the catastrophic fires. Record temperatures day after day, high winds and an extended dry season led to the perfect storm of bushfires. Despite the catastrophic conditions and thanks to fantastic teamwork and collaboration, QFES staff and volunteers were able to keep our communities safe. I cannot commend highly enough the staff and volunteers for their dedication to working in incredibly difficult conditions, with the safety of our community at the top of their minds. At the heart of what they achieved was fantastic teamwork and collaboration between the planes in the air and their support crews, the crews on the ground and those providing valuable information to keep on top of the situation. From potential disaster, they turned the situation around with excellent planning, collaboration, intelligence and experience. I know how grateful our local communities are for everything that they did during those intense days.

Fire and Emergency Services and Disaster Management staff and volunteers responded quickly to the bushfires surrounding Gracemere, Rockhampton and the caves communities and were successful in preventing significant damage and loss of life. Their dedication to public safety makes them an inspiration for us and all in the community. This is particularly true of our volunteers who sacrificed their free time to put others before themselves. On behalf of the entire community, I say a heartfelt thanks to all of the Fire and Emergency Services and Disaster Management staff and volunteers for their hard work. I also thank the Premier and Minister Crawford for their strong leadership.

Scenic Rim Electorate, Public Transport; Bushfire Risk

 **Mr KRAUSE** (Scenic Rim—LNP) (7.18 pm): I bring to the attention of the House and the government the need for better public transport services throughout the Scenic Rim electorate. Currently in the major part of the electorate, that is, the Beaudesert corridor, only one bus service operates, the 540 bus service. It runs from Beaudesert to Browns Plains, only on week days and never at night. Basically, it operates only through the daylight hours. It is a bare-bones service. Residents in the Scenic Rim electorate, from Cedar Grove and Mundoolun all the way down through the Beaudesert corridor, would benefit greatly from more services, especially on weekends. With a lot of residential growth occurring in the region, services are much needed.

We also need to see an improvement in the proximity of bus stops along the Mount Lindesay Highway to the places where people live so that they can easily access the public transport services in existence. Transport and Main Roads also needs to strongly consider investigating additional routes through the region, whether it be out of that corridor to Springfield, or through Yarrabilba and into Logan, and Beenleigh.

When it comes to Tamborine Mountain there is no public transport at all servicing around 7,000 residents. Last year nearly 1,000 people signed a petition about public transport services, only to have TMR say no for whatever reason they formulated. There is a real lack of public transport services on Tamborine Mountain and throughout the Beaudesert corridor. This needs to be improved—not to mention the entire Boonah and Fassifern region, where there is no public transport at all and has not been for quite some time.


The member for Gregory moved a motion today in relation to an inquiry into the bushfires. I wholeheartedly supported that motion because after parliament rose last year we had quite bad bushfires throughout the entire Scenic Rim electorate. One of the worst that we experienced was on Seqwater land at Wyaralong Dam. A lot of the rural fireys who were involved in fighting that fire,

alongside a number of Seqwater employees, certainly reported that Seqwater had failed in their management of their dam land at Wyaralong. They had allowed fuel loads to get out of hand which led to quite a dangerous and serious fire situation for a couple of days. It took a lot of crews, including some crews from Tasmania, to actually bring that fire under control.

Seqwater, national parks and all government landholders need to improve their management of fuel loads on government land to ensure we do not have a disaster which costs human lives in the future.

(Time expired)

Waterford Electorate

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Small Business and Minister for Training and Skills Development) (7.21 pm): I rise this evening to celebrate some of the incredible work in my electorate which is helping to prepare and empower the next generation for their futures. Earlier this month I attended Loganlea High School to launch the Beyond the Broncos Mentoring program. With guidance from dedicated Broncos student support officers like Elijah Alick, who will be based at both Marsden State High School and Loganlea State High School, students will receive day-to-day mentoring and hands-on support to encourage school attendance and completing year 12.

The Palaszczuk government is proud to support this program through our Skilling Queenslanders for Work initiative. In my electorate, Skilling Queenslanders for Work has helped almost 600 jobseekers, with over half gaining employment following their participation in a program. However, ensuring that school leavers are job ready and supported to complete year 12 is only one aspect of a student's development.


I also had the privilege over the last few weeks of representing Minister Jones to announce that Canterbury College in my electorate has received a full athletics track and squash courts as part of the Commonwealth Games legacy program. Over my many visits in the past, I am always in awe of the great opportunities offered to students at Canterbury College, from the innovative technology programs to the sporting excellence program. How fantastic is it that not just students of Canterbury College but young people and residents in Logan will now get access to a world-class athletics track. It is so exciting. I know that this will inspire so many residents in Logan to get out and get active and live healthy lives.

Our school sport programs are absolutely crucial to children's development and so is access to healthy breakfast options. One of my favourite jobs as the member for Waterford is to go to my local schools and be part of the breakfast programs. Last week I had the opportunity to visit Mabel Park State School and the wonderful team of students and support staff to help them hand out breakfast to kids who really need that good start to their day.

The Palaszczuk government understands the important work of these school breakfast programs which is why we have provided over \$1 million in funding so that more students can benefit from a nutritious breakfast so that they can actually learn and play. It is a fantastic program. That particular program is supported by the YMCA. I congratulate them on the work they do.

Spending the morning with the kids from Mabel Park I saw these benefits firsthand as the kids greedily reached for more Vegemite on toast. We knew that they were getting a great start to the day. I am incredibly proud to represent a community that is committed to empowering and supporting the next generation to help them reach their full potential.

Gold Coast, Casino Proposal

 **Mr MOLHOEK** (Southport—LNP) (7.24 pm): I rise today to speak about a very concerning proposal for the Gold Coast which has sparked outrage in my electorate of Southport. This is the proposal to build a second casino on public land at Southport's Carey Park.

Last Thursday over 250 residents, business leaders, councillors and many staff and members of local community clubs gathered for a community rally in the park to voice their concerns and opposition to this state government's proposal. I was very disappointed that on this occasion I was unable to join them, but I had an unexpected family emergency to deal with.

This week a petition against a second Gold Coast casino was tabled with over 9,000 signatures. The support for this petition has further highlighted for me the strong community sentiment against such a proposal. This was also made clear during the community consultation and subsequent declaration of Southport's priority development area some years ago.

The Southport PDA declaration was all about establishing Southport as the official CBD of Gold Coast, boasting a world-class health and knowledge precinct. There was no intent for Southport to become a secondary adult entertainment precinct and definitely never any intent for Southport to be home to a second casino.


Government data shows that the Gold Coast's 5,611 poker machines, excluding those at the Star Casino Gold Coast, raked in an average of \$38,677 every hour during the month of December. We know that Australians lose around \$14 billion every year to pokies and we know that gambling feeds crime, homelessness, family breakdown, suicide and bankruptcy. We really do not need anymore of this on the Gold Coast. It is the Gold Coast's most vulnerable and those who can least afford it who are playing these machines.

According to Clubs Queensland, a second casino would have an impact on over 300 community clubs in the south-east corner, representing some 1.6 million members and over 10,000 jobs. Our local clubs like the Southport RSL provide funding and vital assistance for veterans and our other clubs which support lifesaving, local sporting groups and a whole range of broader needs across the community.

We have enough gaming destinations on the Gold Coast. I stand here tonight and say that I am a little surprised at the Premier's response this morning when she so quickly ducked a question about proposed locations for a second casino and global tourism hub. It was the state government that commissioned PricewaterhouseCoopers to prepare the secret report presented to council behind closed doors. I simply ask the Premier: what is the future of Carey Park, Southport?

(Time expired)

Redcliffe Electorate

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (7.27 pm): There is great news coming out of Redcliffe that I want to tell this parliament about, but before I do I want to start with quite a sad message. I give my condolences to Ryan and Cassie Elson and their children, Laney and Zac. Their 18-year-old son, Jake, had been fighting a battle with chordoma, a rare form of bone cancer, for 14 months. He passed away in his sleep on 24 January, which was the kindest way the family could think of him going. He said goodnight to them. He said he was going to have a good sleep that night and he passed away. I want to acknowledge that Jake was an incredible young man. In the *Redcliffe Herald* recently his dad said—

He fought with quiet strength, never letting anyone else feel bad if he could help it.

The article states—

His mum said that he remained optimistic, no matter how bad the prognosis was. 'He was beautiful. He embraced life,' she said.

The community had a fundraiser for Jake last year and with the \$33,000 that was raised they were able to tick off a few bucket list items and take Jake around and do incredible things in those last few months. Our thoughts are with Ryan and Cassie; Laney, his older sister; and Zac, his twin brother, at this very difficult time.

Good things are happening in Redcliffe. The temporary car park at the Redcliffe Hospital is completed. It is at the showgrounds. It will provide 260 parking spaces. It is targeted for use by day shift staff only, with patients and visitors to continue to park at the hospital campus at the moment while work has commenced on the new multistorey car park at Redcliffe Hospital. I want to thank the Moreton Bay Regional Council and the Redcliffe Show Society for helping establish this temporary car park.

We have started construction on the Hornibrook Esplanade pedestrian upgrade. More than 20,000 vehicles travel on the Hornibrook Esplanade every day. People are trying to cross over four lanes to get to the beautiful waterfront that we have. We are now going to have a signalised pedestrian crossing there which is great news. The Palaszczuk government has invested \$690,000 in this project.

Lastly in terms of accessibility parking at Kippa-Ring train station we have moved the disabled parking. It has cut 300 metres off the distance for commuters. This is a great commitment of and delivery by the Palaszczuk government for the Redcliffe community.

The House adjourned at 7.30 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Andrew, Bailey, Bates, Batt, Bennett, Berkman, Bleijie, Bolton, Boothman, Boyce, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crandon, Crawford, Crisafulli, D'Ath, Dametto, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Frecklington, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hart, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Hunt, Janetzki, Jones, Kelly, King, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Lauga, Leahy, Linard, Lister, Lui, Lynham, Madden, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Millar, Miller, Minnikin, Molhoek, Mullen, Nicholls, O'Connor, O'Rourke B, O'Rourke C, Palaszcuk, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Powell, Power, Pugh, Purdie, Richards, Robinson, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Trad, Watts, Weir, Whiting, Wilson