



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, 27 March 2019

Subject	Page
SPEAKER'S RULING	711
Same Question Rule	711
REPORT	712
Ombudsman	712
<i>Tabled paper.</i> Queensland Ombudsman: The Brisbane Youth Detention Centre report: An investigation into the management of young people at Brisbane Youth Detention Centre between November 2016 and February 2017, dated March 2019.	712
PRIVILEGE	712
Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by a Minister	712
<i>Tabled paper.</i> Bundle of correspondence regarding the allegation made by the member for Burleigh, Mr Michael Hart MP, that the Minister for Employment and Small Business and Minister for Training and Skills Development, Hon. Shannon Fentiman, deliberately misled the House and the minister's response.....	713
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	713
School Group Tour	713
MOTION	713
Citizen's Right of Reply	713
TABLED PAPERS	714
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	714
Hospitals, Demand	714
Gold Coast, The Spit	715
Hospitals, Demand	715
Queensland Economy	716
Land Forces 2020	717
Dreamworld, Research Centre	717

Table of Contents – Wednesday, 27 March 2019

National Disability Insurance Scheme	718
Work Health and Safety Regulation	718
Affordable Energy Plan	719
Queensland Rail, Flood Recovery	719
Building and Construction Industry, Task Force	720
Growing Queensland's Food Exports	721
Cyclone Trevor	721
NOTICE OF MOTION	722
Child Sex Offender Register	722
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	722
Absence of Member	722
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	722
Hospitals, Demand	722
Hospitals, Demand	723
Health System.....	724
Hospitals, Demand	725
Gun Control	726
Hospitals, Demand	726
Jobs.....	728
Hospitals, Demand	728
Renewable Energy.....	729
Hospitals, Demand	729
Business Events.....	730
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, undated, depicting an LNP How to Vote Card for the Nanango electorate	730
Hospitals, Federal Funding.....	731
Morrison Government, Energy Policy.....	732
Renewable Energy.....	733
National Disability Insurance Scheme	733
Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services.....	734
NATURE CONSERVATION (SPECIAL WILDLIFE RESERVES) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	734
Second Reading	734
MOTION	782
Child Sex Offender Register	782
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Australian Institute of Criminology: Document, dated May 2018, titled 'Trends & Issues in crime and criminal justice: What impact do public sex registries have on community safety?'	792
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to	792
Resolved in the negative.....	792
SPEAKER'S RULING.....	793
Tabling of Documents.....	793
NATURE CONSERVATION (SPECIAL WILDLIFE RESERVES) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	793
Second Reading	793
Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a second time.	795
Resolved in the affirmative.....	795
Consideration in Detail.....	796
Amendments agreed to.....	798
Clauses 1 to 63, as amended, agreed to.....	798
Third Reading	799
Division: Question put—That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time.....	799
Resolved in the affirmative.....	799
Long Title.....	799
Amendment agreed to.	799
JUSTICE LEGISLATION (LINKS TO TERRORIST ACTIVITY) AMENDMENT BILL.....	799
Second Reading	799
ADJOURNMENT	804
Caloundra Electorate; Governing from the Regions, Sunshine Coast	804
Birmingham, Ms C	805
Gregory Electorate, Renal Dialysis Services	805
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Nonconforming petition regarding delivery of local renal dialysis services to Emerald and Longreach.....	805
Birmingham, Ms C.....	806
Nolan Jr, Mr B; Pfeffer, Mr L; Raine, Prof. S	807
Operation Energise	807
Hit-and-Run Laws.....	808
Townsville Electorate, Floods Recovery Assistance	809
Theodore Electorate, M1 Motorway Upgrade	809
Morrison Government, Education Funding	810
ATTENDANCE	810

WEDNESDAY, 27 MARCH 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.

SPEAKER'S RULING

Same Question Rule



Mr SPEAKER: I have circulated a statement to members about the application of the same question rule to the Local Government Electoral (Implementing Stage 1 of Belcarra) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018, passed by the House on 17 May 2018, and the member for Maiwar's Electoral Legislation (Political Donations) Amendment Bill, which is currently before the House. Both the act and bill deal with the issue of the prohibition of political donations. The House, in passing the act, has already addressed the question of political donations and, in particular, whether property developers should be prohibited from making political donations. The member for Maiwar's bill, however, puts forward a genuinely alternative proposition, that of whether the prohibition on political donations should also apply to for-profit corporations. Accordingly, I rule that the member for Maiwar's bill does not offend the same question rule.

I note that the member for Maiwar's bill was introduced prior to the passing of the act. Should the private member's bill be read a second time, technical amendments would be needed during consideration in detail to ensure the bill is compatible with the amendments made to the relevant legislation by the act. I seek leave to incorporate my ruling in the *Record of Proceedings*.

Leave granted.

SPEAKER'S RULING—APPLICATION OF SAME QUESTION RULE TO THE ELECTORAL LEGISLATION (POLITICAL DONATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL 2018

Honourable Members, on 6 March 2018, the Minister for Local Government, Racing and Multicultural Affairs, Hon. Hinchliffe, introduced the Local Government Electoral (Implementing Stage 1 of Belcarra) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018.

The Bill was passed on 17 May 2018. The Local Government Electoral (Implementing Stage 1 of Belcarra) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2018 (the Act) received Royal Assent on 21 May 2018.

On 16 May 2018, the Member for Maiwar introduced the Electoral Legislation (Political Donations) Amendment Bill 2018 (the Private Members' Bill).

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

The issue arises as to whether the same question rule is enlivened in respect of the Private Members' Bill, as both the Act and the Private Members' Bill deal with the issue of prohibiting political donations.

As previous Speakers, and I have noted, in order to be out of order under Standing Order 87, a Bill does not have to be identical to another Bill, merely the same in substance as the previous Bill. In other words, it is a question of substance, not form.

A genuinely alternative proposition espousing a different policy approach to the same issue does not offend the same question rule. See Speaker Wellington, 12 November 2015, PD p2913

A detailed (provision by provision) analysis of the Act and the Private Members' Bill has been undertaken to identify whether the same question rule is enlivened.

Both the Act and Private Member's Bill amend the Electoral Act 1992 (Electoral Act) and Local Government Electoral Act 2011 (LGE Act) to prohibit political donations from prescribed groups.

The Act prohibits property developers, and property industry representative organisations (a prohibited donor) from making political donations (defined as a gift or loan for an electoral purpose made to political parties, elected Members of Parliament and local government councillors, and candidates in a local or state government election). Specifically, the Act provides that it is unlawful for:

- a prohibited donor to make a political donation
- a person to make a political donation on behalf of a prohibited donor
- a person to accept a political donation made by, or on behalf of,
- a prohibited donor a prohibited donor to solicit a person to make a political donation, and
- a person to solicit, on behalf of a prohibited donor, another person to make a political donation.

The Act also includes associated offence provisions and provisions for the recovery by the State of prohibited donations.

The Private Member's Bill proposes to extend the above prohibition on political donations to for-profit corporations (a prohibited corporate donor). Similar to the Act, the Private Member's Bill provides that it is unlawful for:

- a prohibited corporate donor to make a political donation
- a person to make a political donation on behalf of a prohibited corporate donor
- a person to accept a political donation made by, or on behalf of, a prohibited corporate donor
- a prohibited corporate donor to solicit
- a person to make a political donation, or a person to solicit, on behalf of a prohibited corporate donor, another person to make a political donation.

The Private Member's Bill replicates the Act's definition of political donation (ie gifts or loans to political parties, elected Members of Parliament and local government councillors, and candidates in a local or state government election) and the Act's recovery and offence provisions.

I note that the House, in passing the Act, has already addressed the question of political donations and, in particular, whether property developers should be prohibited from making political donations.


I consider, however, that the Private Member's Bill puts forward a genuinely alternative proposition to the Act, that of whether the prohibition on political donations should also apply to for-profit corporations.

Accordingly, I rule that the Member for Maiwar's Bill does not, offend the same question rule.

I note that the Private Member's Bill was introduced prior to the passing of the Act. Should the Private Member's Bill be read a second time, technical amendments, i.e. to proposed section numbers etc, should be considered during the consideration-in-detail stage to ensure the Bill is compatible with the amendments made by the Act to the Electoral Act and LGE Act.

REPORT


Ombudsman

 **Mr SPEAKER:** I have to report that I have received from the Ombudsman a report titled *The Brisbane youth detention centre report: an investigation into the management of young people at Brisbane Youth Detention Centre between November 2016 and February 2017*. I table the report for the information of members.

Tabled paper: Queensland Ombudsman: The Brisbane Youth Detention Centre report: An investigation into the management of young people at Brisbane Youth Detention Centre between November 2016 and February 2017, dated March 2019 [\[411\]](#).

PRIVILEGE

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

 **Mr SPEAKER:** On 28 February 2019, the member for Burleigh wrote to me alleging that the Minister for Employment and Small Business and Minister for Training and Skills Development deliberately misled the House during statements made on 27 February 2019.

The matter relates to statements by the minister in regard to changes made by the former LNP government to prevent the Queensland Building and Construction Commission from requesting financial information from building companies. In his letter to me, the member for Burleigh contended that the minister's statements were untrue and misleading. The member attached a copy of the QBCC Minimum Financial Requirements to support his allegation and referred to one dot point in section 8.1 of that document which references the discretion of the commission.

However, the member for Burleigh did not provide any explanation as to why this section proves that the minister's statements contained factually or apparently incorrect material. Further, the member for Burleigh provided no other evidence to suggest that the minister's statements contained factually or apparently incorrect material, other than his assertion that they were 'untrue'.


I sought further information from the minister about the allegation made against her, in accordance with standing order 269(5). The minister advised me that the statements she made in parliament were based on changes in building and construction industry legislation over the period from 2014 to 2019 and provided supporting arguments demonstrating that those changes were a matter of public record.

On the information before me, I considered that the minister has made an adequate explanation in relation to her statements under standing order 269(4). I have therefore decided that this matter does not warrant the further attention of the House via the Ethics Committee and I will not be referring the matter. I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

Tabled paper: Bundle of correspondence regarding the allegation made by the member for Burleigh, Mr Michael Hart MP, that the Minister for Employment and Small Business and Minister for Training and Skills Development, Hon. Shannon Fentiman, deliberately misled the House and the minister's response [\[417\]](#).


SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

School Group Tour

 **Mr SPEAKER:** I wish to advise the House that we will be visited this morning by students and teachers from Arundel State School in the electorate of Bonney.

MOTION

Citizen's Right of Reply

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (9.35 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

1. That this House notes report No. 183 of the Ethics Committee and the recommendation of the committee that a right of reply be incorporated into the *Record of Proceedings*; and
2. That the House adopt the committee's recommendation and incorporate the right of reply into the *Record of Proceedings*.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Response by Mr Geoff Murphy to statements made in the House by the Member for Burleigh, Mr Michael Hart MP, the Member for Kawana, Mr Jarrod Bleijie MP and the Minister for Housing and Public Works, Hon Mick De Brenni MP on 30 October and 1 November 2018

On 30 October 2018, the Member for Burleigh made a statement relating to actions and conduct of JM Kelly Builders.

I, Geoff Murphy established and was the General Manager of JM Kelly Builders Pty Ltd and JM Kelly (Project Builders) Pty Ltd (JMK PB) until June 2016. JM Kelly Builders Pty Ltd (JMK) was a separate business within the JM Kelly Group, which commenced trading in 1961 and undertook construction work. JMK PB was a separate entity within the JM Kelly Group which also undertook construction work and which commenced trading in 1981. In June 2016 I was the Director and QBCC licensee of both of these companies.

I reject all aspersions or imputations that I have in any way acted illegally or improperly in respect of the allegations made by the Member for Burleigh, the Member for Kawana and the Minister for Housing and Public Works.

The reason JMK went into liquidation is because of the pursuit of John Murphy by the Queensland Building and Construction Commission (QBCC) and the Department of Housing and Public Works' Building and Asset Services (BAS). This arose from a dispute with a Sydney based developer in 2005, relating to the construction of a development at Burleigh Heads.

On advice, I decided to liquidate JMK (Project Builders) Pty Ltd in June 2016. At that time JMK Project Builders was undertaking three contracts. The purported debt relating to the development at Burleigh Heads left the companies with liabilities and having just spent significant costs on legal action I decided to protect the remaining businesses, employees, subcontractors and other contracts being constructed by JMK at that time. All employee entitlements and three remaining contracts held by JMK PB were transferred to JMK. Instead of liquidating employee entitlements and subcontractors and suppliers debts, I took the decision to honour those and JMK paid all debts owing on those three contracts. For any other debts owed by JMK PB, I set out to agree on a schedule of payments for JMK to make to subcontractors and suppliers for any other contracts that had reached practical completion before June 2016.

The liquidated companies referred to were not 'phoenixed'.

In addition, for two years prior to June 2016, JMK PB was being propped up by our other companies, meaning that we were investing our profits back into that business.

Arising out of the JMK PB liquidation in 2016, we encountered subcontractors that asserted they had debts owed to them by JMK PB when in fact they did not. Similarly we had subcontractors that asserted that contracts had been novated when they were not. Most of the subcontractors of JMK PB agreed to a schedule of payments from JMK for those contracts that had been completed in June 2016 and JMK made payments accordingly.

Subsequent to the liquidation of JMK PB some of the subcontractors have met with the Minister for Housing and Public Works and lodged complaints against JMK arising out of the liquidation. The Minister for Housing and Public Works has refused to meet with me.

I handed in my QBCC licence in June 2016 as required by law when I liquidated JMK PB. That meant my son, John Murphy, a QBCC licence holder took over my position. Prior to June 2016 I was the sole decision maker in the JMK Group. At that time, QBCC agreed that John Murphy was not regarded as an excluded individual arising out of the liquidation of JMK PB but QBCC altered its position and issued notices of reasons for proposed cancellation of QBCC licences against John Murphy and JMK. JMK filed review applications in QCAT to have those notices set aside, which allowed JMK to continue operating until a decision was made.

In October 2018 it was ruled that John Murphy was not an excluded individual and set aside the QBCC notices.

In relation to the statement made by the Minister for Housing and Public Works, I believe it could be interpreted that the answer to the Question Without Notice would form the view that JMK had failed to meet the QBCC financial standard. At no time have the JMK companies ever failed a QBCC Minimum Financial Requirement. JMK was able to satisfy the standards required by using personal assets and financial resources to back the company.

I believe that the Minister for Housing and Public Works issued an instruction to the Department not to provide JMK with work and that this was a contributing factor to the liquidation.

I have known Robert Schwarten for most of his life. We have been friends. I supported his campaigns but I have never offered him money. I have only ever donated to his campaigns via the Labor party.

I do not consider myself a sole Labor party supporter. I have donated to the Australian Labor party and I have been involved in LNP fundraising activities.

I have never been asked for a favour by Robert Schwarten, nor have I offered one. I was not responsible for painting his residence. I was not reimbursed by way of government funding.

With regard to the claim made by the Member for Kawana that preference has been granted to me in awarding contracts, the company received a fair proportion of work but no more than our competitors. I reject this assertion entirely and have never sought to influence the awarding of any contract.

TABLED PAPERS

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS (SO 32)

MINISTERIAL PAPERS

The following ministerial papers were tabled by the Clerk—

Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy (Hon Dr Lynham)—

[412](#) Commissioner for Mine Safety and Health—Annual performance report 2017-18

[413](#) Coal Mining Safety and Health Advisory Committee—Annual Report 2017-18

[414](#) Mining Safety and Health Advisory Committee—Annual Report 2017-18

[415](#) Board of Examiners—Annual Report 2017-18

MEMBER'S PAPER


The following member's paper was tabled by the Clerk—

Member for Coomera (Mr Crandon)—

[416](#) Nonconforming petition regarding Exit 41 on the M1 Motorway at Ormeau

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Hospitals, Demand

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.36 am): Our hospitals in South-East Queensland are managing an unprecedented and unseasonal demand for care. This unprecedented and unseasonal demand is caused by a number of factors.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Members, I made myself clear yesterday about my expectations. The Premier is not making any statements that I can hear which are inflammatory. I ask all members to cease their interjections. I remind members there are no provisions in the standing orders to allow for your interjections.


Ms PALASZCZUK: This unprecedented and unseasonal demand is caused by a number of factors: a prolonged and extremely hot summer and three times the number of flu cases. In any ordinary season winter flu would spark a system of dealing with the extra number of cases. This had to be activated early. The health minister, Steven Miles, will detail those steps shortly. This morning the minister has been out visiting emergency departments to see how the actions we took yesterday are being implemented on the ground. I commend him for doing that. It involves the immediate spending of \$3 million to add another 50 beds to our hospitals' capacity.

There are other factors that have also been identified. In our hospitals today there are approximately 250 aged-care patients ready for discharge, if an aged-care place was readily available. There are another 400 people who are NDIS eligible who are also ready for discharge. We take responsibility for caring for our people in our hospitals and people will always get the care they need, but 650 beds in our hospitals are being used for responsibilities that rest with the federal government.

Our action plan for dealing with this current demand is to include the federal department of aged care. Our Health budget is a record \$18.3 billion. That includes \$985 million being spent building new wards and hospitals. People are abandoning private health cover because they cannot afford it. Gympie's private hospital is closing. That will add pressure to our system. People are not going to their GP because they cannot afford it.

I ask for people's patience during this time. Our doctors and our nurses in all of our hospitals are doing incredible work. On behalf of the Queensland parliament, I thank those men and women who are performing their duties looking after people in our hospital system. Dealing with this unseasonal, unprecedented situation will take all levels of government working together. I am prepared to work with the federal government on this issue.

Gold Coast, The Spit


 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.40 am): Recently I launched an ambitious plan to build Australia's first, biggest and best ocean park on the Gold Coast. Our redeveloped Spit will be the envy of the world. Almost 140 hectares of The Spit's 201 hectares are set aside for park activities. This will rival the best parks of the world including New York's Central Park at 340 hectares and Hyde Park in London at 142 hectares. Ours on the Gold Coast will have something even better: the surf and the Broadwater. The Spit blueprint is open for discussion and closes at the end of March. It will breathe new life into this well-loved part of the Gold Coast, with seven precincts that preserve and enhance the green space north of Sea World. There will be bikeways, boardwalks and boat ramps. They are all part of this plan, as well as keeping the things we all love like buying fresh prawns from the trawlers. I understand that the mayor is very happy. He can explore the underwater sculpture garden if he chooses to do so.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Resume your seat, Premier. Members, this will be the last direction I give in terms of interjections which are in response to non-provocative language. The Premier has a right to be heard.

Ms PALASZCZUK: It is no surprise that our plan is popular. We spoke to people before we drew it up—over 21,000 pieces of feedback with community groups and people who love The Spit. At the end of this month we will have the final plan. It is yet another example—the Commonwealth Games, the light rail, all the things that we have done on the coast.

Hospitals, Demand

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (9.42 am): In recent days, hospitals in South-East Queensland have experienced an unprecedented, unseasonal—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Members, I can stand all day. I gave instructions yesterday that I will issue notices under the standing orders without warning. I do not wish to go to that place immediately but that is what I am being forced to do. You may not agree with the statements being made by the person on their feet but you will hear them without interjection.

Dr MILES: In recent days, hospitals in South-East Queensland have experienced an unprecedented, unseasonal surge in emergency department presentations, both public and private. Across South-East Queensland our emergency departments are 50 patients above normal capacity following an unexpected surge in patient presentations over the last several days. Yesterday alone, there were 2,582 triple 0 calls to the Queensland Ambulance Service. This is around 220 more than the yearly daily average.

This sustained summer surge culminated in a situation yesterday afternoon where our hospitals had no spare emergency department capacity in the system. To help manage this situation, the Palaszczuk government has approved an immediate capacity investment of up to \$3 million. I visited the PA Hospital and the royal Brisbane hospital this morning. I spoke with staff on the ground and I thanked them on behalf of all members of this parliament for their efforts. It is thanks to them that our hospitals have been able to treat so many unwell Queenslanders over the last few days and weeks. Queenslanders have played their part, too. After urging the public to please keep our emergency departments for emergencies, we saw numbers in some hospitals stabilise overnight. Thanks to these initiatives, no elective surgeries were cancelled at the PA Hospital.

The State Health Emergency Coordinating Centre is coordinating a response centrally. I will attend their SHECC meeting later today. I will chair that meeting and provide an update to the public after that meeting. We will continue to purchase temporary capacity from the private sector and look at other capacity-building options in our hospitals if demand levels continue.


The message remains to people in South-East Queensland: please keep our emergency departments for emergencies. Our hardworking ED clinicians are working to ensure people are treated and admitted where required in a timely manner, but non-emergency and less severe GP style presentations make that harder to do. The quality of care in our emergency departments is first class. Unlike GPs, our emergency departments are free and open 24/7, 365 days a year and people are generally treated inside of four hours, but if you turn up to an ED with one of those less severe GP style presentations you may have to wait. If you are waiting in an emergency department, it is because patients who are sicker than you, who are critically ill or injured, are being seen first.

I am advised there is at present no single identifiable reason for the rapidly increasing number of presentations, but what we do know is that influenza cases across Queensland so far this year are nearly three times higher than the five-year average. Queensland is experiencing a longer, hotter summer that is hitting our health system hard. Extended periods of higher levels of heat and humidity impact on underlying conditions.

As we speak, around 200 beds in our hospitals are occupied by patients who should be in an aged-care facility or being provided assistance through the NDIS. Yesterday afternoon we began conversations with the Commonwealth to urgently address these issues, which are their responsibility. Today I have asked Queensland Health to undertake an analysis of the cause of this extended summer surge. We need to understand the range of factors—whether that is elderly patients awaiting assessment for aged-care beds, NDIS recipients seeking proper care—and we need to understand the impact of sustained hotter summers on the health of Queenslanders going forward.


Queensland has learned the lessons from winter flu. We understand the higher admission rates and their impact on EDs. We understand that impact. We invest in extra winter capacity and we work as a system to manage it. We need to understand the lessons from an increasingly sustained summer surge and plan for them in a similar way. This work will help inform our approach for next summer. In the meantime, I want our staff to know that the government understands the tough pressures they are under and we are responding to them. I want the public to know that our emergency departments remain safe, but please be patient and look to other options if you do not have a genuine emergency.

Queensland Economy

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (9.48 am): Under the Palaszczuk Labor government, jobs are being created, our economy is growing, private sector investment is up and unemployment is down. Since we came to office in January 2015, 184,900 jobs have been created, and 102,600 of those are full-time jobs. I am pleased to advise the House that Queenslanders now have 29 consecutive months of jobs growth under the Palaszczuk Labor government. This is the longest continuous period of jobs growth in the state since the global financial crisis. The latest ABS labour force data for February 2019 includes plenty of good news for Queensland. Our trend unemployment rate has fallen to 5.7 per cent in February 2019. This is 0.9 per cent lower than what we inherited from the previous LNP government.

Queenslanders elected the Palaszczuk Labor government because we were the only party at the last election with a plan to create jobs, and we are delivering on that plan. Some 4,000 full-time jobs were created in February. Our massive \$46 billion capital program over four years is creating jobs and helping to make our economy fit for the future by delivering the infrastructure that we need. Most importantly, this capital program is driving jobs growth, including in our critical regional areas. I am pleased to say that the gap between the unemployment rate in regional Queensland and South-East Queensland continues to narrow. That gap is down from 2.5 percentage points in mid-2016 to only one percentage point in January 2019. Jobs are the Palaszczuk Labor government's No. 1 priority and we are delivering on that promise.


Land Forces 2020

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning) (9.49 am): I am pleased to report to the House that Queensland's drive to claim the title of defence capital of Australia continues to gather momentum. The latest in a series of successes comes with the news that Land Forces 2020, the pre-eminent showcase for land defence forces throughout the Asia-Pacific region, will be held in Brisbane next year. When it was last held in 2018, Land Forces attracted more than 15,000 visitors and exhibitors to South Australia. Participants included 624 companies from 26 countries, and the event attracted 74 official defence, trade and industry delegations.

There is even greater reason to believe that Land Forces 2020 will be bigger and better in our state. We last hosted the event in 2014, with South Australia claiming the next two conferences in 2016 and 2018. The return of Land Forces to Queensland is both a recognition of our prominent position in the defence sector and a huge opportunity to capitalise on that position and expand our influence. Hosting Land Forces 2020 can only highlight the merits of Queensland to deliver the \$15 billion Land 400 phase 3 contract to build infantry fighting vehicles for the Australian Army.

Defence is big business for Queensland. In 2017-18, \$9.55 billion in defence contracts were awarded to companies based in Queensland, more than double the value of the previous year. It is our aim to ensure that Queensland is positioned to secure a significant proportion of federal defence contracts coming up over the next decade. Attracting a showcase event like Land Forces 2020 confirms that Queensland is firmly in the driving seat to secure that work and the long-term, high-value jobs that go with it.

Dreamworld, Research Centre


 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Cooper—ALP) (Minister for Innovation and Tourism Industry Development and Minister for the Commonwealth Games) (9.51 am): Diversifying Queensland's economy to create jobs is a key priority of the Palaszczuk government. That is why I am proud to announce today that, because of the record investment we are making in tourism and innovation, we will be investing \$2.7 million to build a state-of-the-art research facility inside the Dreamworld Corroboree precinct.

The future lab native genome research centre will be the first of its kind in Queensland. It will allow us to deploy experts to tackle some of the biggest issues facing our native wildlife, like the threat of chlamydia on the local koala population. Researchers from QUT and UQ will be able to work more closely than ever before to protect our native species at the future lab. We know that this investment will lead to more scientific breakthroughs in the fight to conserve at-risk wildlife populations.

When it is complete, the future lab will be the only operational scientific laboratory in Queensland that will be able to offer a STEM tourism experience for visitors based on the conservation of koalas and other wildlife. Mr Speaker, as someone who is very interested in tourism, you know that all our research, whether it is through Tourism Australia or Tourism and Events Queensland, shows that people are looking for unique, in-depth experiences that they cannot get any elsewhere in the world. That is exactly what will be on offer at Dreamworld with this investment.

With the Health and Knowledge Precinct just down the road, we are investing in new research facilities on the Gold Coast like the future lab to create jobs for the local economy. That is exactly what our Advance Queensland initiative is all about—diversifying our economy to create the jobs of the future in our state. We also know the Dreamworld Corroboree precinct has been a hit with international visitors, particularly from South-East Asia. Today's announcement will help to boost the Gold Coast's profile as a wildlife tourism destination and will attract more tourists to the coast.

National Disability Insurance Scheme


 **Hon. CJ O'ROURKE** (Mundingburra—ALP) (Minister for Communities and Minister for Disability Services and Seniors) (9.53 am): A successful transition to the National Disability Insurance Scheme is one of the highest priorities for the Queensland government. The Palaszczuk government will make sure that Queenslanders with disability get their fair share of the supports and services that can be accessed through the NDIS. The Palaszczuk government knows that having stable accommodation is one of the most important issues in the lives of people with disability.

As the Premier and Minister for Health have informed the House today, emergency departments across South-East Queensland hospital and health services are experiencing unprecedented demand. Unfortunately, there are an estimated 400 people with NDIS packages who are in Queensland hospitals that should be living in the community. We have known that the demand for affordable and appropriate housing for people with disability, which was already under pressure, would significantly increase with the introduction of the NDIS. I have been raising this issue with successive Commonwealth ministers since 2015. The Productivity Commission estimated that \$700 million was required for disability housing capital at full scheme and this was part of the NDIS Productivity Commission report, but the Abbott-Turnbull-Morrison government has never released this money as was originally intended.

With Queensland's transition to the NDIS our government has put in place resources, information and training to assist hospital staff to assist patients to access the NDIS. We are also working closely with the NDIA and across government to ensure that the NDIA has strong processes in place to assist people with NDIS plans transition from hospital to their homes or to alternative living arrangements. We have been addressing this throughout the transition to the National Disability Insurance Scheme. With the NDIS transition being completed on 30 June this year, it is now time for the federal government to take responsibility and provide specialist accommodation for people with high and complex disability support needs.

I am pleased to advise that I have recently been informed about a response developed by the NDIA with the three tertiary hospitals in Brisbane to prioritise and facilitate the discharge of people with disability who no longer require hospital care, but more needs to be done. More NDIA resources are needed on the ground so that Queenslanders with NDIA packages do not have to live in hospitals.

Work Health and Safety Regulation

 **Hon. G GRACE** (McConnel—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Industrial Relations) (9.56 am): As members will recall, the Palaszczuk government commissioned the best practice review of Workplace Health and Safety Queensland following the tragic fatalities at Dreamworld and an Eagle Farm construction site in 2016. As a community we are all deeply affected by terrible incidents such as these, and I once again express my sincere condolences to those families who have experienced the traumatic loss of a loved one through a workplace incident. We must do all we can to ensure such tragedies are never repeated. The best practice review included recommendations on improvements to safety in the amusement device industry and the establishment of the new independent Work Health and Safety Prosecutor. The Palaszczuk government has delivered on these key recommendations.


New regulations will come into effect from 1 May through changes to the Work Health and Safety Regulation 2011 that will improve health and safety standards in the transportable ride and theme park industry. The new requirements will include: major inspections of all rides operating in Queensland by qualified engineers every 10 years; improved competency and training of ride operators and requiring them to be clearly identified as the competent operator of the ride; proper recording of inspections, maintenance and operator competency through logbooks for every ride operating in Queensland; and a new comprehensive safety case and licensing system for major amusement parks. Restoring and maintaining public confidence in theme parks and the amusement ride sector is critical for the community and will have significant positive benefits for the economy.

We have made these changes before the current coronial process is finalised because we are prioritising safety. These changes have been made in consultation with all industry stakeholders and the Coroner has also been informed. We await the outcome of the coronial inquest and, if further recommendations are made to enhance safety in the industry, we will examine them closely and make further amendments as required.

I am also pleased to announce the appointment of Aaron Guilfoyle as Queensland's first independent Work Health and Safety Prosecutor, commencing on 18 March 2019. Mr Guilfoyle will lead a new independent statutory office focused on workplace health and safety and electrical safety

prosecutions. He is a former assistant director of the Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions based in North Queensland and has extensive experience in complex regulatory prosecutions in the maritime safety industry. Health and safety will always be a priority for the Palaszczuk government. I welcome the new amusement device regulations and the new position of Work Health and Safety Prosecutor.

Affordable Energy Plan

 **Hon. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy) (9.59 am): The Palaszczuk government knows Queenslanders are concerned about cost-of-living pressures. That is why we put our \$2 billion Affordable Energy Plan in place—to put downward pressure on electricity prices. I am pleased to report that our plan is putting the dividends from our proudly publicly owned energy businesses back into the pockets of mums and dads right across the state. I reflect how disappointing it was this morning to hear Keith Pitt, the member for Hinkler, ranting against public ownership and supporting the federal LNP government's privatisation plans.

Let us look at where we are. Queensland now has the lowest typical household power bill of any mainland state. We are also helping to deliver cost savings to up to 4,000 households in Cairns, Townsville, Rockhampton, Toowoomba and Hervey Bay through our Energy Savvy Families program.

Mr Millar interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Gregory.

Dr LYNHAM: This helps regional families experiencing hardship to better understand when and how they use their electricity and some simple actions to reduce their usage and, more importantly, to reduce their electricity bills. When I was in Cairns last month, Lauren was taking great delight in telling the member for Cairns how small things like shutting down her husband's beer fridge and turning off appliances have helped cut their power bill. More than 54,000 Queensland households are reducing their energy usage with a minimum four-star energy efficient appliance such as a fridge, washing machine or air conditioner—thanks to our grants program. We are kickstarting the battery revolution with our interest-free loans for solar and storage initiative. Queenslanders have already snapped up more than 2,400 of these packages. We also recognise that renters should have access to the benefits of solar, so in Bundaberg, Gladstone and Townsville we are trialling grants for landlords to install solar, with safeguards built in for renters.

Some 200 energy audits are currently underway for farms and businesses in regional Queensland, giving them free, expert advice on energy efficiency. There are cash co-contributions on the table to help these customers—

Mr Millar interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. You are warned under the standing orders. I have already given you some guidance this morning.


Dr LYNHAM: As I said before, 200 energy audits are currently underway for farms and businesses in—again—regional Queensland, giving them free, expert advice on energy efficiency.

Mr Hart interjected.

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

Dr LYNHAM: Next month Queenslanders should start receiving their second \$50 dividend as owners of their power assets. This government made a commitment to put downward pressure on electricity prices. With our Affordable Energy Plan we are driving down power prices for all Queensland families.

Queensland Rail, Flood Recovery

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (10.02 am): The past month has been a true example of the strong Queensland spirit. Lashed by unprecedented extreme rainfall, our north and north-west Queensland communities have rallied to rebuild and recover. Nowhere is this truer than on the 1,000-kilometre-long Mount Isa rail line, where a 400-strong workforce has been working around the clock in often very high summer temperatures to reopen one of the state's most

critical transport links. The Mount Isa line is a crucial piece of infrastructure to the north-west minerals province and the North Queensland economy. Getting business and community moving again on the line has been an absolute priority for the Palaszczuk government, and I am pleased to confirm that the line remains on track to reopen between late April and mid-May.

Earlier this month Queensland Rail completed critical repairs between Richmond and Hughenden. I am pleased to report to the House that last week a freight service travelled between Richmond and Townsville. This week crews have started restoring the line between Oorindi and Tibbarri. These works range from reconstructing embankments and track foundations to culvert and bridge restoration and repairs and the relaying of rail, track and ballast. In Nelia, works to recover the Pacific National train is progressing, with all 81 wagons to be fully removed in the coming week. More than 1,700 sleepers and 4,000 tonnes of ballast are being delivered to Nelia to build a 1.2-kilometre deviation that will allow trains to resume travel while the recovery continues.

One of the challenges facing the recovery has been housing the 400-strong workforce. I am pleased to report to the House that Queensland Rail and Minister de Brenni's Department of Housing and Public Works have worked together to establish camps at both Richmond and Julia Creek. These camps have become a hive of activity that have also provided a much needed boost to the local economy, with local businesses providing food, cleaning services and supplies. I would like to acknowledge the hard work of the task force and all of the locals who have been rebuilding our communities in North-West Queensland.

I would also like to acknowledge the donation of disused rail to the volunteer organisation BlazeAid. The rail will be used to assist with the rebuilding of fencing in North-West Queensland communities. The recovery of the Mount Isa rail line is a true demonstration of the Queensland spirit, and I look forward to the line being fully restored and reopened.

Building and Construction Industry, Task Force



Hon. MC de BRENNI (Springwood—ALP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works, Minister for Digital Technology and Minister for Sport) (10.05 am): It is plainly obvious to Australians who is standing up for small and medium business and tradies in the construction industry. It is this Labor government that is making sure that Queensland tradies get paid on time and in full every time.

Governments should govern for all people, but they do need to make a choice sometimes between those who deserve their protection and those who put profit above all else. As the Premier announced during the last sitting week, in conjunction with the Minister for Police and the Attorney-General's department, we have put in place a special joint task force to investigate allegations of fraud in the Queensland building industry—fraudsters that other governments have turned a blind eye to, fraudsters that other governments have given a green light to.

The special joint task force is headed up by retired Supreme Court judge the Hon. John Byrne. While the task force officially begins operation today, Justice Byrne has wasted no time in getting to work. He has outlined that confidential submissions can be made online via email or post. Tradies can also make submissions in person directly to task force members. The task force will visit the Sunshine Coast, the Gold Coast, Rockhampton, Townsville and Cairns.

While this work continues, Justice Byrne and I have made it clear to industry that so too does the Palaszczuk government's nation-leading building industry fairness reforms. In that vein, 1 April is a fool's day for any big building company in this state that thinks it can get around our nation-leading laws, because on the day after, 2 April 2019, the second phase of our minimum financial requirements reforms will commence.


Phase 1 of these changes requires all building and construction companies that have annual revenue of more than \$30 million to provide their financial information to the Queensland Building and Construction Commission. Additionally, reporting standards for larger, higher risk licensees will be strengthened. The commission will be empowered to ask for, receive and independently verify the financial information it is provided. That means the commission can obtain relevant information at any time if they suspect that a licensee is not meeting the minimum financial requirements. Penalties will also apply for licensees who fail to report annually or update the commission on significant changes to their financial position.

The commission will be able to collect evidence enabling proceedings under the Criminal Code and the data that ASIC requires to take action under federal laws. We have reversed changes made under previous governments that removed mandatory financial reporting for the big end of town. Under our rules, we will not let the big end of town walk over small business and working families in this state.

We have already seen the commission use new laws introduced by the Palaszczuk government to come down hard on big businesses who seem to think that the rules do not apply to them. They have also been working to stamp out the thieves in the industry who rot the system and lie to the regulator.

The Palaszczuk government knows that in order for Queenslanders to have secure, stable and well-paid jobs the industry that they work in has to be fair, safe and sustainable, and that is exactly what our building industry fairness reforms are achieving.

Growing Queensland's Food Exports

 **Hon. ML FURNER** (Ferny Grove—ALP) (Minister for Agricultural Industry Development and Fisheries) (10.08 am): I am incredibly proud that the Palaszczuk government is a keen supporter of our Queensland farmers. An example of that was just yesterday when the Premier and I engaged with our friends from the Queensland Farmers' Federation. Queensland produces some of the best produce—something we are celebrating across the state with our recent launch of the #eatqld campaign.

Mr Lister interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Southern Downs, I do not wish to hear much from you today.


Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order, members to my right!

Mr FURNER: That is why I am very proud today to announce \$660,000 in funding under the second round of our Growing Queensland's Food Exports grants. With the first round we supported exporters of macadamias, mangoes, melons, strawberries, sweet corn and pork with matched grants of up to \$100,000. This funding is designed to help businesses, either exporters or ready to export, improve their export competitiveness through better understanding of their markets. In this second round of funding we are supporting exporters of vegetables from Gatton, ginger from Buderim, mandarins from Mundubbera, banana flour from the Atherton Tablelands, dried tropical fruits from Gin Gin, wines from the Granite Belt, and mud crabs and fish from the Gulf Country. We are investing in market access and innovation so Queensland farmers can take on the world.

While the Palaszczuk government is clearly the farmers' friend, the same cannot be said about the coalition government in Canberra. Our state is on the front line of biosecurity in this country, yet this LNP federal government recklessly cut biosecurity staff by more than 20 per cent. Biosecurity is crucial to the success of our agricultural sector and vital to make sure our exporters can maintain Queensland's clean, green reputation for producing some of the world's best produce. In next week's federal budget Queensland needs to get its fair share of biosecurity funding to make sure Queensland farmers do not face the threat of imported pests.

Cyclone Trevor

 **Hon. CD CRAWFORD** (Barron River—ALP) (Minister for Fire and Emergency Services) (10.11 am): I rise to give the House an update on Queensland's latest weather system, Tropical Cyclone Trevor, now ex-Tropical Cyclone Trevor. Trevor crossed the coast near Lockhart River on Cape York Peninsula last Tuesday as a high category 3 system. On Friday I visited Lockhart River with Commissioner Carroll, and I can assure the House that that community was ready. There were swiftwater rescue and floodwater rescue boats, and personnel had been deployed across the Far North region. The town of Lockhart River went into lockdown at one o'clock in the afternoon on Tuesday. The school was closed. Police cars were driven around the town with their sirens on, warning the community to go indoors and stay indoors. I spoke with the mayor, Wayne Butcher, after Trevor had passed over. He said it was like a freight train that ran for around six hours nonstop in the afternoon.

QFES assessment teams started work first thing Wednesday morning and by the end of the week they had assessed more than 170 properties, only one of which was considered severely damaged, and we are pretty sure that it was an abandoned building. An extra half a dozen SES personnel were deployed from Cairns to help with the clean-up. Together with the teams already in Lockhart River they did a mighty fine job.

When I visited Friday I was told much of the debris had already been cleared away. You could see it stacked on the sides of roads, branches piled up and a lot of chainsaw work was occurring across town. There is still a lot of work to do, but an awful lot of work has already been done. In Aurukun 180 homes lost power, while power was completely cut to Lockhart River. Today I am pleased to report that electricity has now been restored to all of that network. That particular weather system is not quite

finished with Queensland. The forecast is for rain across the north and the west of this state, but again QFES staff and volunteers were amongst those at the forefront of operations. They were there before the system arrived, they were there during the system and they are there the moment the winds die down.

Trevor is the latest in what has been an intense summer of fires, floods, monsoon troughs, heatwaves and cyclones. Trevor has given me yet another opportunity to truly appreciate what it is that the men and women of QFES do so readily to assist the people of Queensland in their time of need. Again, I thank them for their time.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Child Sex Offender Register



Mr WATTS (Toowoomba North—LNP) (10.13 am): I give notice that I will move—

That this House calls on the Palaszczuk government to implement the LNP's plan for a public child sex offender register.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Absence of Member



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have received a notification from the member for Whitsunday advising of his intended absence until Tuesday, 2 April 2019. The member's notification complies with standing order 263A.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

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

Hospitals, Demand



Mrs FRECKLINGTON (10.14 am): My first question is to the Premier. In late 2011 Labor Premier Anna Bligh referred to Queensland Health as a basket case. How has it taken Labor four years to have every South-East Queensland hospital at breaking point, taking Queensland Health back to the bad old days of dysfunction under Labor?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. As I said in my ministerial statement, we are being faced with unprecedented demand in our south-east hospitals at the moment. This is a serious issue and one that my government is making a top priority. This afternoon the health minister is going to step in and chair that meeting of the south-east hospitals in terms of prioritising some issues that I talked about. Let me go through those again. The first one is that we have seen an unprecedented demand with the level of the summer flu. We are bringing forward the winter bed strategy now to cope with this demand. As I said this morning—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Members to my left, the Premier is being responsive to the question that has been asked. I would like to hear the answer. I do not believe she is being provocative.

Ms PALASZCZUK: As I said this morning, \$3 million has been put in place urgently to free up some beds in the private sector. As I said, there are currently people who are ready to be discharged who need aged-care placements. What we saw very clearly—

Ms Bates interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: If you want to talk about aged-care bed closures, you closed aged-care beds in this state.

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, please direct your comments through the chair.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The member for Mudgeeraba was probably a minister at the time they sat around the table and talked about closing Eventide, Wynnum, Kingaroy—

Opposition members interjected.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Leader of the Opposition, you will also direct your comments through the chair.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is why we have a record Health budget in this state of \$18.3 billion. That is why we support the hardworking men and women in our health system—our doctors and our nurses who those opposite chose to sack. Four thousand were sacked under them.

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, are you going to table that document?

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is their legacy and that is their record. Under my government—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Southport! Member for Mudgeeraba! The Premier has the call.

Mr Sorensen interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Resume your seat, Premier. Member for Hervey Bay, I am having a sense of *deja vu*. I think I have said before that you need to use the cover of others. You are warned under the standing orders. Premier, do you have anything further to add?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I do. I thank the member for Hervey Bay. We are building a new emergency centre in Hervey Bay thanks to my government. He can thank me later. I will come and personally open it. It is not happening under his government. This government is building a new emergency centre. Leader of the Opposition, we are building the Kingaroy hospital as well. Nothing happened under the LNP; we build.

(Time expired)

Hospitals, Demand

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: My second question is to the Premier. How many Queenslanders have had their planned surgeries cancelled because of Labor's hospital crisis?

Ms PALASZCZUK: As the health minister said today, there have been no elective surgeries that have been cancelled—

Dr Miles: At the PA.

Ms PALASZCZUK: At the PA.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Well, it is one of our largest hospitals. Let us just think about what would happen if those opposite were in government. You would have no nurses and you would have no doctors to look after people.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: They have a track record of cutting 14,000 people, including 4,000 nurses. I notice the member for Clayfield is laughing there. He was the treasurer when all of the cuts happened. It is not a laughing matter.

Mr BLEIJIE: I rise to a point of order, Mr Speaker. You have often asked the opposition to be succinct with their questions. Mr Speaker, I rise on relevance. The question was one sentence and it was about planned surgeries across all of Queensland, and the Premier is going—

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members to my right!

Mr BLEIJIE: The Premier is going clearly way off subject after the very succinct question about planned surgeries cancelled across all hospitals, not just the PA.

Mr SPEAKER: In terms of the point of order raised by the Manager of Opposition Business, Premier, under standing order 118B I do ask you to come back and answer the question. However, I wish to make a point to all members that, when it comes to answering questions, albeit ones that are very direct, the Premier or the minister on their feet is able to respond to interjections and that is also one of the reasons I take a dim view of those interjections.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The individual health and hospital boards make those decisions depending on the demand. They will independently be making those decisions today. Let me say this very clearly. Our hospitals and the people who work in our hospitals put patient care above everything. That is why my government has implemented nurse to patient ratios—to make sure that our patients get the best possible care.

Honestly, health is an issue not just at the state level; it is a national issue. There is not a COAG meeting I go to where every single Premier and state and territory minister does not raise health funding, and still we are waiting on health funding from the federal government of \$300 million. I will stand our record against their record any day. There were no plans for expansions at hospitals. There were no plans for aged care. When they were in office, they cut—

Mr Hinchliffe interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take that interjection from the member for Sandgate. What about Eventide? The opposition leader—I almost said ‘Deputy Leader of the Opposition’—sat around the CBRC table when they closed aged-care beds in Eventide, and they were proud of it. They were proud of the budget that they delivered—absolutely proud of it. Those opposite need to know very clearly that the way in which the LNP Morrison government has administered health in this nation is a disgrace. It is an absolute disgrace when we have to go begging to get payments for Queensland. We know that the Health budget—

(Time expired)

Health System

Ms PEASE: My question without notice is to the Premier. Will the Premier please update the House on what the government is doing to meet the health needs of Queenslanders?

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Ms PALASZCZUK: Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I thank the—

Mr SPEAKER: I have not called you yet, Premier. I will not tolerate interjections before a member has risen to their feet.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I thank the member for Lytton for that question because the member for Lytton well knows the damage that was done by the Newman government when they closed the Wynnum aged-care unit. People were coming to us telling us their stories about how they felt when the Newman government callously came in and shut those beds down. We currently have people who have had their aged-care assessments done and are ready to move outside of hospitals. These people should not be in hospitals; they should be in aged-care facilities. Whose responsibility is it for aged care? The federal government. Why won't the federal government work with us in relation to this matter?

The member for Lytton stood proudly alongside me and Minister Cameron Dick when he was the health minister to open the brand-new centre built by a Labor government. We will continue to build the health infrastructure that is needed. As I said, we have a nearly \$1 billion infrastructure project over the next few years. We are doing major redevelopments in Logan, Caboolture, Ipswich, Nambour and Kingaroy—how could I forget Kingaroy? We are building in Kingaroy. This was not done by the LNP when they were in office. We are also doing Atherton and Roma. This is our commitment to the people of this state.

For example, the Logan Hospital expansion project is a \$280 million investment which is expected to deliver 195 additional beds. There is \$257 million for Caboolture. This is about planning for the future. There is \$124 million for Ipswich, and the member for Ipswich will know how important that hospital is. We do know that those opposite cut nurses and cut midwives. They did not want nurses looking after people in our hospitals. They did not want nurses looking after us. The member for Kawana can laugh and you can smirk.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Well, we fixed your crisis. That is what we did.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Premier, I ask that you ensure your comments are directed through the chair and not at those opposite.

Ms PALASZCZUK: We all know that when the member for Kawana sat around the cabinet table we had the doctor contract crisis as well—doctors, nurses, midwives, cleaners, aged-care facilities.

(Time expired)

Hospitals, Demand

Mr MANDER: My question without notice is to the Premier. I refer to the unprecedented overcrowding crisis at hospitals in South-East Queensland. Given the Premier was unable to advise the number of surgery cancellations, can the Premier guarantee that our major hospitals will be able to cope with the upcoming flu season given that our hospitals are at breaking point now?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Everton, the deputy opposition leader, for the question. That is why Health does planning. Health does planning for every single flu season, but what we are seeing around the world is a spike when it comes to summer flu and a spike when it comes to winter flu as well which is putting the pressure on our hospitals.

My understanding is that the flu vaccine is coming forward. I urge Queenslanders, especially vulnerable Queenslanders, to get their flu shots as soon as they become available in the lead-up to the flu season. It is absolutely crucial. I also want to put on record that what we do need to do is to encourage people to go to their GP if they do not have life-threatening illnesses. The roadblock there has been the federal government. I welcome federal Labor's initiatives in terms of uncapping some of that bulk-billing to allow people to go to their GP and not have to pay a fee. The health minister addressed this very clearly when—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Members, as far as I can hear, the Premier is being responsive to the question. I would like to hear her response.

Ms PALASZCZUK: As the health minister said, people are finding the payment of that fee a roadblock in going to their local GP. I welcome federal Labor's initiative there. It is one that I think will help alleviate some of those pressures. We will continue to work with all of the local HHSs in relation to this issue. As I have said, we are planning for the extra capacity at the major hospitals around the south-east, which is absolutely vital and critical. No planning was done when those opposite were in government.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Everton.

Ms PALASZCZUK: All they did was cut nurses, cut doctors and cut aged-care placements. As I said in my ministerial statement—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order, members.

Ms PALASZCZUK: As I said in my ministerial statement, there are currently people in our hospitals who are aged-care assessed and disability assessed and they should not be—

Mr Mander interjected.

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

Ms PALASZCZUK:—in our hospitals. I am prepared to work with the federal government on this crucial issue. It is called working together, something that members opposite know nothing about, and I will come to that very shortly. We have put on more than 5,270 nurses and midwives—

Mr SPEAKER: The Premier's time has expired.

Ms PALASZCZUK:—which is—

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, your time has expired.

Ms PALASZCZUK:—559 more—

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, your time has expired. Premier, I do not wish to have to warn you three times to resume your seat. If you could not hear me, I appreciate that. There is a lot of interjection, but members must resume their seat once their time has expired.

(Time expired)

Gun Control

Mr RUSSO: My question without notice is of the Premier. Will the Premier update the House on the Palaszczuk government's actions to prevent gun violence and any other alternative policies?

Mr Purdie interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Ninderry, you are warned under the standing orders. I have already made myself clear about interjections before members have even been given the call.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Toohey for that very important question. It is very clear that under my government there will be no weakening of any gun laws in this state. We back—

An opposition member: John Howard's government.

Ms PALASZCZUK:—John Howard's strong legislation that came into force. People will never see a state Labor government back away from those laws. We know very clearly that after the tragedy in Christchurch Jacinda Ardern, the New Zealand Prime Minister, has moved very swiftly to enact similar laws in New Zealand, and I welcome that.

I think everyone in this House should have been rightly shocked when they saw the documentary that was aired last night about One Nation going over to the US to lobby the NRA for money to run their national campaign in the lead-up to the federal election. The two people involved were none other than James Ashby and Steve Dickson. Can I talk about Mr Dickson just briefly? Not only was he a member of the LNP who sat in this chamber; he was appointed a minister of the Crown by the LNP. He was not a backbencher. He sat around the cabinet table—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Capalaba.

Ms PALASZCZUK:—with the member for Clayfield, the member for Kawana—

An honourable member interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Yes, he was one of theirs.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Ms PALASZCZUK: What was said last night by Mr Ashby? 'If you had \$20 million, you would own the lower house and the upper house.' We saw Mr Dickson brag about his time as an LNP government minister. What a disgrace to think that he was sitting around the cabinet table making all those decisions and the whole time all he wanted to do was weaken Australian gun laws. I think every Queenslander should be absolutely disturbed by that. It brings me back to this central point: we will always put One Nation last. We will stand on our principles. What will those opposite do?

Mr Hunt interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Nicklin.

Ms PALASZCZUK: You support it, do you? You support it? You support One Nation?

Mr Hunt interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The member down there—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Nicklin, you are warned under the standing orders. Premier, you will ensure your comments are through the chair. You will not direct your comments at members.

Ms PALASZCZUK: It is a sign of leadership for the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition to rule out—

(Time expired)

Hospitals, Demand

Ms BATES: My question is to the Premier. I refer to the unprecedented overcrowding crisis at hospitals in South-East Queensland.

Dr Miles: Ask me a question.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister for Health, you are warned under the standing orders. Member, please start your question again.

Ms BATES: My question is to the Premier. I refer to the unprecedented overcrowding crisis at hospitals in South-East Queensland. Can the Premier advise on what date the current health crisis will be fixed?

Mr Saunders interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Maryborough, you are warned under the standing orders. I will wait for silence before calling the Premier.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Mudgeeraba for the question. It is an important question. If we had the support from the federal government, I could move people out of our hospitals and free up those beds tonight. That is what would happen.

Honourable members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is right; 200. Why does the member not pick up the phone to her colleague? Yes, I will be approaching the federal government for urgent assistance in prioritising—

Ms Bates interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Mudgeeraba.

Ms PALASZCZUK:—people without aged-care assistance to move into alternative facilities. As we know, our baby boomer population is getting older and we need to make sure that we have more—

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: No, it is called planning for the future. That is why the federal government needs to do planning now to ensure that there are aged-care beds in aged-care facilities to deal—

Mr Powell: ‘Charter boat? What charter boat?’

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Glass House, you are warned under the standing orders.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take the interjection from the member for Glass House. Let me say very clearly that the federal government are responsible for the provision of aged care. They provide the funding. Who said that?

Mr Boothman: Campbell Newman.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Campbell Newman, your boss.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: You’re the apprentice.

Mr SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, I called you to order a couple of times. You were clearly in the moment. You are warned under the standing orders.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I say to the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Nanango: you were working—

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

Mr SPEAKER: No, I will rule. Premier, I have given you three notices of warning today around putting your comments through the chair. I warn you under the standing orders. Members, there is no provision to do so and it is not helpful for the House to direct your comments directly at members.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Mr Speaker—

Mr Mickelberg interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Buderim, you are warned under the standing orders. In case members have not noticed, I do not have a lot of tolerance today.

Ms PALASZCZUK: We will continue to lobby the federal government and to work with the federal government. As I said in this House, I am prepared to work with the federal government to accelerate the transition out of the hospital system into aged care for those people as quickly as possible. As well as that, there are people who are in our hospitals at the moment who have their disability packages and who have been assessed. They, too, need to move into alternative accommodation.

As we all know, the National Disability Insurance Scheme has come into effect. Once again, we call on the federal government to accelerate the funding. I understand that there are negotiations happening at the moment in relation to that. The health minister will convene that meeting this afternoon and will provide an update following that meeting.

(Time expired)

Jobs

Mr POWER: My question is to the Deputy Premier. Can the Deputy Premier please advise the House how the Palaszczuk government's economic plan is supporting jobs growth in Queensland and are there any risks to jobs?

Ms TRAD: I thank the member for Logan for that terrific question. I know that the member for Logan is a very strong advocate for economic growth and jobs in his community. Under the Palaszczuk Labor government we have created more than 33,000 jobs in the Logan-Beaudesert area. Contrast that against what those opposite did when they were in government: in the Logan-Beaudesert region 21,000 Queenslanders lost their jobs under the LNP. As I mentioned earlier, this is the 29th consecutive month of jobs growth in Queensland, and that is because unlike those opposite we are focused on our economic plan and we are focused on Queenslanders. As crazy as this may sound to the deputy opposition leader, it is difficult to focus on an economic plan to improve jobs for Queenslanders when you are focused on yourself and the chaos that you create amongst yourselves. It does not matter whether it is preferences, their relationship with One Nation, preferencing the Greens or their flip-flop position on coal, those opposite are only chaotic.

I am astounded at the federal LNP's response to the outrageous video we have seen concerning former LNP—now One Nation—members over in America lobbying the NRA for money to weaken Australia's gun laws. Their response has been a disgrace. What was Prime Minister Morrison's response? He has repudiated them and he has called them a disgrace, but he has not ruled out preferencing them. What has Keith Pitt said today? He said that all of the candidates should resign, 'but if they don't I'll still preference them.' Arthur Sinodinos said, 'We want to take votes off them, but we want to preference them.' A preference is a vote by any other name, and those opposite know it. It is up to those opposite to show the leadership their federal counterparts have been sorely lacking. Their moral compass is absolutely pointed to base self-interest. Today it is up to the LNP to rule out preferences and a relationship with One Nation because all that means is weaker gun laws for Queenslanders and Australians.

Hospitals, Demand

Dr ROWAN: My question is to the Premier. I refer to the unprecedented overcrowding crisis at hospitals in South-East Queensland, and I ask: will the Premier now concede that fixing our hospitals should have been Labor's priority for patients rather than wasting taxpayers' money renaming the Lady Cilento children's hospital?

Ms PALASZCZUK: Our priority is always on health. We went to the election on jobs, health and education.

A government member: Reverse the cuts.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is right; I will take that interjection. We reversed the savage cuts that happened under the LNP. The members opposite should hang their heads in shame when it comes to those savage cuts. As I said, we have been restoring those services. Not only have we been restoring the doctors, nurses, midwives and paramedics but we have been planning for the building, construction and expansion—

Mr Boothman interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Theodore!

Ms PALASZCZUK: While I am on my feet, I might add that I was asked about the winter flu strategy. Ten million dollars has been allocated towards that. It is something that we do every year. Once again I would urge Queenslanders to get their flu shots as soon as they become available.

The Labor government in this state will always prioritise health. I say to those opposite that Queenslanders do not forget. They do not forget the 4,000 health workers and midwives that were cut. They do not forget the nursing and aged-care facilities that were closed.

Ms Bates interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Mudgeeraba!

Ms PALASZCZUK: Just imagine, if we still had those aged-care facilities open they would be able to take some of this capacity. I commend the health minister for taking swift and decisive action and for going out and visiting our hardworking staff on the ground this morning, which is something that those opposite never did. They do not care about staff. They do not care about patients. They closed things. Who could forget when they removed \$120 million—

Ms Bates interjected.

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

Ms PALASZCZUK:—in funding from Queensland community health organisations? I was reminded about that just recently: Deaf Services Queensland, Cerebral Palsy League, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Service, Queensland AIDS Council and child and family therapy services, just to name a few.

Ms Trad: Epilepsy Queensland.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take that interjection; Epilepsy Queensland as well.

Dr Rowan interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Moggill!

Ms PALASZCZUK: Those opposite also cut funding to non-government organisations—

Dr Rowan interjected.

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

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is your legacy.

Renewable Energy

Ms HOWARD: My question is to the Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning. Could the minister please update the House on any recent projects for the generation of renewable energy in Queensland and is he aware of any other approaches?

Mr DICK: I thank the member for Ipswich for her strong support for improving and increasing renewable energy in Queensland. Last week I announced planning approval for the \$450 million Dulacca Windfarm. The 56 wind turbines that will be built in south-west Queensland for this project will support 400 construction jobs and 35 ongoing operational jobs. It is further evidence of how the Palaszczuk government is supporting investment in regional Queensland.

I regret to inform the House that not everyone is a fan of stable and secure energy policy in this state. When it comes to energy policy, no-one is better at setting out the case for and against than the hand-picked protégé of Campbell Newman: the Leader of the Opposition. Take, for example, the way the Leader of the Opposition is for coalmining in Central Queensland but against coalmining in Kingaroy; for the Adani loan before the election and against the Adani loan after the election; for a coal-fired power station in North Queensland in the last parliament and against it in this one; and for government mandated investment in renewable energy projects in her budget reply and against it one week later. Remember what the Leader of the Opposition said so seriously in her budget reply last year? She said—

An LNP government would mandate government owned energy companies to support renewable energy generation.

That suffered the worst fate any LNP policy could ever have: it was supported by GetUp!. Then of course she got a knock on the door from the then president of the LNP, Gary Spence, and the policy was dead and buried in a week. When it comes to energy policy, the Leader of the Opposition is more compromised than Steve Dickson and James Ashby in an Al Jazeera video shoot.

There is one thing she is absolutely consistent on and crystal clear about before, during and after elections—that is, preferencing One Nation. After everything we have seen—the despicable television footage we saw last night—it is time for decent people to stand up against the dysfunction, the chaos and the politics of hate promulgated by One Nation. It is about time the Leader of the Opposition had the decency to say no to One Nation and put One Nation last.

Hospitals, Demand

Mr BLEIJIE: My question without notice is to the Premier. On what date did the health minister tell the Premier that Queensland Health was again in crisis?

Ms PALASZCZUK: Yesterday afternoon, as soon as we learned that there were pressures across the south-east, I was alerted to that fact.

Mr Mander: Great planning.

Ms PALASZCZUK: No, because all of the hospital and health services usually manage these issues on a daily basis. What we saw was unprecedented demand. I will share with the House some of the key facts. Between 1 March and 25 March—

Mr Janetzki interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Toowoomba South, you are warned under the standing orders.

Ms PALASZCZUK:—there has been a 12 per cent increase in calls to triple 0. In Metro North, the Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital and the Prince Charles Hospital have seen an over eight per cent increase in presentations in comparison to the same 25-day period. Similarly, the Gold Coast University Hospital has seen a nearly 10 per cent increase in presentations in comparison to the same 25-day period. It is the same in Logan. This pressure is also being experienced over the border, in the Tweed. This pressure is not unusual at other hospitals around our nation.

As soon as the health minister heard that a number of hospitals in the south-east—10 in total—had reached capacity, he immediately contacted my office. He contacted me and he immediately did a press conference with the Chief Health Officer, yesterday afternoon. Straightaway this morning he was out on the wards, speaking with people.

I reiterate: the pressure is being felt in not just public hospitals but also private hospitals. Even for those people with private health insurance, we are seeing pressures in the private hospital system as well. What happens when these situations arise? Everybody works together. The public and the private systems work together. Now we are asking the federal government to work together with us. The Prime Minister worked with us in relation to our natural disaster recovery, and I commend him for that. I now ask him for that same cooperation when we seek to have people with disability or those with aged-care assessments moved from public hospital beds into other areas. This would free up bed capacity immediately. In a spirit of cooperation, I make that call to the Prime Minister—

(Time expired)

Business Events

Mr KELLY: 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 government's strategy to grow Queensland's business events sector?

Ms JONES: I thank the honourable member for the question and for his interest in growing our economy. We have already doubled the events calendar in Queensland from when we were elected— from about \$350 million per year to more than \$800 million per year into the Queensland economy. That means jobs, particularly at the Brisbane convention centre.

Right now Queensland is abuzz with activity, with events happening right across our state. We had the World Science Festival. We have QODE coming up next week. Now I am very proud to announce that from 29 April to 2 May Brisbane will host the 39th annual conference of the International Association for Impact Assessment.

Mr Dick: Hear, hear! A fantastic conference.

Ms JONES: You might get an invite; you might get a guernsey at that conference! We know that this will bring to Queensland more than 900 delegates from 70 countries, spreading the message about the great city of Brisbane.

I think the people who have to do an impact assessment are those in the LNP, after what we saw from One Nation last night from Al Jazeera. We know that, when given the choice, the Leader of the Opposition will always preference One Nation. In fact, I table her how-to-vote card.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, depicting an LNP How to Vote Card for the Nanango electorate [418].

She had a choice between three candidates and she chose to put One Nation second, straight after herself. She could have put One Nation last, but we know that those opposite are happy to do deals with One Nation. They are happy to do deals with people who go to America to court the dirty money of the National Rifle Association. The Leader of the Opposition wants to preference the Greens. It is about time she stood up to the gun lobby in Australia. She has to rule out doing a deal with One Nation at the next state election. Everyone in the gallery needs to know that the LNP will do a deal with the Greens in Brisbane and a deal with One Nation in every other seat across this state. It stands for nothing.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Ms JONES: The one thing we know about the LNP under the leadership of the Leader of the Opposition is that it is very happy to jump into bed with One Nation. After the horrific revelations of the last 24 hours—that One Nation is courting NRA money from America to water down John Howard's gun laws—the Leader of the Opposition needs to come out and say that never under her leadership will the LNP do a deal with One Nation. Our children deserve better. They deserve to grow up in a country with strong gun laws that make them safe.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms JONES: You can squawk all you like, but—

Mr SPEAKER: The minister's time has expired.

Ms JONES: You should be ashamed of yourselves. I withdraw.

Hospitals, Federal Funding

Ms SIMPSON: My question is to the Premier. The Morrison government has delivered \$2.2 billion more to Queensland hospitals this year compared to the last year of the Rudd Labor government. Why will the Premier not stop playing the political blame game and start putting patient care first—

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Members to my right! Member for Murrumba, you are already on a warning. I ask you to leave the chamber for the remainder of question time.

Whereupon the honourable member for Murrumba withdrew from the chamber at 10.58 am.

Mr SPEAKER: I have made myself very clear about questions being heard in silence. Member for Maroochydore, will you please start your question again.

Ms SIMPSON: My question is to the Premier. The Morrison government has delivered \$2.2 billion more to Queensland hospitals this year compared to the last year of the Rudd Labor government. Why will the Premier not stop playing the political blame game and start putting patient care first by signing up to the new national partnership agreement, which will deliver an additional \$7.4 billion into Queensland from 2020?

Mr SPEAKER: Before I ask the Premier to answer the question, member for Maroochydore, that comes very close to having a far too lengthy preamble. I will allow the question, but I will also allow much latitude in terms of the way the answer is given.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I will check those figures given by the member for Maroochydore to clarify those figures to the House, but all states get an increase in funding due to the increase in population.

Honourable members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Yes. We have more than 160 public hospitals across Queensland and we are the most decentralised state when it comes to providing good-quality health services to the men and women and the families of this state, no matter where they live. At last count, the federal government owed us \$300 million. In fact, the health minister and I have written numerous letters to the Prime Minister demanding the money. In Queensland we have a record Health budget under my government. As I said, it is over \$18 billion, including \$1 billion of capital infrastructure. When those opposite were in office, in their Health budget they cut the staff. They cut the staff who are needed to operate the hospitals.

Ms Bates interjected.

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

Government members: She's already warned!

Mrs D'ATH: Mr Speaker, the member for Mudgeeraba has already—

Honourable members interjected.

Mrs D'ATH: She is.

Mr SPEAKER: Yes, you are out—

Mr Ryan: For the day.

Mr SPEAKER:—for the remainder of question time.

Whereupon the honourable member for Mudgeeraba withdrew from the chamber at 11.00 am.

Mr SPEAKER: I will take this opportunity to remind members who are on a warning because if I hear interjections from any of you for the remainder of question time you will be out as well: the members for Gregory, Burleigh, Hervey Bay, Everton, Nicklin, Glass House, Maryborough, Nanango, Buderim, Inala, Ipswich, Toowoomba South and Ninderry.

Ms PALASZCZUK: As I said at the beginning, and I will conclude on this point: every time we go to COAG every single Premier and every state and territory Chief Minister talks about the additional pressures that are being caused in our health system across our nation. There is always a demand for more money. There is always a demand. The population is growing. We have more complex health issues in our communities and we have an ageing population. That is why we are planning for the future and doing hospital expansions. What people will not see under this government are the savage cuts to health services, to NGOs, to doctors, to nurses, to paramedics and to ambulance officers because we value the work that our front-line staff do and we will always back them.

Morrison Government, Energy Policy

Mrs GILBERT: My question is to the Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy. Will the minister update the House on the current state of the federal government's energy policy?

Dr LYNHAM: I thank the member for Mackay for the question. Queensland has the cheapest power, the most reliable power and a clear path to a renewable future. We have the nation's youngest, most efficient coal-fired power stations safely and securely owned by the people of this state. We have more than \$5 billion worth of operational and committed renewable projects, but what do we have from our leaders in Canberra? What do we have? We have a list, and what does that list show us? It demonstrates in black and white what private investors know—that Queensland coal-fired power stations are simply not commercial.

Mr Lister interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Southern Downs, you are warned under the standing orders.

Dr LYNHAM: According to my department's analysis, a new high-efficiency coal project would need at least \$1.5 billion in subsidies. Let us put that into perspective: that is around \$750 for every residential electricity customer in Queensland. Every customer in Queensland would have to stump up \$750 to prop up a private operator's profits. It is all over. Matt Canavan's declaration that now is the right time to build new coal-fired power should be seen for what it is—Disneyland! The list is just another fail for the federal LNP on energy policy. It failed to attract private sector interest in coal-fired power because there is not any. It failed with its divestment legislation that had to be shelved. It failed with its National Energy Guarantee that toppled its leader.

Mr Molhoek interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Southport.

Dr LYNHAM: What has it delivered for North and Central Queensland? A \$10 million feasibility study! It is a sham. It is a scam. In fact—

Mr Molhoek interjected.

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

Dr LYNHAM: What we heard from the LNP yesterday was a version of the old shell scam. You know the one, Mr Speaker: the three shells with the pea and you have to guess which one the pea is under. We have Barnaby out in front. He is the urger out in front warming up the crowd on Twitter, promising them all a pea. Out comes the Prime Minister ripping up those shells around the table—

Mr Millar interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Gregory, you have already been warned under the standing orders. You can leave the chamber for the remainder of question time.

Whereupon the honourable member for Gregory withdrew from the chamber at 11.05 am.

Mr SPEAKER: We will wait until the member leaves before recommencing.

Dr LYNHAM: We have the Prime Minister out there whipping around those shells saying, 'Where's the pea? Where's the pea?' However, we have learnt that there is no pea. There is nothing there. There is nothing there for North Queensland, but up in Collinsville there is poor old George Christensen wandering around with his plate looking for his pea. It is an absolute sham!

(Time expired)

Renewable Energy

Ms BOLTON: My question is to the Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy—very busy boy. With reference to the recent strike action by students regarding transitioning to 100 per cent renewables, can the minister outline what is restricting the government from speeding up this transition and how this will be or could be addressed, as well as what role individuals and communities can take to assist in transitioning at a much faster rate as requested by these students?

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Noosa, there are multiple parts to that question. If you can ask a clear question singularly to the minister I invite you to do so; otherwise I will rule it out of order.

Ms BOLTON: My question is to the Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy. With reference to the recent strike action by students regarding transitioning to 100 per cent renewables, can the minister outline what is restricting the government from speeding up this transition and how this will be addressed?

Mr SPEAKER: I will allow the question.

Dr LYNHAM: I have just heard that the UN Secretary-General has asked nations to bring forward steps to reduce emissions by 45 per cent and also to achieve zero carbon by 2050. Coincidentally, that is exactly federal Labor's policy as we move forward.

I thank the member for Noosa for the question and I reflect that the member for Noosa has a sensible and pragmatic approach when it comes to this issue in her electorate, and I commend her for that. That is in stark contrast to those opposite. As I said before, those opposite have been sold a pup from the federal LNP when it comes to energy policy and nothing on climate change. All they have is a feasibility study.

In terms of energy policy, we do not know where its energy policy lies. Is it like One Nation's energy policy? Is it divorcing itself from One Nation with its energy policy, or do we have the LNP following the coal-fired power station aura of One Nation on its energy policy? No matter what, the Leader of the Opposition has to stand up. Does she agree with the energy policies of One Nation? She has to stand up today and outline where she is with One Nation. Is she for One Nation? Is she for accepting One Nation's preferences? Where is she at? She has to stand up today and tell the people of Queensland whether she is with One Nation on energy policy and also those other important things such as gun laws that we have to know about.

In relation to the question asked by the member for Noosa about a 100 per cent renewables target, I commend the students. They want to see significant action on climate change, as does the rest of the nation. It is only the LNP that does not want to see commendable action on climate change. I believe sincerely that Queensland and the nation will one day eventually reach that 100 per cent renewables target.

As members know, in Queensland we have a zero net emissions target by 2050 but, to reach that, we have to take the people of Queensland with us. We have to have a sensible and pragmatic approach, just like the member for Noosa has. I believe that, in 2009, we lost 10 good years with the Greens not supporting Labor's sensible carbon policy. We lost three years under Campbell Newman and his assistant treasurer, the now Leader of the Opposition. We even heard today about Keith Pitt, ignoring the facts, calling for privatisation. If they ever get in again, our renewables future will be thrown to the wolves. We have sensible, pragmatic policies.

National Disability Insurance Scheme

Ms SCANLON: My question is to the Minister for Communities and Minister for Disability Services and Seniors. Will the minister update the House on Queensland's transition to the NDIS?

Mrs O'ROURKE: I thank the member for Gaven for her question, because I know how passionate she is about making sure that people with disability have all the supports they need. As I said earlier, the Palaszczuk government will make sure that Queenslanders with disability get their fair share of supports and services that can be accessed through the NDIS. The current NDIS transitional bilateral agreement notes that the combined Queensland government and Commonwealth government investment will be up to \$4 billion. As at 28 February this year, in Queensland more than 46,000 people with disability had an NDIS plan approved, or were in the planning process.

Without hesitation, Queensland has stepped in during this transition process where uncertainties have arisen around issues such as the interface between the NDIS and mainstream services such as health. In particular, I can recall a number of people contacting my office, including a lady who was a

double amputee and unable to leave hospital because the NDIS would not provide wound care at home. I also heard from nurses who told me about patients who were in hospital only because the NDIS would not provide services to clean their catheters. The Palaszczuk government stepped in on this issue and made sure that the Queensland government allocated \$10 million in 2018-19 to reinstate community nursing services for NDIS participants until the issue was addressed properly by the Commonwealth.

This government has also stepped in to make sure that other interface issues are not a problem for Queensland while we continue to work on them with the Commonwealth, including issues such as the Taxi Subsidy Scheme and school buses. Yesterday, I met with the current Commonwealth minister, Paul Fletcher, and we discussed the need to finalise the NDIS full scheme bilateral agreement before 30 June. I can assure the House that the Palaszczuk government is absolutely committed to getting its fair share for Queensland.

The full scheme agreement contributions from Queensland and the Commonwealth should be clear, fair and transparent. We know that this is a partnership. This is not an opportunity for the Commonwealth to reduce its commitment. We will fight for a bilateral agreement that is fair—nothing more, nothing less.

Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services

Mr BOYCE: My question was to the health minister but, as he is not here, I will direct it to the Premier.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member, there are conventions in this place to not refer to a member's absence. I sit you down.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. If a member of this place has a legitimate question to the health minister and he is on his feet and the health minister is not in his seat—

Mr SPEAKER: That was not the way the question was asked.

Mr BLEIJIE: But Mr Speaker, the question—

Mr SPEAKER: No, I will not debate the matter with you.

Mr BLEIJIE: I rise to a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: What is your point of order?


Mr BLEIJIE: The member ought to be given an opportunity to address his question to the appropriate person in government, who will be answering that question.

Mr SPEAKER: No. Please resume your seat. The member could have just simply asked his question to another minister or sought advice before asking the question, as could anyone in the opposition. There is no compulsion to have that information provided. The member could have asked that question. The period for question time has expired.

NATURE CONSERVATION (SPECIAL WILDLIFE RESERVES) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 15 February 2018 (see p. 152).

Second Reading

 **Hon. LM ENOCH** (Algera—ALP) (Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef, Minister for Science and Minister for the Arts) (11.15 am): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

The Palaszczuk government takes the protection of our environment seriously and is committed to expanding our protected area estate. This bill delivers on our commitment to the people of Queensland at the last state election that we would create a new tenure category called special wildlife reserves that would provide national park level protections for private land with significant ecological value.

Since coming to office in 2015, the Palaszczuk government has increased the protected area estate in Queensland by more than one million hectares. Queensland's protected area estate now covers 8.2 per cent of the state, which is an area that is more than twice the size of Tasmania. I am particularly proud to lead the debate today on a bill that will create a new class of protected area, the

special wildlife reserve. Through this bill, the parliament has an opportunity to contribute further to the protection of our state's unique environmental and cultural values and the habitat and ecosystems that are essential for our native species.

I would like to thank the Innovation, Tourism Development and Environment Committee for its consideration of the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018, those who made submissions on the bill, and those who appeared as witnesses as part of the committee's inquiry. I would also like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the efforts of the members of the former Agriculture and Environment Committee for their consideration of an earlier version of the bill in 2017.

On 9 April 2018, the committee tabled its report recommending that the bill be passed. The committee's report also contained two further recommendations, including one for amendments to be made to the bill. The government has considered the recommendations made by the committee and I am pleased to advise the House that these recommendations have been accepted. The government's response to the committee's report was tabled in parliament on 9 July 2018.

This bill gives effect to the Palaszczuk government's protected area commitments to conserve Queensland's unique ecological diversity and cultural heritage. This is achieved by providing national park level protections for private land with significant ecological or cultural value. This bill establishes a mechanism to assist in the further expansion of Queensland's protected area network by providing a significant incentive for private investment in that network. This mechanism is a new class of protected area for application on privately owned or managed land.

This bill also allows the regulation of activities beyond the territorial limits of the state but with some connection to the state. In particular, it enables the state to directly regulate activities that are conducted partly within Queensland waters and partly in Commonwealth waters.

Consistent with the Palaszczuk government's Advancing Queensland priorities this amendment creates the capacity to implement important protections for our marine environment, particularly our precious Great Barrier Reef Marine Park by recognising that neither pollutants nor nature respect the arbitrary boundary between Queensland and Commonwealth jurisdictions. The amendments enable consistent and fair regulation of activities undertaken in the Great Barrier Reef region by providing a specific head of power in the Environmental Protection Act 1994 to allow environmentally relevant activities to be regulated extraterritorially. This provides crucial support to the management of activities such as transshipping which may be undertaken wholly in Queensland waters or across Queensland and Commonwealth waters.

I will also be moving amendments to the Mineral Resources Act 1989 and the Mineral Resources Regulation 2013 during consideration in detail to ensure that the higher bauxite royalty rate applies to bauxite mined for consumption outside Queensland and the lower bauxite royalty rate applies to bauxite mined for consumption within Queensland. The amendments, which will operate retrospectively from 1 July 2008, will ensure the royalty rates for bauxite operate as intended and support the longstanding administrative practice. The amendments will provide certainty for royalty payers and government and will protect revenue.

I turn now to the recommendations made by the committee. The first recommendation of the committee is that the bill be passed. The second recommendation of the committee is that I continue to work with traditional owners to ensure their concerns in relation to native title are addressed. First Nations people have been custodians of their lands and waters for thousands of generations. It is important to remember that Queensland's protected areas are a cultural landscape and we must, therefore, work in partnership with traditional owners in our conservation efforts. Conservation agreements for special wildlife reserves will contain terms that will ensure that no obligations or restrictions are placed on native title parties which would interfere with the exercise or enjoyment of native title rights. Furthermore, a conservation agreement does not grant additional rights to a landholder. Section 69 of the Nature Conservation Act 1992 preserves native title interests during the declaration or dedication of a protected area, other than to the extent that the native title interest holder is bound by a conservation agreement in relation to the area.

The intent of a conservation agreement for a special wildlife reserve is to bind, and thereby restrict the rights and interests of, the holder of a freehold estate, Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander land, a leasehold estate or a licence under the Land Act 1994. If the interests of a native title holder were to be materially affected by a conservation agreement, their specific, written consent would be required. Consent of a native title interest holder could typically take the form of an Indigenous land use agreement.

Following submissions from traditional owner groups and strong advocacy from the member for Cook, I will propose an amendment during consideration in detail to address the relationship between the establishment of a special wildlife reserve and an Indigenous land use agreement in the Cape York Peninsula region. This amendment requires that the minister may only enter into a conservation agreement for a special wildlife reserve in the Cape York Peninsula region if an Indigenous land use agreement allowing for the reserve exists. This provision will apply to areas where native title has not been extinguished. I would like to thank the member for Cook for being a champion for these amendments on behalf of her community and for working with stakeholders on the cape toward amendments that I believe strengthen this bill and recognise the inherent connection traditional owners have to country.

Native title parties will always be notified and consulted on any special wildlife reserve proposal. Assessments undertaken for any proposal must include a cultural heritage values survey undertaken in accordance with best practice guidelines, including involvement of the traditional owners with rights and/or interests in that area. This will typically involve Aboriginal people and Torres Strait Islander people being employed on a fee-for-service basis to undertake, or assist in the undertaking of, the assessment.

The third recommendation of the committee was that I consider reasonable amendments to improve public accountability with respect to management programs for special wildlife reserves. In addressing this recommendation, I have considered the submissions and evidence put forward to the committee in respect of the broad framework for management programs and propose to make amendments during consideration in detail that not only improve public accountability, but also more clearly link management programs to the conservation agreement for each reserve. The proposed amendments to the bill will ensure that reference to a management program must be included in all conservation agreements for special wildlife reserves. While it has always been the intention to do so, this amendment will ensure that this intention is clear and unambiguous.

The existence of a conservation agreement on a land title will be readily visible to the public through a title search. As a conservation agreement cannot be made without an existing, approved management program, it can be readily determined that a management program exists in relation to a particular title as well. The public viewing of conservation agreements is a matter detailed in regulation. To give effect to the committee recommendation, I commit to including a provision in the proposed regulatory amendments that will follow this bill that will require conservation agreements and management programs are made available to the public on request. This will be achieved in a similar manner to current provisions providing for public access to nature refuge conservation agreements in the Nature Conservation (Protected Areas) Regulation 1994.

I would like to take this opportunity to clarify information provided to the committee in relation to buffer zones associated with special wildlife reserves. The committee's report refers to a 100-metre buffer between the reserve and the next property in relation to restrictions on commercial grazing. There may have been some misinterpretation of the advice provided by the Department of Environment and Science during its briefing to the committee. To clarify, there will be no buffer for commercial grazing or any other agricultural activity associated with a special wildlife reserve, nor has this been proposed at any stage during the development of this bill. The only buffer that is proposed for special wildlife reserves will come through an associated regulatory amendment to include this new class of protected area in the definition of a category A environmentally sensitive area under the Environmental Protection Regulation 2008. This will deliver the intent of national park level protection for special wildlife reserves as it relates to prohibitions on mining activities within and adjacent to declared reserves. The amendment will include special wildlife reserves in the regulatory regime for mining that currently applies to most other classes of protected area.

Additional recommendations were also made by government members of the former Agriculture and Environment Committee for the provision of further information on the bill during the second reading speech. The first of these recommendations relates to the manner by which native title rights and interests are considered and protected in the special wildlife reserve declaration process. Concerns were expressed by the Cape York Land Council Aboriginal Corporation with respect to the potential impacts of the bill on native title rights and interests and the bill's potential violation of section 10 of the Commonwealth Racial Discrimination Act 1975. As I stated earlier, the Queensland government's policy position is not to impact on native title rights and interests. Neither execution of a conservation agreement nor declaration of a private protected area under the Nature Conservation Act can affect native title rights and interests, other than with the express written consent of the interest holder. The Nature Conservation Act already preserves native title interests during the declaration or dedication of a protected area.

I will now address the application of the Racial Discrimination Act to this bill. The government respectfully disagrees with the view that by requiring that the minister only enter into a conservation agreement with the title holder of an area of land the bill violates the Racial Discrimination Act. The distinction made by the provisions of the bill as to the type of interest holder who may enter into a conservation agreement is not one based on race but upon different proprietary interests in land. The provisions distinguish between persons holding an interest in land who fall within the scope of a landholder as defined in the Nature Conservation Act and persons holding other interests in land. In that regard, native title holders are given the same rights as holders of other non-native title interests, namely the right to give or to withhold their consent if the conservation agreement materially affects their interest. The intent of a conservation agreement for a special wildlife reserve is to bind, and thereby restrict the rights and interests of, the holder of a freehold estate, Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander land, a leasehold estate or a trustee of reserve land under the Land Act. It is not intended for a conservation agreement to bind all interest holders in the land or, specifically, to restrict the native title rights and interests of native title parties. The appropriate mechanism to restrict or extinguish these rights is an Indigenous land use agreement.

The government members of the former Agriculture and Environment Committee also recommended that further information is provided on what compliance and enforcement mechanisms will be implemented to ensure the ongoing protection of special wildlife reserves. A range of statutory and non-statutory options will be available to the state in order to manage compliance issues on special wildlife reserves. A typical compliance program involves an escalating series of actions that can be employed to support, encourage and, if necessary, enforce compliance.

Primarily, compliance will be achieved through the development of a tailored conservation agreement and management program for each reserve, which will clearly spell out the agreed obligations of both parties and the scope of activities that are authorised to be undertaken on the reserve. A statutory five-year review period for the management program will ensure that this document continues to be relevant to current management issues on the reserve. A close association between the landholder and departmental staff will also be instrumental in supporting compliance. In the event of more serious compliance issues that cannot be otherwise resolved, including in the event of third-party breaches of the Nature Conservation Act, a range of compliance tools will be available to departmental staff. The Nature Conservation Act contains an indictable offence for the unauthorised take, use, keeping or interference with the cultural or natural resources of a protected area. This offence has a maximum penalty of 3,000 penalty units, or two years imprisonment. This is a significant deterrent.

A range of regulatory provisions are proposed to provide for penalties for lesser offences. The proposed amendment regulation will 'activate' a range of existing restrictions and offences that apply to state owned protected areas, for application to special wildlife reserves. These will include restrictions and offences for things such as unlawful grazing, unauthorised structures and the bringing of such things as weapons, traps, plants and animals, including dogs, into the reserve. A range of other obligations and offences currently exist in relation to the land under other legislation. Of particular note, and relevance to submissions made to the committee, is that landholders of special wildlife reserves will be subject, as are all landholders, to the requirements of the Biosecurity Act 2004 in the way that pest plants and animals are to be controlled on the property. In addition to these requirements, landholders of special wildlife reserves will typically have obligations for pest management detailed under the conservation agreement for the reserve and motivation to manage pests to fulfil the conservation outcomes for the land. It would be reasonable to assume that the management of pest plants and animals will be more comprehensive on special wildlife reserves than is typical elsewhere.

This bill amends the Environmental Offsets Act 2014 to clarify the agencies responsible for deciding how an environmental offset will be delivered and enforced. Due to a technicality in the current wording of the Environmental Offsets Act, it could be interpreted that only the director-general of the Department of State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning can currently decide offset proposals for matters of state environmental significance under the Planning Act 2016. In particular, it will put beyond doubt the intent of the act to cover all persons authorised to impose and/or enforce an offset condition under the Planning Act. This will reduce state government assessment costs because the decision can be delegated to the relevant technical agency with the expertise to decide an offsets proposal. Additionally, it will also potentially reduce decision-making timeframes for proponents.

Regarding the head of power to prescribe environmentally relevant activities beyond the territorial limits of the state, I also propose two amendments for consideration in detail. Together, these amendments ensure comprehensive coverage of different activities that may impact the Great Barrier


Reef and our precious marine environment now and into the future. First, the amendments will clarify that an activity may also be regulated where it is carried out only partly within the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park. An activity will be able to be regulated if it occurs partly in Queensland waters outside the Great Barrier Reef and partly outside Queensland within the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park.

Second, the amendments will adjust the application of the current provision of the bill which allows for an activity to be regulated if it will or may have an adverse effect on the marine environment. This amendment will clarify that the power to prescribe activities on the basis of adverse impact on the marine environment applies to activities conducted across Queensland and Commonwealth waters as well as those conducted wholly within Queensland. The power is not restricted by the territorial context in which the activity is carried out.

In closing, this bill and the amendments I will move during consideration in detail will deliver improved outcomes for the protection of Queensland's unique biodiversity and, further, will do so by acknowledging and encouraging increased private investment in this important endeavour. For the first time, this bill will recognise that areas of exceptional natural and cultural value, with appropriate management regimes in place, are worthy of protection irrespective of the ownership of the land. By providing security in the natural capital of these areas for the owner, pathways to significant investment are opened up in Queensland. Pathways like this do not exist in any other Australian jurisdictions. Additionally, the bill expands the circumstances under which environmentally relevant activities can be prescribed by regulation.

Within the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park these measures will provide greatly enhanced protections for sensitive ecosystems by allowing for the management of activities that may pose an environmental risk across Queensland and Commonwealth waters within the region. One of those activities is transshipping. The bill will assist the Queensland government to give full effect to its newly announced transshipping policy, which recognises the multiple pressures our Great Barrier Reef is facing by prohibiting transshipping operations within the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park. Whatever the activity, the bill will facilitate strict regulation to minimise harm to our reef and marine environment.

This bill fulfils the Queensland government's election commitment to create a new class of protected area, a special wildlife reserve. This will further strengthen Queensland's protected area network by providing national park level protections for private land with significant ecological value. As a Labor government, we are committed to the protection of Queensland's unique biodiversity and this bill is further proof of that commitment. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr CRISAFULLI** (Broadwater—LNP) (11.37 am): The LNP will be opposing the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018 and we will be opposing it for myriad reasons. The deputy chair will outline some of those that were discussed during the committee process. I will outline the three reasons why I feel the bill will not achieve what it sets out to achieve, why it should be opposed and why it should be done in a far more sensible manner.

The first reason is that the bill gives the minister of the day too much power to make a decision with too much latitude on too important an issue. When we put forward legislation in this House, we must be mindful of future governments as well as current governments and we must be mindful of future landholders as well as current landholders. As the bill is set out at the moment, it gives a minister so much power for a variety of reasons to declare a special wildlife reserve. That is scary. I will explain why in a moment.

The second reason is the lack of clarity about the management of these reserves, and the minister has outlined some of the ways that she believes this can occur. The minister spoke about compliance and listed three issues—support, encourage and enforce. Might I suggest to those who have seen the standard of many of our national parks at the moment that there is not a lot of supporting and I am not sure there is a lot of encouraging, but I can assure you that there is not very much enforcing. To say that we are going to use parameters that are so high level and so broad and somehow we are going to get a good environmental outcome I think is being optimistic at best.

The third reason I believe the bill should be opposed is what it does to future owners of a property. I do not believe enough has been outlined as to the reasons for curtailing the future rights of owners of land and the changing circumstances on that land. Many of the stakeholders outlined their concerns. I will get to some of the contributions of stakeholders in a moment.

Firstly, I want to dig down into why I am particularly concerned about the unfettered power being given to the minister. This is referred to in the Queensland Law Society's submission. I will give members a hypothetical example of what is possible to be achieved if a minister has that level of power. Land that could be key for resources or agriculture could be put into one of these reserves by a minister

who has the wrong intention and community groups who seek to use this as a stalking horse to attack industries they do not like. That is possible. At the moment we are seeing everything from a multitude of groups that do not happen to be based in this state or even this nation. We are now being told about the flatulence of bovines being a great concern for the future.

It could be that a concerted campaign is waged to reduce the opportunity for people to conduct agriculture in this state and with a complicit minister this could occur. The parameters for declaring a special wildlife reserve are so broad that strategic agricultural land could be taken out of production—

An opposition member: Forever.

Mr CRISAFULLI: Forever. I will take that interjection. A poorly intentioned minister along with a cunning third-party group could remove strategic land forever. That is how broad the power we are giving the minister is.

Ms Enoch interjected.

Mr CRISAFULLI: Minister, I know you are interjecting. I hope you have noticed that in the last five minutes not once have I suggested that that is your intention.

Ms Enoch interjected.

Mr CRISAFULLI: Right, so let us clear that up.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Direct your comments through the chair, please, member.

Mr CRISAFULLI: The powers are so broad that a poorly intentioned minister could use this provision in that manner, and that scares me a lot.

I will turn to some of the feedback from stakeholders. After that I will get on to the amendments and where we are with those now and the consultation that has happened. I will start with the Queensland Law Society. They described this as 'not good law'. I quote from their submission—

The amended drafting actually expands the matters to be considered when preparing a proposal to declare, effectively allowing the determination to be made based upon either or both of:

- the '*economical, environmental or community interests*' (as determined by the minister) under the definition of 'State interest';
- the second branch of the proposed section which may be applied so as to encompass land areas that do not fit easily into the definition of 'State interest'.

It is frightening how broad it truly is.

The Queensland Resources Council—more on them shortly—raised major concerns about special wildlife reserves being declared over land where there is active exploration underway. They recommended a clarification. I will talk about that amendment shortly.

The fact that we have left 'materially affected' to be as ambiguous as possible in my mind takes away the right of dispute in the courts. The Property Council highlighted the inadequacy in terms of how the minister is to notify parties. That notification is via an advertisement in a newspaper. The government manages to be able to find people when they wish to send them a bill. I would imagine the same channel of communication that exists for landholders in that situation should surely advise them that their property is about to be affected. To say that an advertisement in a newspaper suffices is absolutely ridiculous.

The minister was flagging some of the amendments to be moved. We heard a little about first nations people. I will quote from Balkanu's evidence to the committee in the last parliament because they are powerful words. They are quoted in the report as stating—

... there is the potential to misuse strategic wildlife reserves to lock up country from economic development ... generally our position overall is that for traditional owners in Cape York meaningful employment and economic opportunities are critical. We have always been about looking at conservation—

thousands of years, in fact—

while also ensuring that we protect economic opportunities for traditional owners in the Cape. It is the most impoverished area of Queensland, and a job in the Cape is probably very hard to come by compared to jobs down here. Our experience has been that the conservation sector does not provide much in the way of meaningful employment opportunities. It is important, but the grazing sector and other options are also very important.

I want to turn briefly to the amendments. I thank the minister for raising them at this point. What level of consultation has been undertaken with groups like the Resources Council that are impacted by these amendments? What consultation has occurred, particularly since the amendments have been

tabled? I want to know: what has happened? Here are some questions for the minister. Can the minister guarantee that there will be no impact on investment and employment decisions by the companies affected by this amendment? Can the minister guarantee that this amendment will have no impact on the \$5.2 billion in resource sector royalties that the Treasurer announced in the midyear budget update before Christmas? Can the minister guarantee that there will be no impact on investment and employment decisions by the companies affected by this amendment? When did the minister know about these amendments being included in the bill? Does the minister know which companies are affected by this amendment?

I am going to briefly talk about this bill which is so broad, so rushed and does not have a detailed focus on making sure that if we are going to create special wildlife reserves that they are special and are something that we can be proud of and do not reflect what so many of our national parks look like at the moment where the only ones who truly get to enjoy them are feral animals and weeds. That is not good for the environment. If we are going to create areas like this they have to have an environmentally significant outcome. I do not think there is enough focus on the current owners doing that. I certainly do not think there is enough focus on the capacity of a future owner of one of these to do that. This is forever. Once this gets declared there is no turning back.

I hark back to where I started. With the wrong intention, hectares of land that may have a greater importance to the state than being declared a special wildlife reserve could be locked up forever, and that could have negative impacts particularly for many of those Indigenous communities that are looking for opportunities for jobs—real jobs—for their children.

Without attention to detail, we will see what we have seen with other well-meaning but poorly executed environmental initiatives undertaken by this government. I come to one in particular that this side of the House campaigned for, believes in, pushed for and gave every bit of latitude that was needed. When an extension of time was required, we were not petulant. Not once did we come out and say, 'They're incapable of doing it on time.' We let that happen because we wanted it to roll out properly. What did we get? We got a container deposit scheme that has been rolled out without any thought at all and the results are—

Ms Enoch: The results are success.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I take the interjection from the environment minister.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Member, I am failing to see the relevance of this part of your contribution. I bring you back to the long title of the bill.

Mr CRISAFULLI: Mr Deputy Speaker, it is extremely relevant. If you are going to be big on environmental virtue signalling, you have to be big on environmental outcomes.

Mr Dick: What about environmental protection?

Mr CRISAFULLI: My great concern, aside from the welfare of the Minister for State Development, who is howling across the chamber, as is the norm, is that if we do not have the attention—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause the clock. I will take some advice. Member for Broadwater, I am concerned about relevance. I will be monitoring this. I will give you a bit of latitude to bring it back to the long title of the bill.

Mr CRISAFULLI: It is relevant because good intention without good implementation is worthless. My concern is that, if you combine the breadth of the power afforded to the minister, if you combine the lack of management oversight of these reserves and if you combine the fact that future owners of land, even with changing circumstances, can be bound by the view of one minister at one point in time that then lasts an eternity, that is not going to deliver the environmental outcome that the government is looking for. I believe that it is relevant because every time I stand up in this place and talk about an environmental initiative that this government is trying to implement I point to the lack of attention to detail, and each and every time there is a mess that needs to be fixed up—and so it was with the implementation of the waste tax. It was the same scenario. Because of a lack of discipline, because of a lack of focus—


Ms Enoch interjected.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I take that interjection. I am not quite sure where it came from but it was something about climate change. I have stood in this House and made my views very clear about that, Minister. I will not be verbed on nonsense.

What I am seeking to outline is how poorly thought out this process is. The reason it is poorly thought out is that if you are prepared to put such a great focus on giving ministerial power but are not prepared to put such a great focus on how you are going to get these reserves to be special then it is doomed to failure. The only thing that concerns me more about that is the fact that future generations will be doomed to repeat this because of the binding long-term nature of it.

In closing, I wish to ask the questions yet again of the minister about these amendments and what consultation has been undertaken. I highlight again the poor implementation record of all things environment by this government, whether it be the container deposit scheme, the waste tax, its inability to come up with an effective koala management policy—all of these things. I point to those opposite being all about virtue signalling and nothing about delivery.

I conclude by saying that too much unfettered power rests in the hands of the management, not enough management oversight is there to ensure that these wildlife reserves can be the sorts of areas that we can be proud of and there is the binding nature on future owners. These are the reasons why the LNP will be opposing this bill.

 **Mr PEGG** (Stretton—ALP) (11.55 am): Speaking of future generations, I want to acknowledge the presence in the gallery, from Stretton State College Illaweenaa campus, principal Meryl Johnson and school captains Sophie Burraston, Aaron Paul Guevarra, Danny Wang and Tatum Gold. It is prescient that the school captains from Stretton State College are here in the gallery today to hear the debate on this bill, because this bill is all about protecting our environment and protecting our future, and these young people, the school captains from Stretton State College, are the future. It is important that all of us in this House take that on board when we consider bills such as this.

It is always interesting to follow a contribution from the member for Broadwater. It has happened to me a few times now. I have been critical of the member for Broadwater's approach in the past, but I will give him some credit in this debate. Only the loquacious member for Broadwater could possibly combine issues about power, horses and flatulence in the one contribution. I will give the member for Broadwater some credit. I do not think there are many people who would be interesting enough to make a contribution such as that. I am only going to address one of those issues that the member for Broadwater raised in his contribution because I think the other two issues are so out there that they probably do not need debate in this chamber.

Mr Crisafulli: What were they?

Mr PEGG: The member for Broadwater—

Mr Crisafulli: What were they?

Mr PEGG: I take all of the member for Broadwater's interjections. The member for Broadwater was talking about giving the minister too much power. I think the member for Broadwater is forgetting that we have a responsible government and a very responsible minister. I know the member for Broadwater had a holiday from this place and he represented another seat—

Ms BATES: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. The member has not even addressed the long title of the bill. I ask you to bring him back to the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): I will take some advice. There is no point of order. He is referring to the debate in his speech.

Mr PEGG: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. As I said, I am not going to address stalking horses and flatulence in responding to the member for Broadwater, but I am going to address his point about too much power. The member for Broadwater has bitter experience of ministers behaving irresponsibly and premiers with too much power from his time in the Newman government. I can understand that the member for Broadwater is clearly traumatised by that experience. The member for Broadwater can be assured that we have a very responsible government and a very responsible minister, so the member for Broadwater should not worry. The simple fact is that there is a whole range of safeguards and procedures in this place for this bill that would mean that the minister would behave responsibly, as she always does—and I want to put that on the record.

I want to thank my fellow committee members—the members for Scenic Rim, Noosa, Cook and Jordan—for all their work on this bill which was report No. 2 of our committee. I also want to place on the record our thanks to the former Agriculture and Environment Committee of the 55th Parliament which considered and reported on the 2017 version of the bill. Their public consultation process and scrutiny of the provisions of the 2017 bill helped to inform the committee in our deliberations.

As has been stated, we made three recommendations. Firstly, the committee recommended that the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018 be passed. Recommendation 2 is that the committee recommends that the minister work with traditional owners to ensure their concerns in relation to native title are addressed. Recommendation 3 is that the committee recommends that the minister look at reasonable amendments that would improve public accountability with respect to management programs for special wildlife reserves. The member for Broadwater is worried about the minister having too much power. The minister clearly listens, and I thank the minister for the amendments and taking on board the committee's recommendations.

We had a detailed process. We considered the evidence provided, which was 34 submissions, a departmental briefing and public hearings. We received 28 submissions, we had a public briefing from the Department of Environment and Science and we also had a public hearing on 19 March. There was clear and adequate consultation in relation to this bill. A key objective of the amendments to the Nature Conservation Act is to establish a new class of privately owned or managed protected area. I note the words 'privately owned'. I find it extraordinary that the so-called party of private enterprise and private property is opposing this bill, because at its heart this bill allows owners of private property—their own private property—to establish reserves to protect their environment. We had this lot jump up and down on the vegetation management bill. They thumped their desks. They banged the tables and chairs. They talked about private property rights, yet here we are today less than one year on and now they have completely changed their tune. The member for Broadwater has managed to get those opposite to abandon their commitment to private property rights and vote against the rights of Queenslanders to use their private property to protect the environment as they see fit. I have to hand it to you, member for Broadwater. That is an extraordinary achievement. Maybe you are exercising too much power in the shadow cabinet room. If there are any power issues, they are clearly in relation to the member for Broadwater and those opposite.

A core objective of this bill is to establish a new class of voluntary, privately managed protected area called a special wildlife reserve that will provide a similar level of statutory protection to that afforded to state managed natural parks and the new class of protected area will apply to both freehold and leasehold tenures. There is nothing controversial in that at all, and I note that the minister is nodding her head in agreement in relation to that. The member for Broadwater could not come up with any solid arguments against it. We had some wild conspiracy theories, though, from the member for Broadwater. I would hate for this debate to be later in the evening because I am sure the conspiracies from the member for Broadwater would get wilder and wilder as the night went on. I am very happy to see that this debate is taking place at an early hour because I shudder to think what he would have come up with had the hour been later than what it is right now.

The conservation agreement and management program will detail manage outcomes and actions to ensure enduring protection of each special wildlife reserve's conservation values in order to achieve the management principles. There is a clear process for declaring these special wildlife reserves. This bill should not be considered controversial as negotiation and declaration of a reserve is entirely voluntary and a conservation agreement does not impact on the rights or interests of other relevant parties, including native title holders, without consent. The concept of a special wildlife reserve has support from the key stakeholders in the conservation land management sector, and this mechanism will be applied by the government on a case-by-case basis with consideration of all interests relevant to the proposed area.


In conclusion, those opposite, particularly the member for Broadwater, seem to forget what they say in this place. I always like to remind them. Time is against me, but in relation to the issue of private property rights I ask all those opposite who are going to make a contribution to reflect on their contribution to the Vegetation Management and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. On 1 May last year the member for Broadwater said this in relation to private property rights which he now opposes. He said—

... I understand that agriculture and property rights in agricultural communities are probably not at the forefront of the minds of those three members. They should be for other members, particularly the member representing our most northern area, the member for Cook.

He had a go at the member for Cook for not standing up for private property rights and then he walks into this place today and opposes a sensible bill that enables people on their private land to protect the environment, to look after the environment for our future generations, to think about the young people in our community and to take a stand for protecting the environment—our beautiful natural environment here in Queensland. I do not see anything controversial about that. I do not see that as

exceeding the minister's powers in any way whatsoever. I urge all members here to reject the wild conspiracies of the member for Broadwater and his band of merry followers who we are going to hear from shortly and support this bill.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Pugh): Order! Before I call the member for Scenic Rim, I remind all members to please direct their comments through the chair.

 **Mr KRAUSE** (Scenic Rim—LNP) (12.06 pm): As members have heard, the LNP will be opposing this bill. It is not good law, and that was quite clear from the submission of the Queensland Law Society. As the member for Broadwater has set out, we have serious concerns about the unfettered discretion to be given to the minister regarding the declaration of special wildlife reserves where only one criterion out of two—one being economic, environmental or community interests; the other being the state interest—needs to be considered adequate for the declaration of such a reserve.

To say that that gives a wide range of power to the government and the minister of the day to declare a special wildlife reserve is an understatement. Economic, environmental or community interest can mean anything—anything that the minister of the day wants it to mean or anything they have been lobbied on by whomever is in their ear at a particular point in time. If we are talking about setting up a rigorous system for special wildlife reserves or the preservation of natural environments, this is not it because it is so open to abuse and the politics of abuse under that definition that alarm needs to be sounded.

We also have concerns about the removal of agriculture land from use forever. I note that the minister has made comments in her second reading speech that there is not going to be a 100-metre limit on commercial grazing for adjoining property holders—that is, adjoining property holders next to these special wildlife reserves. I want to ask the minister when summing up if she could point out to the parliament what changes will be made to the act or to any regulations that are made under the act to guarantee that this will not be the case, because the committee received submissions from the department about this 100-metre buffer zone which was given to us both in a public briefing and also in correspondence from the department to the former committee in 2017 saying that there would be a 100-metre buffer zone between the reserve and the next property. What has changed? Is there something being removed from the act or the regulations? I cannot take it at face value that that is going to be the case when we heard in such concrete terms from the department previously that that limit would be put in place. If the minister could please point that out, that would be very much appreciated.

The removal of agricultural land from use forever is just another way for Labor and the Greens to rob future generations of opportunity. The change in use of privately held land should not require a resolution of this House, and that is what this bill does. It can be declared by the minister using the community considerations, broad as they are—it could be anything—but you have to come to the House and get a resolution of the House to get it back to another use and revoke that special wildlife reserve. This is not good law, as the Queensland Law Society said. It is an illogical, ill-thought-out collision between the private and the public sphere when it comes to land management. That is why the Queensland Law Society says it is bad law.

I want to mention the definition of 'materially affected', which was the subject of some consideration by the committee in its deliberation on the bill. As the member for Broadwater said, the only way that people might be notified of these things is through a newspaper advertisement. That is bizarre. They should at the very least be notified in writing through Australia Post or some other means that we come up with.

It is very unclear from the committee's deliberation whether neighbours of a special wildlife reserve would actually be deemed to be a materially impacted party. It needs to be spelt out in the legislation or the regulations whether neighbours will actually be deemed to be materially impacted. If you are in the agricultural sector and you have a special wildlife reserve next to your property, that could obviously have a material impact on your operations. We only have to look at the way national parks have been managed in some parts of Queensland and the impact they have on farmers and graziers next door, and we must remember that special wildlife reserves will have similar characteristics to national parks. Graziers and neighbours of these special wildlife reserves should be enshrined in the legislation or the regulations as materially affected parties.

The minister also said that the Biosecurity Act will apply to special wildlife reserves when it comes to the management of pests, feral animals and the like. I am sure similar provisions apply under the Nature Conservation Act to the management of national parks, yet that does not actually have a great

deal of practical impact on the ground as to whether the state properly manages their land when it comes to dealing with feral pests and weeds. The state is meant to be responsible for it when it comes to national parks, but that does not always work. Saying that the Biosecurity Act applies to these special wildlife reserves simply does not cut it and it will not satisfy the concerns of landholders.

There is a fire risk as well when it comes to these special wildlife reserves. What if special wildlife reserve holders do not properly manage the fire risk on those properties? Who is going to hold them to account for the damage that may occur to neighbouring properties if there is a fire? These are concerns that neighbouring properties will have up and down Queensland if special wildlife reserves are put in place next to them.

I also want to touch on the issue of transfer of freehold land. This goes to what the member for Stretton was trying to expand on when he was speaking about private property rights. He said that we should not have a problem with this because it is a private landholder doing what they want with their land. That may be the case, but in the committee process we also found out that, when it comes to freehold land where special wildlife reserves are laid out upon them, there will actually be no care taken by the government to ensure that successors in title have the ability and the resources to manage them in line with the conditions for that special wildlife reserve. If a person who has bought a parcel of land and has turned it into a wildlife reserve then passes away and passes that land on to their successors in title who have absolutely no interest in managing it as a special wildlife reserve, the state says that they do not care. That came out in the committee process, where it was said—

Transfer of a freehold lot has not been captured in this provision—

which deals with conditions for leasehold land or something like that—

as to do so would be an unusually restrictive provision in relation to freehold land dealings.

I repeat: an unusually restrictive provision. What a crock. This entire bill imposes unusually restrictive provisions on private property. To use that as an excuse to not condition any future holders of title to deal with special wildlife reserves as they are required to is a crock. It is a cop-out. It just lays bare the malevolent intent of this bill to actually lock up parcels of land from productive use forever, whether there is a significant environmental benefit to it or not. The state is not interested in what happens in the future; it is only interested in locking it up in the present.


In closing, I want to touch on a newspaper article that was referenced on page 6 of the transcript of our committee hearing. The article was published in the *Australian* with the heading 'Wildlife reserves destroy local jobs' and it attributes some remarks to the Indigenous leader Gerhardt Pearson, who said—

In a way, it is reinventing and reinvigorating the old mission system in removing indigenous people from their country.

...

The rich philanthropists from Europe and the United States can buy up this land and turn it into national park, and our people will miss out on any economic opportunities from that country.

(Time expired)

 **Mrs MULLEN** (Jordan—ALP) (12.16 pm): In Queensland we are fortunate to have an incredibly expansive and rich biodiversity, and not all areas of outstanding conservation value can be found in our national parks. In fact, lands of outstanding conservation value are frequently privately owned or managed land. The Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018 seeks to ensure that we can comprehensively and securely protect these areas of outstanding conservation value from a range of incompatible uses. Importantly, this is not imposed protection but rather a voluntary scheme that recognises that government alone cannot adequately protect the rich environmental values of our state. This is a shared obligation for those willing to participate. We also recognise that appropriate protection of outstanding natural areas on private land provides certainty and a significant incentive for private investment in Queensland's protected areas.

During its examination of the legislation, the Innovation, Tourism Development and Environment Committee received a number of submissions which supported the intent of the legislation. The National Parks Association of Queensland regards the bill as—

... a leading piece of legislation and a genuine effort to counter the challenges involved in growing and managing the protected area estate in Queensland.

The Queensland Trust for Nature strongly supported the proposal for a new class of privately owned and managed protected areas offered under this legislation. Our friends the Local Government Association of Queensland support the establishment of special wildlife reserves as another protective area mechanism, recognising that there may be situations where local government would benefit from the declaration of a special wildlife reserve to offer greater levels of protection.

A submission provided by Bush Heritage Australia outlines that Queensland's protected area network has grown to almost eight per cent of the state and covers both public and private lands, including national parks and nature refuges. We recognise that privately protected areas make an important contribution to Queensland's protected areas. The United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity sets a target of 17 per cent terrestrial protected area coverage, and it is acknowledged that governments across Australia are grappling with how to achieve this in the context of increased funding constraints and competing priorities. Protected areas initiated by private landholders have and will become an increasingly important strategy in protecting conservation assets for future generations. Bush Heritage Australia acknowledges—

The creation of a Special Wildlife Reserve is an extremely cost effective and efficient strategy to contribute to Queensland Government meeting its conservation obligations.

The bill provides that, prior to the preparation of a proposal for the declaration of a special wildlife reserve, the minister must consider and take into account the 'state interest' in the area of land and consider the area's exceptional natural and cultural resources and values. The term 'state interest' is defined in the legislation to mean an interest the minister considers to be an economic, environmental or community interest of the state. There were some submissions to the parliamentary inquiry that expressed concern that 'state interest' was too broad in definition. Others believed that conservation value should be prioritised over other state interests when considering a special wildlife reserve.

I believe the bill has the definition just right. The fact it is deliberately broad will ensure that all relevant interests are taken into account and the impact of a potential declaration has regard to the broad range of values in the land being considered. Despite the member for Broadwater's conspiracy theories, state interest is not unique to this legislation. There are state interest considerations in planning legislation and in local government legislation, so it is an absolute furphy to believe that this is an all-consuming power to be used by some evil minister.

The bill will establish management principles for special wildlife reserves and provide a framework to guide the management of special wildlife reserves. The legislation will require a legally binding perpetual conservation agreement and an associated management plan to be negotiated for each special wildlife reserve. This recognises that each special wildlife reserve is unique and that there cannot be a one-size-fits-all approach to this mechanism.


A number of stakeholders raised concern about the lack of public access to agreements entered into in relation to special wildlife reserves. Wildlife Queensland in its submission to the parliamentary committee noted that there needs to be a capacity for the public to (a) know what actions have been undertaken and (b) know that over time the commitments entered into via the management program and conservation agreements are being honoured and maintained. The parliamentary committee scrutinised this particular element of the legislation. The department provided a response that indicated the bill does provide for the public availability of conservation agreements for special wildlife reserves and their existence will be readily apparent from a search of the land title. They also indicated conservation agreements will be made available on request and the bill provides for conservation officers to access these reserves to monitor and inspect for compliance. Whilst landholders may be willing to have their management documents available for public scrutiny, I am pleased to see the minister has proposed amendments to improve transparency.

The parliamentary committee recognised that whilst the decision to seek a declaration for a special wildlife reserve was a voluntary one, the signing of a conservation agreement and implementation of a management program is, in fact, an obligation. It is important to reiterate the point that the negotiation and declaration of a reserve is entirely voluntary. This has not been foisted on private landholders and the full range of state interests will be considered in making a decision on individual special wildlife reserves. A binding mechanism is then in place to provide a high level of protection to privately managed lands of outstanding conservation value. This is particularly important if we as a state wish to encourage further private investment in Queensland's protected area estate.

Through these arrangements, landholders will have certainty and the knowledge that their investment in these lands is protected from incompatible land uses—protections that are currently not available in Queensland or elsewhere in Australia. We have an obligation to do all that we can to protect

the exceptional conservation values of the state. As a government we acknowledge that we cannot do this alone. Whilst the acquisition and ongoing management of state owned private areas like national parks will continue to be an important part of the state's ongoing conservation plan, privately protected areas will play an increasing role. The Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018 supports this intent. I commend the bill to the House.


Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Pugh): Before I call the member for Noosa, I acknowledge that we have visiting us in the gallery this afternoon students from the Aboriginal and Islander Independent School in the electorate of Algester, represented here today by Minister Enoch.

 **Ms BOLTON** (Noosa—Ind) (12.23 pm): I rise in support of the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. In establishing a framework for privately held land to be set aside for conservation purposes, the bill provides an avenue to increase the total amount of environmentally protected land across the state. The framework established under this bill is not dissimilar to successful approaches to private conservation in other states. Many of the concerns voiced regarding availability of land for commercial, farming and resource extraction outlined have not occurred in New South Wales and other jurisdictions with private land conservation protections that run with the land. The reality is there is a need for land conservation in Queensland. This bill is simply an innovative means of affecting this conservation and it will not shut down the entire state to business, as some fear.

While conservation of private land is highly desirable and contributes to the total area of protected land in Queensland, it should not be the primary means of land conservation in this state. This bill, however, does not provide an avenue for government to rely solely or primarily on the generosity of private citizens to ensure an appropriate amount of our land is set aside for nature conservation. The government is in a unique position to preserve large, cohesive parcels of land by virtue of its position as holder of radical title over land in the state and significant Crown land holdings. It can and should make use of this unique position to ensure that vulnerable ecosystems are preserved and protected for future generations.

I say thank you to my fellow members of the Innovation, Tourism Development and Environment Committee for the respectful debate surrounding aspects of this bill, including those in my statement of reservation, which covered the issue of appropriate buffers to mitigate future disputes that may occur between properties of incompatible uses. To address this, I ask that when parcels of land are being considered for conservation status, buffers are incorporated as part of effective management plans as well as concerns from submitters regarding appropriate management of these conservation parcels with the appropriate allocation of resources to do so.

In closing, I make special mention of the department and agencies involved as well as submitters for their assistance and valued input. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Ms LUI** (Cook—ALP) (12.26 pm): I rise to support the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. In doing so, I would like to address any concerns that traditional owners may have. The core objective of the bill is to establish a new class of voluntary privately managed protected area that will provide national park level protections for private land containing significant ecological or cultural value. The government recognises the significant contribution of private landholders in the protection of Queensland's expansive and rich biodiversity, and this bill will allow for the protection of those values in perpetuity.

During the committee's consideration of the bill concerns were raised by Cape York Land Council that special wildlife reserves may impact on native title rights, Indigenous land use agreements and economic opportunities for Aboriginal people in Cape York. I would like to make it clear that the declaration or subsequent management of a special wildlife reserve cannot impact on native title rights and interests unless consent is provided.

The existing Nature Conservation Act 1992 preserves native title interests during the declaration or dedication of a protected area other than to the extent that the native title interest holder is bound by a conservation agreement in relation to the area. Further, conservation agreements for special wildlife reserves will contain terms that will ensure that no obligations or restrictions are placed on native title parties which would interfere with the exercise or enjoyment of their native title rights. Native title parties will always be notified and consulted on any special wildlife reserve proposal.

In order to address the specific concerns of the Cape York Land Council regarding Indigenous land use agreements, as the minister stated earlier, amendments will be proposed during consideration in detail to address the relationship between the establishment of a special wildlife reserve and Indigenous land use agreements in the Cape York Peninsula region. This amendment requires that,


where native title has not been extinguished in the Cape York Peninsula region, the minister will only enter into a conservation agreement for a special wildlife reserve if an Indigenous land use agreement allowing for the reserve exists. This will ensure clarity in the relationship between the arrangements and management requirements of the special wildlife reserve and the Indigenous land use agreement.

There are organisations and individuals out there in our community that invest significant amounts of time, money and energy into conservation works for the benefit of our environment for all Queenslanders. In my electorate alone there are 51 nature refuges covering an area of over 1.6 million hectares partnering with the Queensland government to provide conservation outcomes. For example, there is the Olkola Aboriginal Corporation which is protecting significant conservation values, including mound springs, threatened species and plant communities, of over 48,000 hectares of Aboriginal freehold land on the Olkola Nature Refuge.

Another example that many of you may be aware of is the Steve Irwin Wildlife Reserve Nature Refuge, which protects almost 126,000 hectares of diverse ecosystems, important wetlands, threatened species and even Gondwanic fossil sites in Cape York. Commitments of this nature are not just made by organisations. One of the earliest individual commitments to nature refuges in Queensland is the Artemis Antbed Nature Refuge which, among other species, protects the endangered golden-shouldered parrot. There are also nature conservancies and philanthropic organisations such as Bush Heritage Australia, the Australian Wildlife Conservancy and South Endeavour Trust that have made significant financial investments in conservation in Queensland.

They wish to invest much, much more into land conservation, land management and ecotourism ventures, but the security of this investment is of significant concern. They do not wish to invest in these properties only to have to compete with incompatible land uses. This bill will ensure that these conservation significant properties will be protected. The bill will ensure that these organisations continue to feel confident in investing in Queensland, and this will flow through to our local regional communities. We expect that, as a result of the increased investment in conservation which is generated, there will be greater opportunities for our local people with jobs in various fields, including land management activities and nature based tourism.

In closing, I would like to acknowledge the minister for all of her hard work and efforts in bringing this bill together. I would also like to acknowledge the committee secretary and assistant secretary as well as my colleagues, the committee chair and committee members. It has been a pleasure to work with everyone across the board to have a positive outcome for the betterment of everyone.

 **Mr PERRETT** (Gympie—LNP) (12.32 pm): I rise to speak on the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. This bill will make significant changes to property rights while establishing a new class of privately owned or managed protected area: special wildlife reserve; change procedural requirements for tightening and record keeping of conservation agreements and protected area declarations; and define who is bound by a conservation agreement entered into by a landholder. It will also streamline the process by which conservation agreements recognise the new class of protected area, clarify administrative arrangements for approving offset proposals and manage risks to the Great Barrier Reef.

This bill impinges on freehold property rights and raises serious property management issues. It confirms that this is an extreme left-wing Labor government which is vying for the title of Australia's most socialist state. It removed freehold property rights under its vegetation management law and it is again encroaching on those rights. If you try to bequeath or sell your property you will need government consent to transfer the title. In effect, the government has ownership or management over your rights. They potentially transfer an unfair management burden and financial impacts onto neighbours.

The government constantly spins that it is getting on with the job, yet we are debating legislation which was introduced more than 12 months ago in February last year. It is also substantially the same bill that lapsed from the last parliament. It is a pretty feeble example of what it means to get on with the job. No wonder this state is in a mess.

Stakeholders have raised significant concerns, especially relating to the creation of special wildlife reserves. Recommendation 3 of the committee report asks the minister to look at reasonable amendments that would improve public accountability of management programs for special wildlife reserves. Most Queenslanders would have thought that public accountability was one of the top performance measures for any government, for any minister and for any department. Taxpayers grant the government the right to use their hard-earned dollars and manage their assets with the reasonable expectation that accountability would be a top priority.

The government claims that the amendments are to clarify the criteria the minister has to consider in declaring these special wildlife reserves. The reality is that the amendments make matters worse. As a grazier I have experienced the detrimental impacts of successive Labor governments pandering to the agenda of environmental activists. I am not alone. Alarm bells should be ringing as a result of the serious concerns that have been raised by many stakeholders. The Queensland Law Society said—

The amended drafting actually expands the matters to be considered when preparing a proposal to declare, effectively allowing the determination to be made based upon either or both of:

- the 'economical, environmental or community interests' (as determined by the Minister) under the definition of 'State interest';
- the second branch of the proposed section which appears may be applied so as to encompass land areas that do not fit easily into the definition of 'State interest'.

The vagueness of what is meant by 'state interest' seems to give the minister unfettered power to make declarations. At the very least it should require meeting both economic, environmental or community interests and state interests.

This bill will effectively remove land from agricultural production and economic development. Landholders' property rights are again under threat of further erosion. The Queensland Farmers' Federation said—

Management of SWRs will have flow on effects to the management of adjacent productive agricultural land. It is therefore essential that restrictive management practices imposed on SWRs do not negatively impact productive agricultural land and the overall management of the farming system.

The management of pests and weeds on crown land have created ongoing issues for landholders that about these government-managed lands. The management practices used can be restrictive and frequently do not manage pests and weeds effectively.

The impact on adjacent agricultural producers is similar to those already experienced by landholders adjacent to parts of Queensland's national park estates. Agricultural producers already struggle with inadequate and poor management of pests, both animals and weeds, on state land. As someone with a property next door to a national park, I have firsthand experience. Let's be very clear: state controlled land can be a haven for uncontrolled feral animals and pests, uncontrolled weeds and it is often a fire hazard.

This government is hiding from any responsibility. It does not want an open and transparent parliamentary inquiry into what fuelled last year's bushfire disasters, despite some regional landholders identifying that they were exacerbated by the fuel loads on state controlled land.

Mr Ryan: What a joke!

Mr PERRETT: It is not a joke, Minister. I will take that interjection. I see it next door to me. As I mentioned earlier, there is no fire management on some of your state controlled land. There is none, Minister. The government does not want to hear from a parliamentary inquiry that looked at the government's record on weed management. It passes the buck to rural landholders while at the same time making it harder for them to be good land managers.

I am continually approached by landowners in Gympie and throughout the state who are seriously concerned about land management practices to control fuel loads, innovative pests and weeds, the management of our national parks and how they can protect their property and livestock. The government's approach is driven by their addiction to Green preferences and pandering to the agenda of green activists, despite the cost to the environment and hardworking Queenslanders.

At considerable expense, and at no cost to the state, these landholders efficiently manage declared and environmental weeds and feral animals. They manage fuel loads, thus preventing catastrophic bushfires which destroy every living animal and plant in their path. They manage declared weeds and animals such as giant rat's-tail grass, groundsel bush, wild dogs, feral pegs, foxes and feral cats and rabbits. They control environmental weeds such as lantana, Noogoora burr, wild tobacco bush and cat's claw creeper.

Graziers have worked side by side with Forestry and on-the-ground QPWS officers—those who wear their khaki shirts and possum badges—to establish best management practices. These officers regularly say they need the help of rural landholders. AgForce confirmed this and said—


We also know that simply locking away land does not always protect it, but rather opens the door to feral animal, pest and weed infestation and serious fire risks. AgForce anecdotally receives feedback from members that this occurs within the current public protected area estate.

The implication is that the management is clearly under-resourced and reliant on the input from neighbouring landholders. It is concerning that the way the management plans of these reserves will be policed is unclear. The government's record does not give confidence. Landholders are justifiably concerned that once a property is declared there is a good chance that wildlife reserve will not be adequately managed and adjoining landholders will suffer.

The definition of those considered to be materially affected is inadequate. We do not know whether adjacent landholders can claim to be affected, even though it is obvious they would be impacted. The department expects landholders to be satisfied with its assurance that it is the plain-English meaning. That is no reassurance, considering the state's growing bureaucratic and regulatory framework.

Then we have the government assuming the right to veto or approve whether someone can lease, sell or bequeath a property. These are perpetual agreements, which means that future owners will be tied to them. Their property rights and the ability to review or renegotiate an SWR are severely restricted. There is not even a process to do so, even with a change in property ownership. In fact, there are very limited circumstances in which it can be revoked. It will require a resolution of this parliament. This takes bureaucratic and litigious nightmare to a new level. Clearly, it will affect property values as well as those of neighbouring property owners. If future owners cannot meet their obligations, once again the interests of neighbouring landholders are impacted.

Landholders are hamstrung by strict management requirements. I have a similar issue in my electorate with constituents on a property that has been declared a nature refuge. They need to fence the property to prevent stray livestock wandering on to it; however, they are hamstrung in accessing financial loans to pay for the fencing because commercial banks view the property as high risk. It is high risk because of the strict management obligations required by a covenant over the property. What we have here is a situation whereby those management obligations are preventing them from being able to fund meeting those management obligations. It is clearly impractical and lacks any appearance of common sense. This bill is onerous and unfair, tramples on property rights and places more burdens on neighbouring landholders. It should be opposed.

 **Ms RICHARDS** (Redlands—ALP) (12.41 pm): I rise to make a short contribution in support of the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. Queensland is renowned for its unique environment. We are a global hot spot for biodiversity. That is what we are well known for. Our natural places and our unique species are recognised globally for their importance. Biodiversity is central to our Queensland identity, wellbeing and lifestyle. It also underpins our prosperity. Queensland has world-class national parks. This legislation builds on our ability to protect and conserve important land.

The bill makes amendments to the Nature Conservation Act, Land Act, Land Title Act, Environmental Offsets Act, Environmental Protection Act, Biodiscovery Act, Forestry Act and Vegetation Management Act. The introduction of this legislation will create a new class of voluntary, privately managed protected area that will provide a similar level of statutory protection to that afforded to state managed national parks. The new class of protected area will apply to both freehold and leasehold tenures.

The bill will establish management principles for special wildlife reserves. These principles will provide a framework to guide management of special wildlife reserves by the landholder. A legally binding perpetual conservation management agreement and an associated management program will be negotiated for each special wildlife reserve. I think it is really important that we tailor each piece of land to its unique context. The conservation agreement and management program will detail management outcomes and actions to ensure long-lasting protection of each reserve's conservation values in order to achieve the management principles.


This mechanism will encourage private investment in Queensland's protected area estate—it builds upon our unique assets and environment that deliver for our Queensland economy—with the knowledge that this investment will be offered protection from incompatible land uses, such as mining and timber harvesting, that is not currently available in Queensland or elsewhere in Australia.

Establishing this special wildlife reserve mechanism will allow for protection of areas of exceptional conservation value on privately owned land and will be a significant incentive for private investment in Queensland's protected areas. This will be achieved by providing a high level of private land protection and ensuring that investments in conservation will not be compromised by incompatible land uses. This will create a level of investment confidence on private land that is not available elsewhere in Australia. When coupled with the state's extraordinary biodiversity values, the bill will serve to make Queensland a priority area for private investment in protected areas.

Protected areas are the most significant and visible means by which the people of Queensland seek to ensure the continued safeguarding of our internationally recognised and iconic biological diversity. In recent decades, the Queensland community has made an enormous contribution to the protection of our biodiversity through the creation of nature refuges, a class of private protected area. We now have 504 refuges covering almost 4½ million hectares.

Nature refuges are managed to conserve their significant natural and cultural values. Unlike special wildlife reserves, they allow for the continuation of a range of other sustainable land uses. Many nature refuges contain significant species and ecosystems that are not found in national parks or other state owned protected areas. While the contribution of nature refuges and their landholders to our protected area estate is unquestionable, some areas of our unique landscape are deserving of and require a level of protection that recognises their exceptional natural and cultural values. This bill seeks to fill this gap in Queensland's protected area framework by providing a mechanism to deliver a high level of protection for areas of private land that have outstanding conservation values. Essentially, this bill allows for the protection of any area based on its inherent values and future conservation management, not on its ownership by the state.

The bill is not overly controversial. It creates a new class of protected area. It provides clarity and streamlines land title registration processes. It provides for better regulation of activities that may harm our iconic Great Barrier Reef. It allows the government to consistently regulate transshipping in the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park. It also improves the flexibility of environmental offset approval processes. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Mr WEIR** (Condamine—LNP) (12.46 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. This bill was introduced into the House for the second time on 15 February 2018. The committee was required to report by 9 April 2018. This bill had been previously introduced to the House on 11 August 2017 and lapsed when the 55th Parliament was dissolved on 29 October 2017. I was a member of the former committee that scrutinised the previous bill, which was essentially the same as this one.

The explanatory notes show that this bill seeks to establish a new class of privately owned or managed protected area, called a special wildlife reserve. This would see a new class of voluntary, privately managed protected area that will provide a similar level of statutory protection to that afforded to state managed national parks. This new class of protected area would apply to freehold and leasehold tenure. The department advised the committee that under the Nature Conservation Act the term 'wildlife' includes both animals and plants, and the intent of the bill is to protect a broad range of natural and cultural values.

A number of submissions on the 2017 bill noted that, while the explanatory notes advised the introduction of the special wildlife reserve as a new class of private protected area was for the protection of lands of outstanding conservation value, the 2017 bill itself did not require the minister to be satisfied that an area of land had such values before proceeding to declaration. A number of submissions also raised a concern about a lack of clarity on what criteria the minister would use to make a decision on whether to declare an area of land as a special wildlife reserve.

The term 'state interest' is defined to mean 'an interest the minister considers to be an economic, environmental or community interest of the state'. The department told the committee that the definition of 'state interest' is 'deliberately broad', which means it is open to interpretation by the minister. That, to me, is very concerning. The potential for bad decisions to be made under pressure from green activists and political pressure is very real. These concerns are also held by the Queensland Law Society.

The Queensland Law Society submission noted that land use planning principles require that land is utilised for its highest and best use and recommended that proposed section 43A include a requirement that consideration be given to these principles when a determination is being made. My concern is about valuable profitable agricultural land, as the production of that land now and in the future for an ever-expanding population is high. If the minister is satisfied that an area should be declared as a special wildlife reserve, a proposal for declaration must be prepared and, under proposed section 43A(5), the minister must give written notice, including a due date for submissions about the proposal, to each person who has an interest in the land, each holder of an exploration permit and each holder of an authority to prospect. Consequently, proposed section 43C of the 2018 bill was amended to ensure that a conservation agreement for a special wildlife reserve must contain the same terms that prohibit the granting of authorities over the land that would be prohibited on declaration.

Some stakeholders expressed concern about the use of the term 'materially affected' as they considered that it was unclear what 'materially affected' means. The Queensland Resources Council recommended that the term 'materially affected' be defined in the bill and include those activities prohibited. AgForce Queensland Farmers Ltd proposed that, where a proposal for a special wildlife reserve is made within agricultural land, for example in a strategic cropping area, neighbouring properties should be included in the list of interested parties given the risks of third-party impacts from unmanaged reserves. The Property Council of Australia submitted that all parties with an interest in the land should be directly notified and that parties should not be notified by placing advertisements in newspapers.


The 2017 Queensland Law Society submission recommended a process be inserted to protect third-party interests, including elements of notification, a right to make a submission or an objection to the proposal, a requirement for the minister to provide written reasons in response and a right to appeal by the interest holder. Proposed new section 43B of the Nature Conservation Act provides that the minister and landholders must agree on the declaration of the area as a special wildlife reserve and agree to the terms of the conservation agreement and there must be an approved management program in place. The Queensland Resources Council also recommended that the explanatory notes be amended to clarify that special wildlife reserves will not be declared over land where there is an active exploration, prospecting and resource extraction interest unless granted by consent. The department responded that the explanatory notes are clear that any materially affected interest holder, including holders of the authorities mentioned, is required to consent to the conservation agreement.

According to the bill and advice from the department, upon declaration of a special wildlife reserve, the following land uses will be restricted: the state will be prohibited from getting or selling forest products on the protected area; the granting of mining, petroleum, geothermal and GHG authorities will be prohibited; commercial grazing will not be allowed on the reserve; and beekeeping would not be permitted on special wildlife reserves. The department advised that an option to renew a lease would not be considered part of the allowable term under proposed section 43H and this restriction would need to be considered by the holder of such a lease when considering whether to provide consent to the conservation agreement. A legally binding perpetual conservation agreement and an associated management program will be negotiated for each special wildlife reserve. AgForce stated—

The management of pests and weeds on crown land have created ongoing issues for landholders that abut these government-managed lands. The management practices used can be restrictive and frequently do not manage pests and weeds ... effectively.

The bill proposes to amend section 154 of the Nature Conservation Act, 'Other powers of conservation officer', to extend the powers of a conservation officer to access a protected area to investigate or monitor compliance with the conservation agreement. This means that special wildlife reserves will be retained in perpetuity. Proposed section 43C(1)(b) of the Nature Conservation Act will require a conservation agreement for a special wildlife reserve to state that it is binding on the landholder of the land and the landholder's successors in title. That is one area that causes me a lot of concern. In the event that that property is then to be sold or is part of a deceased estate, part of that property will be allocated as a special nature reserve. If the owners of the property after an estate have no interest in maintaining that land, it will become infested with weeds and pests.

There is also the potential for this legislation to be used by large corporations that will buy land for their social licence and also for their carbon credits. That land could be strategically located in areas where there could be future resources or there could be infrastructure such as dams or weirs constructed. I think there is a potential for this legislation to be misused and abused, and that is why I oppose this bill.

 **Ms McMILLAN** (Mansfield—ALP) (12.55 pm): In rising to participate in the debate on the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018, I want to support the provisions contained in this bill that will create a new type of private protected area for Queenslanders. The core objective of the bill is to establish a new class of voluntary, privately managed protected area that will provide national park level protections for private land containing significant ecological or cultural value.

The government recognises the significant contribution of private landholders in the protection of Queensland's expansive and rich biodiversity and this bill will allow for the protection of those values in perpetuity. Queensland's national parks are world renowned for their spectacular natural beauty as well as the diverse natural and cultural heritage they protect. Iconic national parks such as the Carnarvon and K'gari on Fraser Island come to mind. However, Queensland's rich biodiversity and outstanding

conservation and cultural values are not restricted to our national parks. The International Union for Conservation of Nature, of which Australia is a member, acknowledges private protected areas as an essential component of a successful protected area network.

Members will note that the Nature Conservation Act 1992 currently contains terms that extend protection to land that is privately managed for conservation whilst allowing for sustainable land uses such as grazing to occur. These nature refuges make a significant contribution to Queensland's protected area network. I personally want to take this opportunity to acknowledge nature refuge landholders for their ongoing commitment to manage and conserve some of Queensland's most unique natural environments. For example, Pullen Pullen nature refuge in Mount Isa, Brooklyn nature refuge in Cook, Mount Zero-Taravale nature refuge in Keppel and Blue Fig Creek Nature Refuge in Mudgeeraba are all excellent examples of the commitment private landholders can make to biodiversity conservation in this great state.


This bill fills the gap between Queensland's national parks and nature refuges by providing top-shelf protection to privately managed land containing significant biodiversity and cultural values and will be managed in a way that focuses on conserving those values. The special wildlife reserve mechanism will not only allow for the appropriate protection of outstanding natural areas and cultural values on private land but will also provide an incentive for private investors to invest in Queensland's protected areas by providing a level of private land protection and investment confidence not currently available anywhere else in the nation.

As part of the committee process, individuals and organisations expressed the desire to invest in protecting areas of outstanding conservation value in Queensland. However, the current legislative framework did not provide them with a high level of investment security. This bill will create a voluntary perpetual mechanism that will provide protection to such areas from threatening processes, including mining and forestry. Organisations that invest in conservation such as nature conservancies and philanthropic organisations will have the opportunity to create and manage conservation reserves that will have the same legal status and protection as national park.

Private investment of this type allows for an increase in Queensland's protected area estate at considerably less cost than is required for the purchase and ongoing management of national parks by the state. This potential investment would lead to improved biodiversity outcomes to the benefit of all Queenslanders and create sustainable employment in areas where this is critically needed. Special wildlife reserves will be actively managed to improve conservation outcomes and by doing so will protect and conserve important natural processes that provide communities with clean air and water.

Creating and protecting strong, resilient examples of Queensland's rich biodiversity and ecosystems will contribute to the resilience of our natural areas in the face of a changing climate, a situation that those opposite continue to refute. It is rewarding to see Queensland leading the debate about protected area policy by providing protections to private lands of significant biological diversity and cultural value from incompatible land uses. I congratulate the minister for this progressive policy approach and commend the bill to the House.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 pm to 2.00 pm.

 **Mr KNUTH** (Hill—KAP) (2.00 pm): I rise to speak to the nature conservation bill. The explanatory notes to the bill, under the heading 'Achievement of policy objectives', state—

To achieve its objective, the Bill will establish a new class of voluntary, privately managed protected area (special wildlife reserve) that will provide a similar level of statutory protection to that afforded to state managed national parks. The new class of protected area will apply to freehold and leasehold tenures, and ownership and management responsibilities will remain unaffected.

I believe it is very important that we protect our native wildlife. I am a big supporter of the protection of the cassowary. I admire the wonderful work of the Cassowary Coast region and probably also the Tablelands region to ensure that the protection of cassowaries is a priority. I remember when Wayne Goss introduced a policy, which was finally rejected, of expanding the number of national parks, but then he told the recreational fishermen that he was going to kick them out of the national parks. To me, that does not make any sense. National parks are supposed to be utilised for the benefit of the state, yet people cannot access them.


I do not have here the percentage of Queensland that is covered by national parks—it might have been mentioned in the House—but going back about 20 years ago I think it was five per cent. That might have increased to seven per cent. We have to be very concerned about the massive increase in the number of feral animals and noxious weeds in national parks that are a burden to our landowners and affect our native wildlife that we are trying to protect. I have seen sugar gliders ripped to pieces by feral cats. Some of these national parks have been a breeding ground for wild dogs and

feral pigs. Over the past 10 years, the feral pig population has increased from around 20 million—I could be proven wrong—to 25 million. The feral pig population is or nearly as high as the population of Australia. Feral pigs are probably our biggest environmental vandals. They are worse than feral cats and worse than cane toads. A feral pig can rip up riverbanks like a rotary hoe. Feral pigs cause a lot of erosion problems. They also rip up our cane fields and destroy our native wildlife by killing our cassowaries and digging up turtle eggs.

I appreciate the fact that we are looking for opportunities where we can to create wildlife reserves. I think that is very important, but we have to be very careful. We do not want to spend hundreds and millions of dollars on increasing the number of national parks and not manage them. These areas have to be control burned. Grazing is needed in some areas to keep fuel down as much as possible. Otherwise, if these areas are not managed properly, a big fire could wipe out a whole rainforest.

I appreciate what the local pig hunters do in their own time and at their own expense. That is good for the economy. They purchase all the gear that is needed—a four-wheel drive, crates, pig dogs, fuel and camping equipment. That is at no cost to the government. I admit that I believe in a bounty, because we want to see that number of 25 million feral pigs reduced to about 10 million. There needs to be incentives for that to happen.

The Staaten River National Park covers about 3,500 square kilometres. Pigs are breeding in there. There are noxious weeds in there. The people who live in the surrounding properties are constantly complaining about it. For that park to be managed properly, pig hunters should be given permits to access that national park so that the number of feral pigs can be reduced. The noxious weeds in the park should be reduced and there should be proper controlled burns. I definitely understand the need for wildlife reserves to protect our wildlife, but that protection has to be done properly.

 **Mrs GILBERT** (Mackay—ALP) (2.06 pm): The Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill will establish a new class of privately owned or managed protected area of special wildlife reserves that will deliver Queensland's regulatory mechanisms to protect nature refuges and areas located outside national parks from mining and other types of incompatible land use. In Queensland, our biodiversity has experienced major threats, such as land clearing and habitat fragmentation, including the impacts of past clearing and grazing pastures, invasive weeds and animals. It is important to retain our biodiversity to support our ecosystems. Healthy and well-functioning freshwater and terrestrial ecosystems are important for a productive and healthy environment. Intact or well-connected ecosystems provide habitat for native plants and animals. By maintaining our local ecosystems, we are ensuring their long-term conservation.

Nature refuges not only reflect the significant value of the land but also recognise the effect of management to maintain the reserve over time. To assist landholders in establishing a wildlife reserve on their property, whether that be freehold or leasehold, the bill will establish a framework to guide management principles for special wildlife reserves. It will be a legally binding, perpetual conservation agreement and an associated management program that will be negotiated for each special wildlife reserve. The conservation agreement and management program will detail management outcomes and actions to ensure the enduring protection of each special reserve's conservation values in order to achieve the management principles.

We need private investment in Queensland's protected area estate. Landholders need to have confidence and know that their investment will be offered protection from incompatible land use, such as mining and timber harvesting. Currently, that is not available in Queensland. This will be a first for anywhere in Australia.


It is recognised that not all of our unique flora and fauna is found in our national parks. Some significant ecosystems are found only on private landholdings. It also needs to be recognised that there are significant and unique landscapes that need preserving. The cultural and natural significance of areas need recognition and protection.

In my regional community we have significant diversity of our natural habitats that are not found in other parts of the state. For example, Mackay is home to many different habitat areas, including tropical rainforests, wide sandy beaches, beach scrub, mangrove lined creeks and waterways and also open eucalypt forests. Our region is home to a diversity of animals, including 62 mammal species, 350 birds, 95 reptiles, 31 frogs—and new species have been discovered in recent years—and 44 fish species. About 10 per cent of these animals are listed as rare or threatened under the Queensland Nature Conservation Act 1992. Rare or threatened species include the flat back turtle, the false water rat, many species of waders and shorebirds, the rufous owl, the glossy black cockatoo, the ghost bat, the squirrel glider, estuarine crocodile and the beach stone-curlew.

We have an easily accessible reserve on the Bluewater Boardwalk at Sandfly Creek Environmental Reserve which is an important shorebird roost site. Shorebirds mainly use the area at high tide and internationally significant numbers have been observed. The Sandfly Creek Wetlands support one of the highest diversities of shorebirds in the region. Twenty-nine species have been recorded at the site, including 22 migratory species and seven resident species. This significant area is near the busy city centre. It is a living case that highlights the importance of nature needing to be preserved over continued development on all land.

In our mangrove areas you can observe mangrove trees, palms or ground ferns generally larger than half a metre in height that grow above the mean sea level in the intertidal zone of marine coastal environments and estuarine margins. Mackay is home to at least eight mangrove species living in the harsh environment of the intertidal zone. Mangrove soils are regularly waterlogged and loaded with salt. It is estimated 75 per cent of fish caught commercially spend time in mangroves or are dependent on food chains which can be tracked back to mangrove environments. Mangroves also protect the coast by absorbing wave and wind energy, particularly during storms. Mangrove roots can trap sediments and help protect corals and sea grasses in adjacent marine habitats, which can be killed by high levels of sedimentation. The mangrove ecosystem is only one example of how one system is vital to many other ecosystems in our overall environment.

Landholders voluntarily engaging in an agreement for a wildlife nature reserve on their property must be commended for their commitment to the future health of Queensland's unique biodiversity of both flora and fauna. These people who are engaging voluntarily I am sure will not be reckless and delinquent in their duties as has been highlighted by opposition members. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr MILLAR** (Gregory—LNP) (2.13 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill with a sense of dread and frustration. This is bad legislation, much like the vegetation management legislation. It is bad for Queensland, bad for farming and bad for rural industries. Like so much of this government's legislation there has clearly been an eagerness to look as green as possible. Green ideology is at the core of the Queensland Labor Party. Those shearers who were sitting beside that tree in Barcardine where the Labor Party was born over 100 years ago would be rolling in their graves at the way this Labor Party is treating regional and rural Queensland. I wish the government had the same eagerness to invest time and effort into developing thoughtful, practical legislation, legislation that respects the rights of Queenslanders and has some checks and balances. That would be new, would it not: checks and balances and legislation that actually works?

Essentially, this bill will establish a special category of private land that will have the protections of a national park bestowed upon it without the government owning it or being responsible for the management and maintenance of the protected areas and without a regime of any public scrutiny of the management practices on the land in terms of fire hazard management, control of erosion, control of feral pests and exotic weeds. We only have to go back a couple of months and look at what happened with the bushfire season. Areas where some of those fires were coming from were not managed. We saw property being destroyed because of bushfires coming out of national park. I do not think the Labor Party has a great record when it comes to national parks and it will not have a great record by introducing this legislation into this House.

If Queenslanders learned anything this summer it was that you do not want to be neighbours with a national park of the current Labor state government because they are not good neighbours. Many constituents of mine tell of the issues poor management creates for them. Parks have been allowed to become a Noah's ark for feral pests, including pigs, wild dogs and feral cats. They are absolutely destroying private property owners trying to get on with the job of producing good food and fibre for this state. We would not need cluster fencing in Western Queensland if the national parks were managed properly and we did not have wild dogs continuing to breed in those national parks. If the state government managed the national parks, took care of the land it owns and manages, we would not have these problems.

Under Labor our national parks have become a seed bank of exotic weeds. No matter how much the landholder invests in eradicating the weeds on their own land, when the conditions are right out come the weeds from the national parks. There has been a lack of fire management. Labor clearly did not want public scrutiny of their lack of fire management in national parks. It wanted to hide the results. It would not have a parliamentary committee hearing into the bushfires. We need to get to the bottom of this.

Given the observed impacts of national park management on neighbouring agriculture I hold serious concerns about the impact of what will essentially be privately owned national parks. To make matters worse, it is completely unclear how the private management practices of these private reserves will be overseen by this government. This government does not have a great track record at the moment. How is it going to oversee this? This legislation does not lay down any rules on how a management plan is to be developed. It does not specify that it has to be based on science.

This legislation does not say who has the approval over such plans or what financial guarantees will be given to ensure the plans will be carried out. This legislation does not say which department will have the powers to police the implementation of the land management on this private ground in real time. Even the National Parks Association of Queensland has been scathing about the lack of accountability for conservation land that is being handed to private interests.

This legislation does not contain a disputes or a complaints regime. Who can neighbouring private landholders complain to about poor management that affects their lands? This legislation seems to ignore the reality that our ecosystems are called systems because they are physically interconnected. The Queensland Farmers' Federation gets this. This morning I heard the minister talking about how he advocates for the Queensland Farmers' Federation. I am sure the agriculture minister would have heard from the Queensland Farmers' Federation about this legislation. Did you take it to the cabinet table? No, you haven't.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stevens): Order! Pause the clock. Minister, there will be no further conversations across the chamber. That was a sincere form of provocation and the next time there will be a warning.

Mr MILLAR: It is important to take notice of the Queensland Farmers' Federation and AgForce because they do not like this legislation. They think this legislation will be damaging to agriculture and rural landholders right across Queensland. According to the minister for environment the neighbours are not materially impacted. They do not even need to be told a reserve is being proposed. They do not have any rights and so there is no redress.

Landholders who directly adjoin a proposed special wildlife reserve will find that they are not even consulted when someone buys up the neighbouring leasehold or freehold and applies to have it classified as a special wildlife reserve. The only obligation is a newspaper ad. If you live in the seat of Gregory you immediately say, 'What newspaper will I find it in?' You have to make sure that you have proper communication with landholders in terms of a special wildlife reserve. Neighbours should be contacted directly by registered post. Labor would not dare do this in terms of residential and commercial property owners in urban areas. Why do they feel it is okay to treat regional and rural Queenslanders as having no rights?


The minister boasts that this is a first for Australia. Not everyone will create a reserve for eco motivations. The concept of a special reserve would certainly appeal to environmental activist groups, like the ones we are seeing at the moment in Bowen and like the ones we are seeing in North Queensland in the member for Burdekin's seat, where he continually has to fight to ensure that things happen, that we continue to see progress in these regional towns and that jobs continue to be created. Such a group like those activists in North Queensland could buy land through a donation from an overseas environmental trust, declare it a special wildlife reserve and undertake no active land management. They would not clear the weeds. They would not reduce the feral animals like wild dogs and pigs.

This legislation does not say how the situation could be dealt with. The group have their rights in perpetuity. Even if the group fizzles out—and let us hope that some of those groups do fizzle out—and sells the land, it would be extremely difficult to revoke, review and renegotiate the special status. What that means is that the land can never be reverted to a productive status—something I would think that the minister for agriculture would want—to grow agriculture. We do not want to be locking up land and allowing it just to sit there idly and increase weeds, feral dogs, feral cats and feral pigs. That land would be in limbo. Primary producers will not want it because it would be just too hard to bring back. You can bet your bottom dollar that as soon as a special wildlife reserve is declared property prices in that whole district will fall and will remain depressed.

Even the Queensland Law Society has plainly said that this bill is not good law, simply on the basis of the requirement of declaring a piece of land a special wildlife reserve. Does the declaration require the satisfaction of strict and encompassing criteria? No. The legislation, the new law of our land,

gives the minister sweeping powers to make a declaration. Then there is the 100-metre buffer zone. This is an outright violation of property rights of our neighbours. Remember, a special wildlife reserve is privately owned.

It is also going to have massive impacts on our Queensland resources. It will affect not just the big players but also those under the Fossicking Act. The Central Queensland gem fields in my electorate are unique in Australia. They draw visitors from around the state and the world. There is small scale machinery mining and also hand mining and fossicking. Now the economic contribution of these fields will be secondary if someone has their land declared a special wildlife reserve. Fossickers will not be able to fossick on designated land or on land within 100 metres of a special wildlife reserve. I think that is absolutely appalling. Not only are you locking up land and agriculture but you are taking away the economic prosperity of these small communities such as the gem fields. This is bad legislation. Again, this shows that the Labor Party is all about green ideology and not about regional and rural Queensland. Shame on you.

 **Mr MADDEN** (Ipswich West—ALP) (2.23 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. This bill was introduced into the Legislative Assembly on 15 February 2018 and referred to the Innovation, Tourism Development and Environment Committee, chaired by the member for Stretton. The committee was required to report to the Legislative Assembly by 9 April 2018. A similar bill was introduced into the 55th Parliament, the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2017, and referred to the then committee, the Agriculture and Environment Committee, of which I was a committee member. On 11 August 2017 the Agriculture and Environment Committee of the 55th Parliament reported to parliament on the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2017. The committee's report did not make a recommendation as to whether or not the bill should be passed. In 2017 the bill lapsed when the 55th Parliament was dissolved on 29 October 2017.

The current bill was introduced to the 56th Parliament on 15 February 2018 by the Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef, Minister for Science and Minister for the Arts and referred to the Innovation, Tourism Development and Environment Committee. The committee's inquiry process included consideration of the evidence provided to the former Agriculture and Environment Committee in 2017, an invitation to stakeholders and subscribers to make written submissions, a public briefing by the Department of Environment and Science on 5 March 2018, a public hearing on 19 March 2018 and a review of written advice from the department in response to matters raised in the report.

In its report to parliament, the committee recommended that the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018 be passed. The committee also recommended that the minister work with traditional owners to ensure their concerns were addressed in relation to native title. In the government response, it stated that it accepted the committee's recommendation and advised that—

The minister has continued to work with traditional owners on their concerns. As a result, amendments to be moved during consideration in detail are proposed. These proposed amendments will ensure that the minister does not enter into a conservation agreement for a special wildlife reserve for leasehold lands on Cape York Peninsula unless Indigenous land use agreements are in place and registered in relation to the proposed special wildlife reserve. This amendment will ensure that processes in place on Cape York Peninsula to return land to local Aboriginal traditional owners via the Cape York Peninsula Tenure Resolution Program cannot be undermined by the declaration of special wildlife reserves.

The committee also recommended the minister look at reasonable amendments that would improve public accountability in relation to specific management programs for special wildlife reserves. The government's response was that the government—

... accepts the committee's recommendation and, as such, amendments to be moved during consideration in detail are proposed. These proposed amendments will ensure a reference to the management program for special wildlife reserve is included in a list of items a conservation agreement must contain, in order to allow for the management program, as part of the conservation agreement, to be made available to the public as required. Additionally, subject to passage of the bill, regulatory amendments are proposed to specify process by which management programs are made available to the public.


In its response, the government provided additional clarification regarding commercial grazing and stated—

The government would like to provide clarification around reference to the committee's report to a '100m buffer between the reserve and the next property' in relation to commercial grazing. There will be no buffer for commercial grazing or any other agricultural activity associated with a special wildlife reserve. The only buffer that is proposed for special wildlife reserves will come through an associated regulatory amendment to include this new class of protected area in the definition of a 'category A environmentally sensitive area', under the Environmental Protection Regulation 2008. This will deliver the intent of national park level protection for special wildlife reserves as it relates to prohibitions on mining activities within and adjacent to declared reserves. The amendment will simply include special wildlife reserves in the regulatory regime for mining that currently applies to most other classes of protected area.

The minister outlined in her introductory speech—

This bill will establish management principles for special wildlife reserves. These principles will provide a framework to guide management of special wildlife reserves by the landholder. Negotiation of special wildlife reserves will be entirely voluntary for landholders. A legally binding perpetual conservation agreement and an associated management program will be negotiated for each special wildlife reserve. In order to achieve the management principles for this class of protected area, the conservation agreement and management program will detail management outcomes and actions to ensure enduring protection of each special wildlife reserve's outstanding conservation values. This mechanism will be applied on a case-by-case voluntary basis in full consideration of state interests relevant to the proposal area and only with the consent of anyone whose interests in the area will be materially affected.

In closing, I would like to thank not only the members of the Innovation, Tourism Development and Environment Committee of the 56th Parliament but also the members of the Agriculture and Environment Committee of the 55th Parliament, as well as the secretariats of each of the committees and the submitters. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.30 pm): The LNP will be opposing this bill. The Palaszczuk Labor government can spin this all it wants, but it is simply pushing regional Queensland to the brink. When I became the leader of the LNP I said that I wanted to bridge the divide between the south-east corner and the rest of Queensland. There is no greater example of division between regional Queensland and the south-east in this term than the legislation before us.

The Palaszczuk government's hardline policy agenda is providing no environmental outcomes—none at all. We all know that agriculture is the backbone of the Queensland economy. It is no more so than in regional Queensland. Who does that benefit? That benefits everyone in Queensland. It does not matter whether you live in Caloundra, whether you live in Southern Downs, whether you live in Inala or whether you live in Carindale, we all need agriculture. Unfortunately, under the Palaszczuk government managing our land is becoming almost impossible.

In relation to the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill before the House today, let us look at what Bill Potts of the Queensland Law Society said about the bill. I know the Palaszczuk Labor government does not want to believe the LNP, it does not want to believe people in regional Queensland, it does not want to believe the people who feed the people of this great state, but it should believe the president of the Queensland Law Society. What did he say during the committee process? Bill Potts said, 'This is not good law.' If there is a time for the Palaszczuk government to sit up and listen to the Queensland Law Society, it is now. It is not good law.

We know that this law is not good for regional Queensland and not good for the environment. This government is incapable of creating and implementing effective environmental initiatives because it is simply obsessed with media attention and media headlines and grabs. The fact that neighbouring graziers might not be considered as materially affected parties is simply out of touch. It is beyond out of touch.

This bill does not even create a clear framework for ecotourism. This bill could result in the permanent loss of viable, valuable farming land. Let us think about that. I listened to the shadow minister's contribution to this bill. Viable, productive farming land could be lost in perpetuity. For those opposite who have no clue about what in perpetuity means, I point out that in perpetuity means forever. It does not matter when land changes—

Government members interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I will take the arrogant contributions from those opposite.

Mr Power interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stevens): Member for Logan, if you are going to interject please return to your seat. Otherwise leave the parliament.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: There we have a full display of the arrogance of the Palaszczuk government. They have no comprehension of the effect that this bill will have on the lives of Queenslanders.

Even beekeeping would be considered incompatible with SWR management practices. It is wonderful that the minister for agriculture is in the chamber. Mr Deputy Speaker, you know, as a member from the Gold Coast and as someone who has been raised there, that we need to do everything we possibly can to support the beekeeping industry. We need the beekeeping industry so we can ensure the future of agriculture and the environment of this state. That is why we need beekeeping.

Ms Grace: On the Gold Coast?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: A minister who is so out of touch and does not understand that there is in the—

Ms Grace: Bees in other parts of Queensland, yes, I understand.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, please refrain from further comment across the House.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: In the hinterland of the Gold Coast we have mushroom farmers, chicken farmers, herb farmers and flower farmers and that is why we need bees for the Gold Coast.

We know that the Law Society has called this bad law. We know that an inner-city Brisbane minister would have no clue about the agricultural industry and its effect on the Gold Coast. The Property Council has highlighted the inadequacy in terms of how the minister is to notify parties. It is to be done through newspapers rather than by directly contacting people. It is a disgrace that the Labor Party in Queensland think it is acceptable to notify affected Queenslanders through newspapers and not by direct contact.


Imagine if those provisions applied in the inner-city seats of McConnel or South Brisbane. It would never be proposed. The Palaszczuk government and this minister think it is okay to treat the people of regional Queensland this way—that is, advise them through newspapers and not direct contact. How arrogant, how out of touch and how unacceptable is that?

We know that this is bad law. We have heard that from the Law Society. We have heard the submissions during the committee process. That is why the LNP cannot support this law. We know that the intent of this bill is not to help the environment. The intent of this bill is not to make it easier for agricultural producers to support the economy of Queensland.

We also know that everything the Palaszczuk government does is for its own self-interest. That box has been ticked clearly by this bill before the House today. The Palaszczuk government needs to stop moving the goalpost for business in Queensland. There is one thing this government constantly gets wrong. It fails to understand that an agricultural business is exactly that—it is a business that employs people and helps this economy tick.

That is why agriculture is so important to the economy of Queensland. That is why agriculturalists are the best environmentalist out there. People who own the land and farm the land make sure they do everything possible for the next generation. They understand and know that bad law will only inhibit their future, their children's future and their grandchildren's future.

That is why we can no longer afford to have this out-of-touch, arrogant Palaszczuk government ramming bad laws—terrible laws—down the throat of the people of Queensland. This is bad law for regional Queensland and, make no mistake, this is bad law for Queensland.

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (2.39 pm): What an extraordinary level of hyperbole and negativity from the Leader of the Opposition. I suspect that the Leader of the Opposition will not be in the leadership position in perpetuity based on performances like that. No doubt she will be looking over her shoulder, as she is doing—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stevens): Order! Minister, if you could return to the long title of the bill it would be helpful.

Mr BAILEY: We all know that she is looking over her shoulder at the member for Broadwater. We see that in her behaviour all the time.

I rise to speak in support of the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. This bill will establish a new class of voluntary, privately managed protected areas—special wildlife reserves—that will provide a similar level of statutory protection to that currently afforded to state managed national parks.

Establishing the special wildlife reserve mechanism will not only allow for appropriate protection of outstanding natural areas on private land but also provide a significant incentive for private investment in Queensland's protected areas. This is yet another example of this Palaszczuk Labor government leading the way as this level of protection of private land does not currently exist in Queensland or, indeed, in any other jurisdiction in Australia. We are leading the country on environmental protection once again.

This bill will also allow the government to consistently regulate transshipping in the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park regardless of whether it is conducted wholly or only partly in Queensland waters. Transshipping is the transferring of cargo from one vessel to another while at sea, and we want to make sure that this is regulated consistently across waters in the Great Barrier Reef region. When we are talking about the Great Barrier Reef, it is this government that has acted to protect the Great Barrier Reef in every way, shape or form, acting on renewable energy, acting on tree clearing—dealing with the issues affecting the Great Barrier Reef. We are the ones who are acting to protect it. Those opposite are opposing those measures. This is another form of good environmental policy.

A minor amendment to the Environmental Protection Act will allow for environmentally risky activities to be regulated even when they are conducted partially within Queensland waters and partially beyond but within the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park. This is relevant especially for activities such as transshipping that have an onshore and offshore component.


Back in March 2015, the Palaszczuk government joined with the Australian government to release the Reef 2050 Long-Term Sustainability Plan. My department has worked collaboratively with the Department of Environment and Science in consultation with the shipping industry and other federal agencies to develop stringent safety measures for bulk carriers operating in the Great Barrier Reef. Queensland's economy relies heavily on our shipping and it is important that this be conducted in a safe and sustainable manner.

The reef contributes more than \$6 billion to the Australian economy and supports more than 60,000 jobs—but the reef is under threat. That is very clear. That is what science tells us. That is what all the agencies know. We need to do everything we can to ensure that it is protected. Thankfully, with this government now in its second term and getting through policy with the support of the Queensland people, we are delivering on this very high commitment. To be quite frank, the claims by those opposite, including the Leader of the Opposition, that they have any credibility on environmental protection is absolutely laughable. That is one of the key reasons they lost not just the last election but the election before. While they continue to dud the environment, while they continue to not support policy in terms of protecting the environment and the reef, they will keep losing elections.

The amendments to the Environmental Protection Act contained in this bill are a necessary prerequisite to amend the regulations to deliver the transshipping outcomes required to ensure the safety of the reef, and further community and industry engagement will occur during this process. These protections are vitally important for the protection of our marine environment because we recognise that neither nature nor pollution are bound by arbitrary boundaries between Queensland and Commonwealth jurisdictions.

The Palaszczuk Labor government has a strong track record on the sustainable protection of our environment. It was this Palaszczuk Labor government that banned single-use plastic bags. It was this Palaszczuk Labor government that introduced the container refund scheme. It was this Palaszczuk Labor government that brought back the waste levy to ensure that Queensland is not the dumping ground for other states, as it had become under the Newman LNP government. It was the Palaszczuk Labor government that has been leading the way in the transition to renewable energy after we went absolutely nowhere for three years under the LNP. We all know that they are still contorted on that issue, unable to come up with a modern policy that has anything to do with the modern energy market. It was the Palaszczuk Labor government that stopped tree clearing in this state.

Once again, it will be the Palaszczuk Labor government leading the way in protecting our environment through establishing special wildlife reserves and regulating transshipping. I commend the minister for her excellent leadership in this area. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr BOOTHMAN** (Theodore—LNP) (2.45 pm): I, too, rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. As a new member of the Innovation, Tourism Development and Environment Committee, the inquiry on this bill was before my time. After speaking to the deputy chair to get some insight from him and on reading the committee report, I share the concerns of my colleagues when it comes to this legislation and the wideranging impacts it will have on many communities throughout the state, including in my area of the Gold Coast. My electorate spans Helensvale in a suburban setting to places like Maudsland, which becomes more and more rural the further out you go, and Guanaba, which is quite a rural area at the foothills of the Gold Coast hinterland right beside Mount Tamborine.

This legislation, as I said, has wideranging impacts. It amends a number of bills such as the Nature Conservation Act 1992, the Land Act 1994, the Land Title Act 1994, the Environmental Offsets Act 2014, the Environmental Protection Act 1994, the Biodiscovery Act 2004, the Forestry Act 1959


and the Vegetation Management Act 1999. Putting this into perspective for my constituents in my electorate of Theodore, which is at the foothills of the Gold Coast hinterland, we have multiple conservation areas that are run by the Gold Coast City Council, we have some state forest areas, plus we border national parks. What greatly concerns me about this legislation is the lack of clarity about the special wildlife reserves and how they will be managed through government policy in the respect that multiple conservation areas within my electorate lack maintenance. We have lantana and elephant grass growing wild throughout the region.

We all talk about the environment. We all talk about sustainability. We all talk about waterways and protecting the quality of water. These conservation areas need to be properly managed. As an example, we have elephant grass along the Coomera River. A lot of it comes from upstream from government owned land—in this case, the Canungra Army base. If it is not properly managed, using this example of elephant grass, when we get a flood event, the elephant grass clumps together and rips away from the banks. Then it washes downstream and repopulates itself further downstream. It also increases the soil levels and nutrient content in the water, and that is something we are all very fearful of especially when it comes to our reef—or, in my case, Moreton Bay—in terms of the quality of water coming down the river.

To bring that into line with another aspect, recently during the summer period my electorate was subjected to multiple bushfires. One of my local rural fire brigade officers told me that one of the biggest problems we have is the proper management of some of these conservation areas. These conservation areas tend to have a build-up of fuel over many years. When we get a hot summer, a dry period, an electrical strike from a storm, an accidental ignition of fire or arson, this has detrimental impacts on not just that local conservation area, which we should all be trying to protect, but also on other properties throughout the district. It potentially puts residential properties and people's farmhouses at risk. We need to manage these properties. We need to ensure that feral species—feral weeds, feral pigs, feral dogs et cetera—are managed properly. I cannot see anything in this bill that will do this.

My constituents talk about mass development. I just distributed a letter to my residents about development in their neck of the woods and asking them what they would like to see in the more rural sector. People in South-East Queensland see development for housing—clear-felled lots where everything is cleared because people need somewhere to live. They think the same thing is happening in more rural areas when it is not true. It needs to be explained to the people of South-East Queensland that having farmers properly managing their properties is one of the best things for our environment. These special wildlife reserves could potentially become infested with weeds such as fireweed. Fireweed will blow across onto producing lands. The cattle do not like to eat fireweed because it is quite toxic for them. I have seen vast areas of the Gold Coast hinterland completely covered in this stuff. That is because we are not managing these properties. Therefore, what hope and what faith do we have if we start locking all these other properties up in perpetuity? The government is not going to properly manage it. It will wreak havoc for our rural properties that border them.

This legislation is not good legislation. As Bill Potts alluded to, it is bad legislation. This legislation needs to be thrown out and redrafted with something that is genuine for the environment and will be genuinely managing people's properties. Do not disadvantage our rural and productive lands in this state. When it comes down to it, they are the people who feed us. We need farmers. As the saying goes, everybody needs a farmer. When we introduce legislation in this House we need to make sure that it is for the betterment of all Queenslanders, and this is not.

 **Mr LAST** (Burdekin—LNP) (2.54 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. I say at the outset that I support my colleague the member for Broadwater and other members on this side of the House in opposing this bill. Once again, we are seeing transparency taking a back seat to political point-scoring in Queensland. Once again, we are being asked to support bad legislation that is not focused on making Queensland better—legislation that is instead focused on feel-good announcements and photo opportunities. Once again, we are seeing legislation in this House that has not been fully thought through, and once again we are being asked to support legislation where consultation is nothing but a buzzword.

You cannot govern for the betterment of Queensland when your gaze goes no further than the inner city. You cannot treat primary producers and Indigenous Australians with contempt, and you definitely cannot turn your back on some of this state's key industries. But once again those opposite have done just that. The feedback from across Queensland—from individuals, industry bodies and community groups—on this legislation is damning to say the least. It is a dark day for Queensland when

the Queensland Law Society says that legislation introduced by the law-makers of this state is not good law. It is a sad day for Queensland when legislation is purposely ambiguous and it is a sad day when a government decides that a newspaper ad is sufficient notice that generations of work may be thrown on its head.

We only need to read the first few pages of the committee report into this legislation to see that the Queensland Law Society is correct and that this is bad legislation. When a committee dominated by the government recommends increased consultation and amendments to improve public accountability, you can understand that the Law Society is correct. Let us be clear: this government has no respect for primary producers without doubt. This is because they simply do not understand and do not value the hardworking men and women of the agricultural sector. This is not just evident with this legislation; we are seeing this time and time again.

The LNP holds serious concerns about the impact special wildlife reserves may have on adjacent agricultural producers—impacts similar to those experienced by landholders adjacent to parts of Queensland's national park estate where inadequate management of pests, both animals and weeds, continues to impact negatively on agricultural producers trying to make a living on their land. That saying that is going around Queensland at the moment that the worst neighbour you can have if you are a landholder is the state government is an absolute disgrace and a reflection on this government because they are not fulfilling their role as owners and trustees of Crown land throughout Queensland.

A lack of clarity provided by the department about how owners with special wildlife reserves will be policed in the implementation of management plans on special wildlife reserves only adds to these concerns that, once declared, there is a good chance that these reserves will not be adequately managed and adjoining landholders will suffer as a result. If we use national parks as an example, then I have grave concerns about how these special wildlife reserves will be managed, because in many cases our national parks have been completely abandoned. They have become refuges for pests, weeds and feral animals. They are overrun. There are no longer rangers living on a lot of these national parks. They have simply become wild, feral habitats that are a poor reflection on Queensland.

How can this government claim to support Indigenous communities without specifically noting that Indigenous people are materially affected by changes to their traditional lands? Let us be clear: Indigenous communities in Queensland are seeing this government for what it is. Instead of helping Indigenous communities to advance, this government is stifling them.

The Premier has said many times in this place that her government is focused on jobs. What about the jobs that the communities of Cape York want? To make it worse, this is not the first time. Indigenous communities were ignored when this government rammed through vegetation management laws and we are seeing it again here today. It is a worrying trend that is coming into this parliament when it comes to legislation that is being rammed through this place without proper consultation by stakeholders and fellow Queenslanders.

Let us look at the agricultural and resources sectors. Once again, those opposite have proved that the agricultural industry is nothing but an opportunity for this government to engage in grubby land grab after grubby land grab. To assume that a neighbouring landholder is not significantly affected by the neighbouring property being turned into a wildlife reserve illustrates perfectly that the minister and this government as a whole have no respect for primary producers. I ask the minister here today: what consultation did you undertake with the resources sector and in particular the Queensland Resources Council? I can tell the House, unequivocally, that the answer is none. I spoke with Ian Macfarlane earlier today and he was bitterly disappointed that the Queensland Resources Council had not been consulted on these amendments to this bill. What a disgraceful act that is that the peak resources body in this state was not consulted on something so important.


I remember when Queensland was innovative, when the government worked with Queenslanders to find solutions. Unfortunately, for Queenslanders and our future, those days are over. A perfect example of that innovation can be seen in my electorate of the Burdekin at the Cromarty Wetlands located within the Wongaloo Regional Park. Cromarty Wetlands is a jewel in the crown when it comes to native birdlife. It is home to the largest congregation of brolgas in Australia, with over 12,000 birds calling Cromarty home. Just last week, some 1,100 black swans were counted at Cromarty.

How was this done? It was not done by locking it up. It was not done by ignoring the generations of knowledge built up by our primary producers and landholders. It was done with common-sense, practical management and that includes grazing livestock—that is right, those animals that those opposite detest. The industry that those opposite are happy to sacrifice to militant greens helped create

Australia's largest population of this spectacular native bird. Despite years of experimentation, it was grazing under permit that controlled para grass. Neither fire nor machinery could stop that grass that was degrading these important wetlands, but what could? The knowledge of Queensland landholders is what prevented the degradation, and it is unacceptable that this government is ignoring that knowledge. Not only is this government ignoring landholders and their knowledge in an attempt to prop up the member for South Brisbane; this government does not even value these landholders as important enough to be consulted during the decision-making process.

This legislation is making the governance of Queensland less transparent. This legislation further degrades the rights of regional communities and it must be called out. It does nothing to provide clarity. The interests of regional communities, the state's economic interests and environmental interests are being sold off in favour of deliberately ambiguous language that gives the minister unfettered control. All Queenslanders deserve transparency in government and deserve public scrutiny of the use of taxpayer funds. This legislation provides neither. Regional Queenslanders deserve to be treated with respect and to have their knowledge valued. Landholders in regional Queensland deserve more than a notice in a newspaper when it comes to their family's future.

This legislation should be sounding alarm bells throughout Queensland. It should be ringing alarm bells because it will enable green ideological groups to purchase large tracts of land that will be locked up forever. This backdoor method of locking up our land should be stopped at all costs. This is bad legislation. It is about political pointscoreing, and Queensland deserves better. Like my colleagues, I will not be supporting this legislation for those reasons.

 **Mr BENNETT** (Burnett—LNP) (3.03 pm): There have been a number of significant concerns raised by stakeholders through the committee's consideration of the bill, largely relating to the creation of special wildlife reserves. The long title of the bill and the details in the explanatory notes allow me again to call for a parliamentary inquiry into the government's bushfire preparedness. It is made on behalf of those who have been excluded from the process and those who have lost so much in the bushfires of 2018 and 2019.

The opening paragraph of the explanatory notes clearly acknowledges that the government cannot adequately protect Queensland's large protected estate. This parliament needs some very serious investigation as to why the fires have occurred in the first place and to the extreme levels experienced. We are debating this bill to increase the protected estates without any regard to bushfire mitigation strategies. I have raised previously in this House that a million hectares of land was burnt in the Central Queensland Baffle Creek bushfires in December 2018. We have a failed policy agenda when another eight million hectares of national parks are added to our protected estates without bushfire prevention and preparedness activities to reduce vegetation fuel loads.

More tragedy occurred to farming families in my electorate when in March this year we had a six-day fire that came out of the Kinkuna and Burrum national parks near Woodgate. These families have lost more than half of their pasture grass, some 700 hectares, and 22 kilometres of fencing, and they now have to divest of 200 calves and 200 breeders all before they are ready for market—all because this government cannot manage our protected estates. The fire started in the national park and has devastated these farming families.

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. What is the future of the special wildlife reserves being proposed in the bill? It is anyone's guess. Some of these fires burnt so intensely that they destroyed much of our national parks. I have quoted this before but scientists say that a thousand years of biodiversity went up in smoke, particularly around Eungella as we all know.

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 estates. Little attempt has been made in recent years to carry out proper forest management or fire hazard reduction there. The state government is a landowner like everyone else, with perhaps more obligations to its neighbours to do hazard reduction burns and maintain these protected estates.

The fires in the Deepwater and Eurimbula national parks are unfortunately examples of the poor management of these areas for many years. History proves we have it wrong. Back when these protected estates were privately held property or were leased to local graziers, there was more 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, predominantly with rubbish and weeds such as lantana and giant rat's-tail grass. We all know how devastating they are.

Who can forget when Labor aggressively started to remove 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? The savagery of the Labor government's legislative agenda fails to review and reform many failures—some include state forest leases that adjoin freehold properties, leases now being abolished with the rapid return of noxious weeds and feral animals that cause havoc to neighbours that once cared for the same country. We have seen the increased destruction of our protected estates under this government.

This legislation has been scrutinised by stakeholders. We have heard a few times here this afternoon that this is just not good law. The issue regarding a 'state interest' seems to give the minister unprecedented power to make declarations. We can imagine what these powers mean for the future of Queensland and the future of farming, especially when they are totally beholden to Greens preferences. At the very least, meeting the criteria should require both 'economical, environmental or community interests' and 'state interests' to be satisfied. The Queensland Resources Council expressed concerns because they have not been consulted on the amendments. Combined with the fact that neighbouring graziers might not even be considered as a 'materially affected' party, this will negatively affect families across Queensland.

We hold concerns that the bill will result in the permanent loss of valuable farming land, and we echo the concerns of AgForce Queensland in both this inquiry and the inquiry undertaken in 2017. This is not only about vital horticultural, beef and other agricultural uses that are readily identifiable with Queensland; the committee heard that even beekeeping would be considered incompatible with the special wildlife reserves management principles. We cannot have a Nature Conservation Act that continually gets changed with unintended consequences, particularly in reference to beekeepers in our state.

The LNP holds serious concerns about the impact special wildlife reserves may have on adjacent agricultural producers, impacts similar to those experienced by landholders adjacent to Queensland's national parks where inadequate management of pests—both animals and weeds—continues to impact negatively on agricultural producers. We used to have a good neighbours policy; now we just have locked up land causing havoc.

The lack of clarity provided by the department about how the owners of these reserves will be policed in the implementation of the management plans only adds to these concerns. It shows just how diabolical it is out there in regional Queensland, particularly around protected estates. We cannot manage what we have now, and that has been admitted in the first paragraph of the explanatory notes. Again, off we go with an ideological view and no real management plan prepared around the issue.

We believe the definition of those considered to be 'materially affected' by the creation of these reserves to be inadequate. It is the department's assertion that the term 'materially affected' should be understood by its plain English meaning without further guidance in the bill. This is another example of why there are so many concerns with legislation that is pushed through with so many concerns being raised by so many stakeholders and, importantly, Queenslanders.

The Property Council also highlighted the inadequacy of how the minister is to notify parties. I saw many members opposite shaking their head about the notifications in newspapers. However, it is our understanding, reported to us by stakeholders, that is exactly how this was done. There are many examples, particularly in the environment space, of lack of communication and consultation on a lot of issues. I have experienced many in my part of the electorate where constantly things are pushed through without consultation or communication—turn up for a press release, back on the plane and back to Brisbane they go. Under this bill, conservation agreements for the proposed special wildlife reserves will be perpetual. We have heard about how dire, diabolical and even nonsensical these sorts of issues become when people hold these views.

I now turn to property rights of future landowners. There are very limited circumstances in which these reserves can be revoked, and there are other concerns. The process should be outlined for scenarios in which the relationship between the landowner and the department breaks down due to disagreement. That has not been addressed. I heard people talking up the National Parks Association's contribution. They also raised concerns, which should send alarm bells about the legislative reform process to the minister.

After flagrant disregard for consultation with the traditional owners I know amendments are being proposed. How does this government think they get to the point where they have to move amendments at the 11th hour to appease some of the most important Queenslanders regarding the aspirations of

Indigenous people about the future of their land and their opportunities? The government has already claimed that the bill will be amended to clarify these issues, but I understand from reports that that will make it even worse.

This government is incapable of creating and implementing effective environmental initiatives. At the end of the day, the one thing that Labor loves is rolling out these policies with great media announcements but with little practical results on the ground. This relentless environmental ideologically driven agenda is also short on details and delivers small, tangible results in terms of outcome in Queensland. I would challenge anyone who says the proposed legislation we are debating here today will achieve the desired outcome. It looks good on paper and there is a nice, glossy brochure, but the reality is somewhat different.


Last year we saw the container deposit debacle turn into a bungled program. The rollout was meant to come into effect months earlier than it eventually did; it had to be postponed. The government did not do the work and it did not have the ticker to get it right. The rollout was a train wreck, as has been reported many times.

We also now have this big, new waste levy/tax coming, causing havoc. We have seen a changing of the goalposts in terms of who will and will not be affected. I noticed with interest that the other day my own local council put out a memo talking about who will now be affected. We remember the promises in this House about who was going to be impacted by the waste levy/tax. Of course, we now know it was secret; it was going to be the latest tax to be introduced and dressed up as an environmental initiative.

Ms ENOCH: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. It is on relevance to the long title of the bill.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms McMillan): I ask the member to come back to the long title.

Mr BENNETT: In conclusion, with 30 seconds to go, I reiterate that there are many examples of how the environmental programs, particularly in the last little while under this minister, have not been aspirational for Queenslanders and they are not having the desired effect for the reef or the environment. More importantly, the agenda driven by the ever-increasing south-east corner that is foisted on the rest of us in Queensland is offensive and arrogant. I think we need to call out what has happened. If the minister would like to come back to the Burnett to engage on some of these environmental programs, as she has promised to do, we would certainly make her welcome.

 **Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (3.13 pm):** I rise today to oppose the passage of the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserve) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. At the outset, I would like to place on record my appreciation and acknowledge the invaluable and fine work done by our Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service and associated staff in managing large areas of Queensland entrusted to them as national parks.

The Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service successfully manages and maintains such lands and marine environments, retaining original flora and fauna, as many parts of our state become more urbanised due to expanding human populations. Our national parks are a very valuable recreational destination for Queenslanders as well as visitors from interstate and overseas. As such, they also provide revenue for our great state.

The cardinal principle adopted by the Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service for managing national parks is to provide so far as possible for the permanent preservation of their natural condition and the protection of their cultural resources and values. Protecting a park's natural condition can, however, require considerable action. This is what national park management is all about.

I note the primary objective of this bill is to establish a special wildlife reserve as a new class of voluntary, privately managed protected area that would provide for a similar level of statutory protection to that afforded to a state managed national park. I also note that the special wildlife reserve would apply to freehold and leasehold tenures.

The bill claims to establish management principles for special wildlife reserves. The bill also stipulates a legally binding perpetual conservation agreement and an associated management program to be negotiated for each special wildlife reserve. The question arises then: what happens should this relationship break down? What happens should the respective parties disagree over the interpretation of the management program provisions? Where do the parties go to resolve these matters?

I note in the explanatory notes it is claimed that the legislation seeks to encourage private investment in Queensland's protected area estates with the knowledge that investment will be offered protection from incompatible land uses such as mining and forestry. I note the omission of the word

'grazing' here. I hope that throughout the course of discussions surrounding this bill the minister provides some clarity and appropriate explanation with respect to this point. I note later in relation to consultation on the bill the explanatory notes make the following statement—

Some interest groups did, however, argue for the continuance of certain activities on special wildlife reserves (e.g. commercial grazing, forest harvesting, mining), however this is not considered compatible with the intent of the legislation.

Grazing can be an effective tool in the management of fire and pest risks and I note this practice is not being considered as an appropriate activity as part of a future management program.

The legislation before us today is substantially the same as the bill that was originally referred to the agriculture and environment committee prior to the dissolution of the parliament for the 2017 election. Back in the 55th Parliament when the bill was first proposed, I commenced reading through the explanatory notes in relation to this legislation. At first this sounded like a reasonable proposal and a financial benefit for government and the taxpayers of Queensland. Let me read out just why it was I thought this concept may have some merit. It states—

Private protected areas, such as special wildlife reserves proposed in the Bill, are extremely cost-effective for government as acquisition and on-going management costs are met by the private sector. Use of public monies to fund government delivery of incentives and landholder services is a significantly cheaper, efficient and more far-reaching means of realising the same conservation outcome, and meeting protected area targets, compared with acquisition and on-going management of state-owned protected areas (e.g. national parks).

Unfortunately, that is where the potential financial savings ended and the potential as well as direct and indirect costs commenced. It goes on—

Core costs for government implementation of the Bill include: Assessment and negotiation of a proposed special wildlife reserve *(e.g. staffing, field inspections, reporting, administrative checks, drafting of a conservation agreement, assessment and review of management program); on-going monitoring and landholder services (e.g. staffing, provision of advice, property visits, compliance checks); and incentives (e.g. funding for assistance with on-ground threat mitigation measures).

The apparent risk of an increase in bureaucracy in order to deliver an outcome that was supposed to reduce financial expenditure of the state government then became apparent, and so I read on. It continues—

Initially, the creation and management of special wildlife reserves will be undertaken by the Department of Environment and Science ... staff within the existing NatureAssist budget allocation. It should be noted that this model is likely to have some impact on recruitment of nature refuges and landholder support of the almost 500 nature refuges declared within Queensland. It is anticipated that DES may require one additional full-time equivalent position for every five to 10 special wildlife reserves that are created; again dependent on factors identified above.

Based on the department's own reasoning, if the 500 declared nature refuges are made into special wildlife reserves, we can potentially expect to see an additional 50 to 100 departmental staff being engaged by the department. So much for a saving!

The more I look at this bill the less I see a building of our protected estates and the more I see a building of a further bureaucratic empire in Queensland. There will be staff focused on process metrics—checking this; inspecting that; making sure they have filled out all the required paperwork, potentially in triplicate, and that is before the administrative support staff are put on to ensure all the paperwork is sent off to the relevant filing cabinet.

Of significant concern is the very real prospect of a default by the owner and deliverer of a special wildlife reserve or its associated management being referred back to the state government. The minister should advise the House how it is she intends to address these legitimate concerns. Neither farmers nor park managers welcome invasive pests and weeds, and it is in the interests of both to contain and/or eradicate them. In addition, what happens to the property should the leaseholder meet financial difficulties which reduce their capacity to undertake appropriate land management? What happens if the department deems the landholder has failed a compliance check and the parties disagree? These are matters the minister needs to address. They should be clarified before this House considers enacting such far-reaching legislation.

The Law Society said this is not good law, and I agree. The Queensland Law Society making this damning comment is prima facie evidence of draft legislation that is fundamentally flawed. I also note other concerns raised by stakeholders during the Agriculture and Environment Committee's consideration of the bill. At the committee's public hearing, Balkanu said it was concerned there is the potential to misuse special wildlife reserves to lock up country from economic development. As quoted in the committee report, Balkanu said—

Generally our position overall is that for traditional owners in [Cape York] meaningful employment and economic opportunities are critical. We have always been about looking at conservation while also ensuring that we protect economic opportunities for traditional owners in the Cape.

The Innovation, Tourism Development and Environment Committee, in its report on this bill tabled to parliament last year, noted the serious concerns expressed by the Cape York Land Council Aboriginal Corporation with respect to the potential impacts of the bill on native title rights and interests. The committee found it necessary to issue this recommendation to the minister—

The committee recommends that the Minister work with Traditional Owners to ensure their concerns in relation to native title are addressed.

As the LNP shadow minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander partnerships, this recommendation is an indictment of the way this government worked with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples to get the legislation right. Whilst further consultation is welcome, it is ultimately far too little far too late, although I acknowledge there will be amendments introduced and debated this afternoon as part of this legislation.

The Liberal National Party is also concerned that this bill will not only take large areas of Queensland out of production but also have a negative impact on neighbouring property owners as a result of an increase in pests, weeds and general biosecurity risks. Such concerns were also expressed in evidence provided by the Queensland Farmers' Federation.


I also support the request made by AgForce to the Agriculture and Environment Committee that neighbouring properties of any proposed special wildlife reserve be included on the list of interested parties for ministerial notification. There is a very real prospect that a proposed special wildlife reserve may impact on neighbouring agricultural properties by the inappropriate management of potential pest, weed and fire risks in the future.

The Queensland Beekeepers' Association also raised the concern that, if passed, this legislation will force them off more areas. They requested that the clause in the Nature Conservation Act which bans the keeping of bees from 31 December 2024 not be applied to these reserves. I also noted the comments of the Queensland Resources Council. They expressed concerns regarding the risk that land use interests other than conservation could potentially be 'blocked by vexatious special wildlife reserve proposals'.

There are certainly significant ongoing concerns around the legislation. I also acknowledge the submissions and contributions of the National Parks Association of Queensland, Bush Heritage Australia, the Australian Wildlife Conservancy and Healthy Soils Australia.

Unfortunately, this legislation will lock up land and potentially cause grief and heartache for many property owners trying to manage pests and weeds on their land. The LNP will oppose the bill given the sheer volume of concerns that continue to be left unaddressed by this Labor government, the strong submissions of many stakeholders and the sovereign risks and harm to economic development that this legislation poses to Queensland.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms McMillan): Before I call the member for Traeger I acknowledge Tim Mulherin, former member for Mackay, in the gallery today.


 **Mr KATTER** (Traeger—KAP) (3.24 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I cast my mind back to a couple of weeks ago, when I was shown a map of Cape York that included all of the wildlife reserves, national parks and state forests. When you put all of them together there is not much left. I put that together with a conversation that I had with Freddy Pascoe in Normanton last year. We were talking about the effects of ice and how to get kids engaged. He said, 'Rob, money's no longer an incentive. The only carrot I can think of for these kids is cattle work. We have the benefit of Delta Downs around Normanton, so we can put those kids out to cattle work.'

Speaking from my own experience, I think that is true. People love to engage in productive activities and meaningful work, and I think that many people in those areas yearn for the opportunity to prosper, but it is lacking. There is a role for rangers in those areas, and the Carpentaria land rangers do a terrific job, but often trying to control weeds and pests out there is just like a drop in the ocean. Unfortunately, we mostly rely on the leaseholders up there on grazing leases to at least try and maintain weeds and pests at no cost to the taxpayer. It works out very well for all of us, but unfortunately I see the continual tension between the people who live up there, who want the right to prosper and go forward and do the activities that they want, and the ideologies that filter out of this place and impose themselves up there. We have seen a continuation of that with this bill.

Another thing that raises concern is the proposed ban on transshipping in the cape area. For example, silica is an inert product so there is no risk to the reef. You could have a similar size tourist vessel coming into a miniport. A miniport is 100 metres wide at best. Even if we are just talking about

a barge ramp for a miniport, if it is for a tourist vessel bringing people in there is no problem. If the material changes and you put silica sand in it, it would no longer be allowed. Therefore, if anyone up there wants the opportunity to try to get ahead and make some money—and I am talking about the first Australians in this case—they will be denied. This is a case of ideologies that are continually being imposed, so it is very worrying.

I can see firsthand in my own electorate where we are losing control of prickly acacia, calotrope and feral cats. The rangers do a very good job with the pigs up in the gulf, but they are still a very widespread problem and they are very costly. When you have leaseholders paying \$30,000 or \$40,000 a year in lease rent to the government and they are doing all of that work for you for free because it is in their interest as well, that is a pretty good outcome. I think it is poor government policy to remove that opportunity. It is certainly not welcome. It denies Queenslanders in the north economic opportunities that the rest of the state has enjoyed throughout the history of Queensland. In the future we will be denied those opportunities if this bill is passed, and on that basis we oppose the bill.

 **Mr McDONALD** (Lockyer—LNP) (3.28 pm): A goal for anyone is to feed themselves sustainably while preserving the environment in which they live. I am proud to represent an area that contributes to that goal; however, I believe that this bill has the balance wrong and is focused on environmental outcomes at the expense of landholders who produce food for our consumption and manage that land very well. I appreciate the opportunity to contribute to the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. Like my colleagues on this side of the House, I will be expressing my strong opposition to the bill by pointing out its glaringly obvious flaws and inconsistencies. Before doing so I would like to take a moment to thank the committee secretariat and members of the Innovation, Tourism Development and Environment Committee for their efforts in assessing this bill and reviewing each of the 28 submissions received.

In order to point out exactly where this bill goes wrong, it is first important to point out what it intends to achieve. Almost identical to the now lapsed nature conservation and other legislation amendment bill of 2017, the primary objective of this bill is to amend the Nature Conservation Act 1992, as well as other legislation, to create a new class of privately owned or managed protected land area, to be referred to as a special wildlife reserve. Alongside this objective, the bill intends to simplify procedural requirements for titling and record keeping of conservation agreements and protected area declarations, and to clarify who is bound to a conservation agreement entered into by a landholder. That is a lofty goal.

While some support these objectives, it is clear, both from the consideration of the bill's contents and from the concerns raised by stakeholders, that this bill is another example of this government's inability to legislate effectively. Whether that be through a total disregard for transparency or simply a case of just not caring, this government does not stack up and neither does this bill.

While the government claims that this bill will clarify the criteria the minister must consider when declaring land as a special wildlife reserve, both the Queensland Property Council and the Queensland Law Society refute this claim. Indeed, in its submission to the inquiry the Queensland Law Society detailed its recognition of the fundamental flaws that riddle the bill. It straight-out said that it is not good law. When considering the amended drafting of the bill, the Law Society went on to say—

The amended drafting actually expands the matters to be considered when preparing a proposal to declare, effectively allowing the determination to be made based upon either or both of:

- the 'economical, environmental or community interests' (as determined by the Minister) under the definition of 'State interest';

Essentially, the loose parameters regarding what is a state interest give the minister virtually unrestricted power to make declarations. I am not opposed to people making decisions, but when wrong decisions are made there needs to be a clear set of criteria so that aggrieved persons can challenge that decision. Without clarity in the criteria, it is easy to think that this government does not care about our landholders.

This bill serves as another example of this government's blatant attacks on rural and regional Queenslanders. After last year's vegetation management legislation, this bill once again threatens the rights of farmers, graziers and other landholders. This sentiment is shared by the Queensland Resources Council, Queensland Farmers' Federation and AgForce Queensland, which each expressed concerns that this bill's provisions dictating the establishment, management and maintenance of special wildlife reserves are inadequate. Like those sitting on this side of the House, each of these submitters stated this this bill is not simply an inconvenience or an annoyance; it is nothing less than a direct affront

to Queensland's vital agriculture industry. The ability to declare virtually any area as a special wildlife reserve, with no consultation with the landholder, will not only jeopardise the efficient use of some of our nation's greatest agricultural land but also impinge upon the property rights of affected landholders. The Queensland Farmers' Federation addressed this concern in its submission, stating—

Management of SWRs—

special wildlife reserves—

will have flow on effects to the management of adjacent productive agricultural land. It is therefore essential that restrictive management practices imposed on SWRs do not negatively impact productive agricultural land and the overall management of the farming system.

Unfortunately, the management practices outlined in this bill will do nothing but negatively impact the productivity of agricultural land. This bill will limit landholders' ability to effectively manage their land and utilise it to maximise efficiency and sustainability. This is simply unacceptable and a blatant abuse of power. Has this city-centric government become so arrogant that it now feels it appropriate to tell farmers and graziers how to do their jobs?


For a government that claims to support our agriculture industry and says it wants to lend a hand to drought-affected communities, like those I represent, this is just another kick in the guts. Once again, the government has produced a bill to continue pushing its hardline agenda, which will only push farming families further towards financial and emotional ruin. I suppose that is not really a concern for those opposite. After all, they are pushing this hardline agenda so that they might just save the Deputy Premier's seat next year.

As well as these concerns I have outlined, the bill also provides us with a concerning example of this government's take on transparency. As suggested by AgForce and the Queensland Resources Council in their submissions, the LNP feels that this bill's definition of a 'materially affected' party could not possibly be any more ambiguous. Having read the bill and the explanatory notes and listened to the minister's second reading speech, I have received no further confirmation of how this term could possibly be defined. This oversight needs to be corrected to remove the doubt of affected landholders.

The method through which the minister is required to notify materially affected parties of declarations is also questionable. The bill contains provisions for these parties to be notified via newspaper of any changes that may affect them. Just like the Property Council of Queensland, which first highlighted this concern, the LNP is aghast at the inadequacy of this method. I gather these figures may have been missed, but for those opposite I outline that a study conducted by market research firm Roy Morgan in May 2018 showed that only 7.3 million Australians—slightly more than a quarter of the nation's population—read a print newspaper on a regular basis. I do not know about those opposite, but if there were a risk to my livelihood by the creation of a special wildlife reserve I would prefer that there was more than a one-in-four chance of being notified of that change. It is simply unacceptable that this government thinks it appropriate to not directly contact affected parties. If this is the sort of practice that those opposite define as transparent, they desperately need to reconsider the definition.

Many in my community who neighbour state owned reserves of varying natures are very critical of the government's management of those large tracts of land. From feral animals to pest weeds, I have seen with my own eyes these poor land management practices. Those who neighbour the land are continually cleaning up the problems that come across the fence. I fear that these special reserves will not be managed properly and will cause further grief to neighbouring landholders.

This bill has fundamental flaws. It contains numerous ambiguous definitions and is labelled by Queensland's leading law experts as bad law. Queenslanders may have given this government a mandate, but if it continues to present this House with legislation like this, it can be assured that that mandate will come to an end in October 2020, when a Deb Frecklington led LNP government takes the reins to govern for all Queenslanders.

 **Mr LISTER** (Southern Downs—LNP) (3.37 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the second reading debate of the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. Like the other members on this side of the House, I will be opposing this terrible bill. Of course I am because it is bad law, to use the words of Bill Potts. Bill Potts and I do not share a lot of things in common, but I can say that I am in absolute agreement with him on this, and rightly so.

Numerous issues have been raised by a plethora of stakeholders over the ambiguities and uncertainties relating to special wildlife reserves. Whilst we have heard the minister and government members talk about how uncertainty will be fixed by the amendments, I think they will make things

worse. This is yet another example of this Labor government—this city-centric, Brisbane based Labor government—taking the stick to the people of my electorate of Southern Downs and other regional electorates.

The position was scrutinised by many stakeholders and we have seen some very illuminating responses from groups such as the Property Council, the Queensland Law Society, the Resources Council, the Queensland Farmers' Federation and AgForce. They have recognised the fundamental flaws in this bill and in the very significant statement that I referred to earlier by Bill Potts. He referred explicitly to this bill as 'bad law'. The Queensland Law Society specifically said—

The amended drafting actually expands the matters to be considered when preparing a proposal to declare, effectively allowing the determination to be made based upon either or both of:

- the 'economical, environmental or community interests' (as determined by the Minister) under the definition of 'State interest';
- the second branch of the proposed section which appears may be applied so as to encompass land areas that do not fit easily into the definition of 'State interest'.

As my honourable friend the member for Broadwater, the shadow environment minister, remarked, this is a very far-reaching discretion. This enables almost unfettered power for the minister to declare a special wildlife reserve. He also said, rather delicately I felt, that in the hands of the wrong minister that could be a danger to landholders everywhere. I would say that we already have a government that does not have the interests of our landholders at heart. We have already seen the miserable attacks on landholders in my electorate of Southern Downs and in other regional electorates in the vegetation management bill with an absolute utter lack of consultation and with no care whatsoever for the absurdities in the law, just an attack on the bush in order to secure Greens preferences to save seats like South Brisbane.

I heard the minister say, 'Well, you don't understand it. The people who provided submissions didn't understand the bill. It's really not that bad.' Excuse me, but I would say that I do not believe this government. Why should we trust this government? On a day-by-day basis I write to the minister about absurdities where the stick has been taken terribly to residents in my electorate of Southern Downs, but the absurdities are not recognised. They are dismissed summarily simply because there is this institutionalised presumption that there are no votes out there in the bush for the Labor Party and it thinks, 'We'll stick with what we know best—the radical Greens in Brisbane.'

We have seen the Vegetation Management Act. We have seen the cartoonistically ludicrous references to the black-throated finch as a way of desperately holding up the exploration and the exploitation of coal in our state. We see blue dots applied to people's properties where the very presence of the blue dot threatens the species which is supposed to be protected, but nobody wants to know anything about that. The individual property owner can just simply pay the bill and live with it. The environment department is brimful of lefties. In recent times we have seen some appalling appointments to the department. It is well known to be dysfunctional for the people who have to live under the decisions that are handed down by the department. We have seen extreme green activists appointed to extremely sensitive positions in the department. In my view that says to me that the department is not fit to make—

Ms ENOCH: I rise to a point of order on relevance to the long title of the bill.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms McMillan): Thank you, Minister. Member, I remind you to come back to the long title of the bill.

Mr LISTER: Madam Deputy Speaker, I will speak about the things that have been canvassed at length in the House today and have been allowed by a succession of Speakers in the chair.

Honourable members interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, I have asked you to come back to the long title of the bill.

Mr LISTER: I am on the long title of the bill, Madam Deputy Speaker. With regard to the environment department, I have no faith in its ability or its impartiality to administer something like this. As for the ministers, we have seen that this government has been beholden utterly to the extreme left, the extreme Greens, of this state, and the landholders whom I represent have no faith whatsoever in the way that these special wildlife reserves will be decided. Today I heard other members in the House such as the member for Stretton saying, 'Why would we worry about it? We have a responsible government.' I would suggest that the member for Stretton might like to go to Goondiwindi, Stanthorpe, Warwick or Millmerran and tell people in the street that. They would not agree with that.

Mr Pegg interjected.

Mr LISTER: I heard the member for Jordan—

Mr CRISAFULLI: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: I just remind the member for Stretton to return to your seat if you are going to interject. Secondly, what was your point of order?

Mr CRISAFULLI: It was everything to do with the member for Stretton's location. He is not a frontbencher.


Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member. Member for Stretton, return to your seat or leave the chamber, thank you. I remind the member for Southern Downs: do not argue with the chair.

Mr LISTER: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. We heard the member for Jordan, in the precise language of a technocrat, tell us how wonderful this bill will be. I suggested to the member for Jordan that she ought to come to Southern Downs or to Gregory or some of the other electorates about the place where this is going to hurt. It is appalling legislation. I echo the concerns of the deputy chair of the committee, the member for Scenic Rim, who restated the minister's assurances that the 100-metre buffer zones are not going to affect grazing. That is not what the department has said. I am not satisfied and nor are the people on this side of the House that that is the case. I say again: with the track record of this government and the complexion of the department, how are we to know that for sure?

We have heard concerns from neighbours. What are they going to be facing with these special wildlife reserves? If the government's track record is to be believed—and I think it ought to be, because past behaviour is a good indicator of future behaviour—those places will become a mess. They will be fire risks. They will be full of pests such as wild dogs and pigs to invade neighbours' properties. Who is going to be looking after these? Who is going to be making sure that they are maintained, because if the government cannot even maintain its own backyard—its own state forests and its own national parks—what faith can we have in it? I think it was the member for Gregory who made the point that it is a common phrase in the bush that this state government is the worst neighbour anyone can have, and that is absolutely true. Try finding someone in the department who is responsible for a common fence between a state forest or a national park and someone's own property. It is nigh on impossible. It is not looking after what it has now, yet it wants to have more of it to make the lives of those in the bush even harder again.

This law is too broad. The powers conferred upon the minister are unacceptable and in this House there are many of us who feel that that power has great potential to be misused to the disadvantage of hardworking farmers in electorates like mine in Southern Downs. I have talked about blue dots and the way the department behaves. I was approached by a delegation of beekeepers the other day who said to me that the department of environment takes 114 days—a disgraceful 114 days—to turn around an application for a beekeeping permit in a national park, and I can see the contorted look from the minister on the other side of the chamber. That is a disgrace, but it is an indication of the lack of awareness and the lack of care that the department and the minister and this government have for people who are creating things from nothing, paying taxes, paying for us as politicians and paying for public servants in this state.

This law is an affront to everybody who is productive and to every Queenslander—and that means every Queenslander—who depends on a strong and vibrant agricultural sector. It is an affront to the property rights of individuals and it will achieve nothing to safeguard the environment. It is typical of the hollow posturing—the virtue signalling—of this government to court green votes in the city but with no concern for actual outcomes. I condemn this bill and urge all members in the House not to support it.

 **Ms LEAHY** (Warrego—LNP) (3.48 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and wish to outline a number of concerns that I have in relation to this legislation and concerns that my constituents share as well. The LNP opposition will be opposing this legislation, and we have many reasons for doing so.

This bill is a direct affront to Queensland's agricultural industries, particularly in my electorate. I have concerns about this legislation and I doubt that it will deliver environmental outcomes. It really is just another land grab without compensation. Will the special wildlife reserves be well managed and what may happen in the future to those lands that are affected by this legislation? I have always had a longstanding principle: if the community requires private land for an environmental or conservation purpose, the community should pay, not the landholder. In this bill we see the opposite. The landholder will have a loss of property rights, and that loss will be in perpetuity.

I wish to highlight the opinion of the Queensland Law Society on this legislation. It has stated that this bill is not good law. The Law Society said—

The amended drafting actually expands the matters to be considered when preparing a proposal to declare, effectively allowing the determination to be made based upon either or both of:

- the 'economical, environmental or community interests' ... under the definition of 'State interest';
- ... the proposed section which appears may be applied so as to encompass the land areas that do not fit easily into the definition of 'State interest'.

The loose parameters regarding the state interest seek to give the minister unfettered control to make declarations. At the very least, meeting the criteria should require both economical, environmental, or community interest and state interest to be satisfied.

As we heard from the opposition spokesman, this legislation gives far too much power to the minister. A future minister with the wrong intentions or, for that matter, influenced by those who have devious or dubious intentions could result in very perverse declarations. As legislators, we should be concerned about what a future government may do and the impacts that may have on landholders.

That brings me to the definition of those who are materially affected. The definition of those considered materially affected by the creation of a special wildlife reserve is negligent. The term 'materially affected' is ambiguous and there is little guidance in the bill, the explanatory notes, or the minister's second reading speech. It remains unclear whether parties such as neighbouring landholders or, for that matter, local governments will be considered in this definition even though the declaration of a special wildlife reserve would have an impact on their property. No doubt, the Labor government has purposely left this 'materially affected' definition to be as ambiguous as possible to make it difficult for any dispute in the courts. This is a massive concern that has also been raised by stakeholders, including AgForce and the Queensland Resources Council.

There is a question about how the notification will be provided about the declarations of a special wildlife reserve. Notification will be provided by newspaper advertisement to the materially affected persons. I have another question for the minister. Are local governments going to be considered materially affected persons and, if not, why not? We will find that there will be one notification in a Brisbane newspaper. If people happen to live at Thargomindah, they probably do not buy the Brisbane newspaper on a daily basis, because it takes a day or two for it to get to Thargomindah.

We already have the problem with the blue dots, or the regional ecosystem trigger maps, where these restrictions can be imposed on landowners' homes—in fact, I am aware of one over the Warrego Highway and many in cultivation paddocks. Landholders receive no notification of these trigger maps, yet they have to go through an ongoing, costly approval process to develop any area that is trigger mapped. Here we go again: an inappropriate notification system from a Labor government. It can find a landholder when it wants to send them a tax invoice for rental or land tax, but it cannot find them for the blue dots of death or for the special wildlife reserve declaration.

When it comes to the management of special wildlife reserves, we need to look no further than the impact carbon farming is having on my electorate. Carbon farmers are often absentee landowners. As more land moves into carbon farming, the more communities depopulate. The same will happen with special wildlife reserves. With carbon farming, there is no incentive to control wild dogs or other pests such as wild pigs, foxes or cats, or to fix the boundary fences. The same will happen with special wildlife reserves. I have not even considered what will happen when existing carbon farms will be overlaid with special wildlife reserves. What a mess that will be in the future thanks to the Palaszczuk Labor government.


People in my electorate do not need more land removed from agricultural production and they do not want more people drifting away from their communities. People in my electorate do not need to lock up areas of land, because they are good land managers who manage that land responsibly and sustainably. I echo the concerns of AgForce both at this inquiry and also that undertaken in 2017. When it comes to helping our drought affected communities, or those who are flood affected, the Palaszczuk Labor government can spin all it wants but the devastating reality is that Labor continues to press this hardline green policy agenda that pushes farmers financially and emotionally to the brink. This bill is not about our vital horticultural, beef, sheep, goat, grazing or other agricultural industry. As the committee heard, even beekeeping would be considered incompatible with a special wildlife management principle.

Under this bill, the conservation agreements for the proposed special wildlife reserves are perpetual—that is, future owners will be tied to this agreement. The LNP and I have serious concerns about the property rights of future landholders and their ability to review, reinvigorate, or renegotiate a special wildlife reserve. There are very limited circumstances in which a special wildlife reserve can be revoked, requiring a resolution of parliament. That is an absolutely extraordinary requirement. That will have an effect on the value of the property, which will adversely impact the owner of the property, as well as potentially impact the value of neighbouring properties.

Future property owners may not wish to fully revoke the full special wildlife reserve, but the bill does not outline the process for review or renegotiation of the reserve even upon a change of ownership of the land. There is no guarantee that a future owner would be able to fulfil the obligations required under the management agreement financially or otherwise. Again, that places risks to the interests of the adjacent landholders and also the stated aims of the special wildlife reserve. If the reserves are to be perpetually binding on the title as a result of this state's laws, surely the state must have some responsibility to ensure that future landholders of the land can fulfil their obligations under the requirements of the reserve. This is a clear case of not much care and no responsibility at all from the Labor government.

This bill will create some headaches for local government. Should there be a lack of management of these special wildlife reserves, there will be a greater impact on the services and budgets of local government. There is no proposal that I can find—or perhaps the minister can enlighten me—to notify local governments in relation to the titles affected by reserves. How will local governments adjust their rating policies if they are not formally notified of these reserves? When an area is declared a reserve, there will be a clear land use change.

Local governments play an important role in supporting our rural fire brigades and in the control of feral pests and weeds. If there is a lack of management on these reserves, no doubt the local government will be impacted and, no doubt, that local government will be requested to increase its compliance in relation to the feral pests and weeds and the fire risk. There will be an impact on a local government's budget despite not getting any advice about a declaration of a reserve. I would very like to hear in the minister's summing-up how she intends to inform local governments about these special wildlife reserves.


 **Mr DAMETTO** (Hinchinbrook—KAP) (3.57 pm): I rise to make my contribution to the debate on the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. We are at a time where, if people are involved in agriculture, or if they are graziers, or if they are out there trying to earn a dollar off the land, it is very hard for them. Every day we see more and more legislation introduced into this House that is going to make it very hard for farmers who are trying to turn a dollar in this state. This is another piece of legislation that will do that.

The biggest problem with this legislation is that it locks up land that would have been productive to landowners. Those people have purchased this land and, all of a sudden, what they can do with it is going to change. That adds to the concerns of our farmers. They may want to pass on this property to their sons or daughters or even potentially sell it to someone one day. Once this legislation is enacted, these special wildlife reserves are going to be very hard to revoke—probably just as hard as it is to revoke an area that has been declared a national park.

Another concern about these special wildlife reserves is how they are going to be managed. Where is the money going to come from for that? There has not been a lot of clarity on that, which worries some landholders and some of my constituents.

Other concerns we have with the bill relate to the amount of power that will be given to the minister to make decisions on what happens with this land. We oppose the transshipping section of this bill. The member for Traeger referred to areas in the gulf that will be affected. Transshipping in these areas will not impact the Great Barrier Reef. It is of grave concern that these areas will be affected and will not be able to utilise their resources and ship goods in and out effectively.

I also have concerns about the consultation through the committee process. People gave evidence and were heard, but were they listened to? We see amendments coming through but they do not address all of the concerns. I and Katter's Australian Party will be opposing this bill.

 **Mr PURDIE** (Ninderry—LNP) (4.00 pm): I also rise today to speak to the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill presented by the Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef on 15 February 2018. These amendments apply to a special class of privately owned and managed protected areas, special wildlife reserves, which are equivalent in conservation merit and protection to a national park.


During consultation with external stakeholders numerous concerns were raised: concerns about the process of the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries determining permanent removal of land from agriculture production; concerns about the infringement of existing landowners' rights that are adjacent to special wildlife reserves, such as a 100-metre buffer requirement; concerns about the blanket exclusion of grazing on these special wildlife reserves, especially in times of drought; concerns from the Queensland Law Society in regard to the wording of who is involved in the determination of these special wildlife reserves, such as the loose parameters of state interest—does this mean the minister responsible has the control to make declarations that supersede everyone else's interest; concerns about the lack of clarification within this proposed legislation in regard to future ecotourism proposals on special wildlife reserves; concerns about incompatible land use with the new special wildlife reserve management policies, such as beekeeping, in addition to beef, horticulture and other identifiable land uses; concerns about the ongoing issues with pest management on Crown lands now and how these special wildlife reserve management policies will address future invasive animal and weed issues; concerns about the ambiguous term 'materially affected' and how that would impede one's ability to dispute any issues with land designations and/or land management in court; concerns about which parties would be materially affected and how they would be consulted with respect to the declaration of a special wildlife reserve, such as native title holders not being expressed as a party with land interest; and concerns about the property rights of future landholders and the ability to review or renegotiate a special wildlife reserve as it stands—it appears one would need a revocation via a resolution in parliament.

Protecting our local environment is important to me, my constituents, my family and our future generations. However, it is equally important that these initiatives are executed in a fair, accountable and transparent manner. Legislation that is ambiguous, that leaves overarching powers in the hands of one minister and/or confusion as to where land rights start and end is not reflective of good government. Landowners, traditional owners, organisations and communities should be equal partners working together to create a greener, sustainable future.

The results of this external consultation do not demonstrate collaboration. In fact, the National Parks Association of Queensland and the Wildlife Preservation Society of Queensland specifically expressed grave concerns with respect to the opportunity for rorting this legislation. As well, the Property Council highlighted the inadequacy of how the minister responsible notified parties through newspapers rather than contacting them directly. The response from this current government does not provide adequate reassurance that existing land rights will not be infringed upon and that the livelihoods of our rural Queenslanders will not be significantly affected in a negative way. This is not perception. You can hear the fear and the uncertainty in the words of the people being directly affected. The last thing landholders need is less available land for their animals and crops to carry out their livelihood. Our landowners and traditional owners are capable of being good land stewards. They recognise the impact of responsible land use and they understand the need to conserve marginal natural land that still exists. They do not need this government imposing legislation and excluding them from being active participants. They need a government that is willing to work with them.

What I hear and see is a long list of concerns, concerns and more concerns—too many concerns to address in my time allocated here today, which is unfortunate for the people that this legislation will negatively affect. As well, it is unfortunate for the people who were hoping this legislation would have a greater positive impact, as when we all work together we can truly make a real, meaningful, significant difference as opposed to a meaningless, insignificant, government-only driven legislative one.

For the accountability and transparency reasons mentioned and the lack of consideration towards landholders, especially those with native title, I urge this government to move forward in a way that is inclusive to all stakeholders, that encourages collaboration, that will create a greater positive environmental impact and that is supported by the current and future land stewards themselves. Imposing poorly constructed legislation and penalties on people is less effective and does not build a better tomorrow. Perhaps it is time for this government to consider working together with everyone involved to create better ways to help make our local environment, Queensland and the world a greener, healthier place.

 **Mr MOLHOEK** (Southport—LNP) (4.06 pm): Labor has had a long history of having an unnecessary number of tenure types for Queensland's protected areas. It has kept quiet for a few years and now this issue raises its head again with the government wanting to establish a new class of privately owned or managed protected area, almost certainly just to pander to their friends, the Greens. 'National park protection for private land,' the minister said. Sounds more like red tape for our struggling graziers and our agricultural industry to me. Honestly, even that is being too kind. This bill is an outright and unjustified attack on Queensland farmers and graziers and I am absolutely appalled.

When we were in government we reduced the number of national park tenure categories within the act from 14 to seven, which included three types of tenure which were never actually used. We streamlined tenures into two main categories: national parks and regional parks. Finally, the objective of the legislation we introduced was expanded to recognise the involvement of Indigenous people in the management of protected areas for the first time, as well as the social, cultural and commercial use of protected areas by the wider community. We provided opportunity and certainty for ecotourism industry operators by opening up our national park estate for recreational and environmentally friendly families. We implemented leases of up to 30 years for operators to strengthen our world-class ecotourism industry in Queensland. Do members know what else we did? We showed some faith in tourism operators and our key agricultural industry members that they also had the best interests of Queensland land at heart. National park protection for private land is an insult to the agricultural industry and it is just red tape and an excuse to put more jobs in Brisbane government office towers.

There have been numerous major concerns raised by stakeholders, largely relating to the murky creation of special wildlife reserves and the loose parameters regarding a state interest, which seeks to give the minister unfettered control to make declarations.

At the very least, surely meeting the criteria should require economic, environmental or community interests and state interests being satisfied, but I suppose this is an issue we have with current government ministers. They enjoy unfettered control to make declarations regardless of whether it is in the local community's best interest. As members opposite talk about the importance of protecting sensitive land, they conveniently hide that the minister for innovation and tourism has put important and sensitive community land such as Carey Park in my electorate of Southport on the chopping block for a mega casino. The minister will not rule out just how much of the Broadwater parklands this project may resume. I would like to table some maps that identify just how much of Southport's important community land could be taken because of the minister's unwillingness—

Ms ENOCH: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance to the long title of the bill. I do not see how the maps that the member is proposing to table have anything to do with this bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Weir): Could you explain the relevance to the nature of the special wildlife reserves?

Mr MOLHOEK: It is my understanding that the legislation makes provision for a new class of voluntary, privately managed and protected areas or special wildlife reserves. I suggest that maybe the Broadwater parklands be declared a special wildlife reserve and that those government members opposite should do more to protect community land on the Gold Coast.

Mr Stevens interjected.


Mr MOLHOEK: I take that interjection from the member for Mermaid Beach.

Mr Ryan interjected.

Mr MOLHOEK: This is what we are reduced to, to get the minister's attention.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Southport, I have just taken advice. We will table those documents, the Speaker will consider them later on and then we will bring you back to the long title of the bill.

Mr MOLHOEK: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. Prime agricultural land has been at risk for years due to the drought. We value the agriculture industry and, when we were in government, we even made efforts to lend some restricted areas to assist the graziers and their livelihoods—not lock up more of their land and put their futures on a knife edge. The Queensland Farmers' Federation said the management of pests and weeds on Crown land has created ongoing issue for landholders that abut these government managed lands. The management practices used can be restrictive and frequently do not manage pests and weeds effectively. What Queensland's protected areas really need is a focus on protecting and maintaining the current national parks before we go around locking up more land. Let me be clear: I condemn the removal of Queensland's strategic land both in the bush and on the coast, and I also condemn this Labor government's proposed resumption of public land in Southport.

 **Mr POWELL (Glass House—LNP) (4.13 pm):** I rise to address the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. At the outset, I want to say that the concept of private individuals assisting in the protection of our most special ecosystems, our wildlife, be it fauna or flora, is a wise investment. Indeed, during my term as the minister for the environment in an LNP government, if I recall correctly—and I am sure the minister will correct me if I have this wrong—we oversaw the four millionth hectare under the nature refuge system. It is a system that works extremely well particularly in parts of the world such as the electorate of Glass House, where we do

have some excellent remnant ecosystems and some endangered species, such as the Richmond birdwing butterfly, that definitely need protecting. We do have private landowners invested in ensuring that part or all of their property continues to be looked after well in perpetuity. It is a system that works extremely well.

I will be honest: I think even in my time as the minister for environment we did look at whether this concept which the current government has labelled 'special wildlife reserves' could be considered, whereby blocks of land that have significant environmental value could be considered in a way that was equivalent to national parks. My concern and that of all my colleagues on this side is that, in trying to achieve this, this bill falls far short. In doing so, it creates many and more of the same issues around national parks. The contributions that I have heard from Labor members in this chamber are what concern me most when I start speaking about some of these issues. As a guide, I know the process that we undertook when looking to secure additional national parks in Queensland was exhaustive. We would go and assess the environmental value of properties and then talk to landholders who potentially—

A government member: Don't put an ad in the paper!

Mr POWELL: We would not necessarily put an ad in the paper, but we knew the areas we would be looking for. They often bounded existing national parks. I was just talking to the member for Warrego and there were a number of properties adjacent to the Currawinya National Park that we purchased in negotiation. Indeed, the former member for Warrego brought down some of the property owners and we had a very sensible discussion around the appropriate compensation for the purchase of those properties, but that is not where the process ended. We then had to look at mining tenements, agricultural opportunities—all of these steps that must necessarily be exhausted before you get to declaring that property a national park. My fear—and it has been explained at length by many on this side—is that we will not have that same process applied in relation to these special wildlife reserves.

It has been raised by a number of submitters as well that the uncertainty regarding the declaration of a special wildlife reserve creates a very broad application, one that potentially will prevent agricultural or resource industry development. It will lock up marginal country for Greens preferences. They will do that for seats here in Brisbane but neglect what I started out at, that really we should be looking to protect the best of the best. I do not think we will get it under the current state interest or the economic and environmental assessments listed in this bill. You still need to exhaust all of those mineral and agricultural opportunities. I refer in particular to the contribution of the member for Mansfield, who basically admitted that this is about protecting certain parts of the state from mining. It is not about protecting the best of the best environmentally but protecting a patch of dirt out somewhere in Western or North Queensland from mining. That automatically raises a concern for me that this will be abused. If legislation can be abused, it should not be put in in the first place or it should be significantly amended to prevent it from being abused.

The definition is so ambiguous that the department was quite happy for it to stay that way, so that if it ended up in the court you could drive a truck through it and any opposition to such a declaration would be thrown out because of the ambiguity of the definition. That also applies to that consultation that will occur with those materially affected. Neighbouring landholders first and foremost but Queensland resource companies secondly—anyone with an agricultural interest in the property—also need to be consulted before these kinds of decisions are made. It should not be left up to the minister and her department. There needs to be a comprehensive assessment, like we currently undertake when declaring national parks. That needs to be applied in this situation as well.

The Property Council mentioned the inadequacy of how the minister is to notify parties through notification in newspapers rather than directly contacting them. That flies in the face of what I said we used to do when it came to national parks. You would sit down with the landholder and have a conversation with them. You would talk to the neighbouring landholders and have a conversation with them. You did not put an ad in the paper and hope for the best.

Other colleagues have mentioned the concerns that traditional owners have raised. I understand that some of those concerns are going to be addressed in the amendments, but not all. Others have also mentioned the permanency of this legislation. In essence it becomes a national park and that means the only way it can be changed is through revocation, as we sometimes do, in this parliament. They are few and far between. It creates issues for subsequent landholders in terms of their ability to manage these properties. Do people fully understand the obligations they are signing up to when they purchase such a property? It creates a field of landmines when it comes to that permanency and ownership change.

It also creates some significant concerns around the management of those properties. It surprises me that two submitters, the National Parks Association of Queensland and the Wildlife Preservation Society of Queensland, have raised these concerns. There is no evidence in this bill that suggests that the management plans for these special wildlife reserves will be made public.

One of the rules around national parks is that how the site is intended to be managed must be shared with the broader community, with other departments, with councils and with surrounding landholders. There is no intention to do the same with regard to these special wildlife reserves. Neighbouring landholders should be fearful, as many on this side of the chamber have said. People already do not trust the national parks department to manage their properties properly. As we have heard, fire, weeds and pests often originate in national parks.


Ms Enoch: That's not true.

Mr POWELL: I will take the interjection that that is not true. That is entirely true. It was true in our day and it is true now that pests and weeds are not being managed in national parks.

I am happy to take the minister down one road in my electorate where there is a former state forest on one side and a national park on the other and I will not tell her which side is which. I bet the minister picks the wrong side. The one that has been managed through careful forestry over decades looks like a national park. The one that is a national park looks like my feral backyard.

Investment is not occurring in our national parks, and that is with management plans that are made public. My fear with special wildlife reserves, private landholdings and private management plans is that neighbouring landholders are going to get done over again and the whole concept of a good neighbour will go out the window.

There are so many concerns around this bill. Whilst the idea and concept might seem sound and may have worked elsewhere, this bill cannot be supported. There is one other area that needs to be addressed. The shadow minister for tourism is sitting here. There is no element in this bill that allows ecotourism to operate on these properties either. We continue to fall behind other Australian jurisdictions, especially Tasmania, and other nations such as New Zealand around the use of our protected area estates. It is bad enough that we cannot do it in our national parks responsibly, but to now lock up private land as well under special wildlife reserves with no capacity to operate ecotourism opportunities, which is what makes these special wildlife reserves in other nations so successful, is a real travesty. For that reason, I cannot support this bill.

 **Mr BERKMAN** (Maiwar—Grn) (4.22 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. It is vitally important that we expand and better manage the protected area estate in Queensland. This bill does go some way to achieving those dual outcomes.

Queensland is underperforming in terms of our national objectives for the creation and management of national parks. Commonwealth environment department figures show that less than nine per cent of Queensland is part of the national reserve system, which is, on their figures, the lowest proportion of any state or territory in Australia. Clearly we have lots to do in terms of not just improving the management of existing national parks but also expanding the national parks estate to meet those targets.

Preservation of our extraordinary biodiversity relies on Queensland doing a better job to develop a truly comprehensive, adequate and representative national parks estate. Our unique, endemic species in ecosystems are reliant on this. We need to bear in mind that this task is against the backdrop of climate change, which, as it takes hold, is going to drive landscape-scale change in ways that we cannot yet properly understand. That only increases the scale of the task that we have to deal with in ensuring preservation of our natural environment in Queensland.

I commend the government for taking steps to formally and permanently protect areas of outstanding natural value and for creating the mechanisms that we have not enjoyed previously. The bill provides stronger environmental protections than nature refuge status has previously. This is absolutely a positive step.

It is important that these protections are established in perpetuity to the greatest extent possible. I do believe that more could have been done to ensure this though. For example, the power to revoke a special wildlife reserve declaration could have been subject to further conditions that limit the revocation of a declaration. I acknowledge the amendments to the Land Act and the Land Title Act go some way towards safeguarding and continuing these protections.

It is also important to recognise that while private reserves like nature refuges and special wildlife reserves can play and will play an increasingly important role in meeting the challenge of establishing a truly comprehensive, adequate, representative national parks estate, this task absolutely requires government to play a primary role. The statistics I have just mentioned suggest that we are failing at that task.

I support the amendments to the EP Act that will allow Queensland to regulate environmentally relevant activities occurring in GBR catchments. As custodians of the reef, we have a responsibility to protect it. I will always welcome legislation that reflects this responsibility.

There are some concerns I have about the bill and some missed opportunities. Given the declaration of a special wildlife reserve is theoretically intended to be similar to a national park declaration, it follows that this new type of declaration should also require the consent of traditional owners. This should be sought through existing native title procedures—for example, by negotiating ILUAs to enable consistency with the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. It is important to note that the omission of native title holders in the definition of landholder in this bill and the Nature Conservation Act more broadly are problematic features.

I share the views of a number of submissions made on the bill that it falls short in terms of transparency and accountability. Audits of the effectiveness and compliance with management plans for special wildlife reserves, I would suggest, should be conducted at least every five years. These audits should include regular on-the-ground conservation audits by appropriately qualified officers.

The bill provides for landholders to receive public funding to assist in conservation. There are no penalties for landholders who do not adhere to commitments in relation to special wildlife reserves. At a minimum, the public should be able to access and scrutinise management programs and conservation agreements and information on how they are being honoured and maintained over time. This could be done by including the material on the public register under the Nature Conservation Act.

Conversion of nature refuges to special wildlife reserves is also something that could, and I would suggest should, be better facilitated. The ecological values of nature refuges are already established by their very status as a nature refuge. This bill does not appear to me to take advantage of that fact to the extent it could. A number of submissions point to the need for a mechanism to promote the conversion of existing nature refuges to special wildlife reserves, extinguishing existing incompatible use and providing for rehabilitation.


New reserves are an improvement on nature refuge status because they exclude logging, mining and grazing activities. A number of submissions on the bill proposed further exclusions that would be more consistent with protection and conservation values, such as excluding all grazing not just commercial grazing, petroleum and pipeline leases which are notorious for their tendency to fragment habitat and introduce weeds into national parks and areas of ecological value and also the exclusion of private tourism activities on these reserves.

The bill's explanatory notes point to private protected areas forming an increasingly important part of the system in the future and also endorse public and private investment in this. The preference for private management of our precious natural environment over publicly owned management is part of a worrying trend that we are seeing. There is good reason to endorse the objective of the bill to give these new reserves equivalent conservation merit and protection to that of a national park, but the state cannot abrogate its own responsibilities to expand and manage national parks in accordance with the cardinal rule—that being the conservation of nature.

Reliance on private contributions to the national parks estate does reflect a tendency of this government to permit and even encourage private ecotourism activities in protected areas. For example, there were recent offers of long-term, exclusive leases of publicly owned national park land to private ecotourism operators in Hinchinbrook, Cooloola and Whitsunday. This was considered by many to be a method of privatisation by stealth, and I find it hard to disagree with that. Indeed, it appears to be quite contrary to the cardinal principle of national parks management. Responsible ecotourism can be a positive, but it should only be allowed outside, even adjacent to, high-level protected areas. This should include special wildlife reserves as well as national parks.

Briefly, in terms of funding, it is incredibly important that this initiative is adequately funded. Our national parks estate falls well below the federal target of 17 per cent, or our equivalent contribution to that. Given that they represent such a small area to avoid in terms of tourism, it clearly indicates that more needs to be done to expand and protect it. It is vital that the public costs for administration and financial incentives for special wildlife reserves receive special Treasury allocation over and above existing allocations for national parks management. Quite simply, these initiatives cannot be at the

expense of national park management and expansion efforts already underway which are grossly underfunded. That said, I do support and endorse the bill. I commend the government for bringing it before the parliament and encourage further efforts as I have described.


 **Mr BOYCE** (Callide—LNP) (4.31 pm): I rise to make a contribution on the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. I oppose this bill. It is just another Labor attempt to further vilify farmers and graziers throughout rural Queensland as environmental vandals. It is just the same as the native vegetation legislation that was passed purely to prop up the Treasurer's seat against the militant Greens. This bill is a ruthless and unjustified attack on property and the rights of Queensland farmers and graziers. The fact is that neighbouring graziers may not even be consulted in regard to a nature conservation proposal. It is outrageous. This is another blow to rural business who quite obviously will be affected.

The Queensland Farmers' Federation has raised concerns regarding restrictions arising from a special wildlife reserve. The management of SWRs will have a flow-on effect to the management of adjacent productive agricultural land. It is therefore essential that restrictive management practices imposed on SWRs do not negatively impact on productive grazing and agricultural land and the overall management of those grazing and farming systems.

How can the management of feral pests and noxious weeds be guaranteed under this bill? The government and its departments cannot control and manage the problem it already has now on Crown lands and national parks, and of course the majority of the voting public are not aware of how big this problem is, as they rarely see it. There is also no drought or starving stock on a sewered suburban block. In this bill it is clear that Labor has purposely left 'materially affected' to be as ambiguous as possible to take away any right of dispute in the courts, further alienating rural Queensland.

The National Parks Association of Queensland and the Wildlife Preservation Society of Queensland have raised grave concerns with respect to the opportunity for rorting this legislation. The National Parks Association of Queensland said that the bill currently includes no provision for management programs as special wildlife reserves to be reviewed or accessed by the public. Public scrutiny is necessary to ensure the areas meet their obligations under the legislation. This brings into question the transparency and accountability that may be minimised and/or removed by the Greens-pandering Labor government.

For the Minister for Agriculture to stand in this House and pontificate about how the Labor government is being a friend of the farmer and the grazier is an absurdity and a mistruth. This is another bill that panders to the environmental left so the Labor Party can stay in power. I most definitely do not support this bill.

 **Mr SORENSEN** (Hervey Bay—LNP) (4.34 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I wonder why we are here debating this legislation today. Why do we need this legislation when we look at all of the other vegetation legislation that we have such as tree-clearing laws and all the rest? It goes on and on. How do you expect farmers to understand all of this if you are only going to advertise the changes in a Brisbane newspaper? How the hell are they going to operate? Farmers will not know what they are doing half the time with all of this legislation going through.

When we look at the hospital system, we would be better introducing legislation to make sure that we look after people's health in this state rather than having all of this vegetation legislation. At the end of the day, it is ridiculous. The Queensland Farmers' Federation is concerned that the management of SWRs will have a flow-on effect to the management of adjacent productive agricultural land. We have seen in the past what that means—feral animals and weeds such as groundsel bush, which when it flowers just blows in the wind, and Crofton weed. At the end of the day, why do we need this legislation? We have the vegetation laws. Farmers are not allowed to clear their land. What is the point of this law? It is ridiculous.

The government talks about conservation but have a look at Fraser Island. When I was in local government they used to tell me that you only need a fire once every 15 years. They tried it over on Fraser. I flew over the area after that fire and all we saw was beautiful white sand and black sticks—everything was burnt and I mean everything. There was nothing left. If they think that is conservation, I think we should go back to the Indigenous people and see how conservation really works. They would have mosaic burns so they did not wipe the whole area out.

There used to be a great number of echidnas on Woody Island when they had goats on Fraser Island to keep the grass down. Then somebody thought it was a great idea to take all the goats off the island. What happened then? The grass grew and they had a big fire and it cooked nearly every echidna

on the island. Some of this is scorched earth policy—it really is. They are happy to scorch the earth and burn everything down to the sand—every little bird nest and every little creature in the area; just wipe them out. It is devastating to see—it really is. It is so stupid.

A government member interjected.

Mr SORENSEN: You can laugh about it but go and smell the dead animals after some of those big fires. You can smell a big old dead carpet snake for a couple of miles. That is the sort of thing that the government wants. It wants to store all of this vegetation up, make sure there is a big fuel load on the ground, and then let her go and see what happens. It is crazy. I have seen it before and I suppose I will see it again. We saw it in the big bushfires recently. Then they call it climate change. If they burnt and managed the place, it would not happen. It is all about management.

The other issue that concerns me is the potential to misuse strategic wildlife reserves to lock up country. What are the boundaries going to be? Can they be changed under regulations after this bill is passed? In terms of the 100-metre buffer, if you have a boundary that is 100 kilometres long then 100 hectares would be locked up as well. What is stopping the government from changing that under regulations with the power that we are giving the minister?

Honestly, where are we going? Farmers need to be able to farm their land. People in inner-city areas do eat food. It is ridiculous to keep kicking farmers in the guts all the time. We wonder why they are discontent with government. I can tell you why.

A government member interjected.

Mr SORENSEN: I have been a farmer, mate. I have seen deregulation and different things. Does it work? No. It just pushes everybody out of the industry.

Mr Stevens: Like the dairy industry.

Mr SORENSEN: Like the dairy industry. The next one will be the cane industry. This government is going all out to knock out the sugar industry up and down this coast. We have seen sugar mills close. We have seen the Nambour sugar mill close a number of years ago. We have seen a couple of sugar mills—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Weir): Order! Member for Hervey Bay, I will bring you back to the long title of the bill.

A government member: It's fascinating!

Mr SORENSEN: It is. I bet there will be more sugar mills close over the coming years. The Law Society says that this is bad legislation. Look at the land that will be taken away from mining and agriculture. What is stopping somebody buying a block of land, saying it is a beautiful spot and then someone wants to mine the area? How many years is that going to take to go through the courts? I agree with the shadow minister this morning about the power that the minister has at this point in time. We do live in a society. We do not live in a communist country yet, and this legislation is very socialist. It takes land away, more or less, and there is no compensation for it.

Mr Whiting: Do we still trade with China?

Mr SORENSEN: Yes, you do. If you have been to China you will see that it is not a very communist country.

Mr Power interjected.

Mr Bennett interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! That is enough cross-chamber chatter. The member for Hervey Bay has the call.


Mr SORENSEN: I do not see any need for this legislation. What is the need for this extra legislation and extra paperwork? We cannot even clear the land if it has the wrong colours on it and yet we are going to change the law. Why? We are making extra work. What for? Who is going to look after this land? If the farmer cannot look after it in times of drought, is the government going to fine him for it according to the agreement?

Mr Molhoek interjected.

Mr SORENSEN: They will set a budget which some poor person will have to abide by. It is ridiculous to put all this pressure on people just because they own a block of land. It is over the top. I cannot support this legislation which, as the Law Society says, is bad legislation. I fully support our side of politics rejecting this ridiculous legislation.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Hervey Bay, before you wrap up I will get you to withdraw a couple of words—'guts' and 'stupid'. If you could withdraw those before you conclude, that would be good.

Mr SORENSEN: I withdraw.

 **Mr JANETZKI** (Toowoomba South—LNP) (4.44 pm): It is always a pleasure to follow the heartfelt, passionate contributions from the member for Hervey Bay. I acknowledge his contribution and his lifelong experience. I too rise to make a short contribution to the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. My contribution relates primarily to my suspicion of any government intervention or interaction with freehold land in Queensland. Freehold land is as it says it is. For 160 years in Queensland it has been free from hold. That is what freehold land is. I am more than ever convinced that this particular Labor government—the Palaszczuk Labor government—is more obsessed with intervention into private property in Queensland than any other government in Queensland's history.

Mr Bailey: It's a conspiracy!

Mr JANETZKI: We need only go back to the history, and I will take the interjection from the member for Miller. There is nothing conspiratorial about what happened in 2016. If you recall, in its first attempt to pass vegetation management legislation, or re-work the vegetation management legislation, in this House in 2016 the Labor government blatantly sought to criminalise landholders. There were mistake-of-fact provisions. There were reverse onus of proof provisions.

This government has proven itself incapable of leaving freehold property alone. Last year with the final passing of the vegetation management legislation—and I recall that the bill in 2016 was the one bill that was defeated during that term of parliament—what we saw was still an attack on private property rights in Queensland. Regardless of the merits or otherwise of this particular bill, this government has proven itself to be incapable of keeping its hands away from private property in Queensland.

I turn to the Property Council's submission which raises a couple of first concerns—and I will return to landholder interests shortly—with the government process by which these special wildlife reserves will be identified. If you turn to section 43A(8), the Property Council talked about the very broad trigger provisions that the minister may have in determining whether a special wildlife reserve will be enacted. Those broad parameters are economic, environmental or community interest of the state. This government is incapable of keeping its hands off private property and with those three broad categories—economic, environmental or community interest—we can rest assured that any private property in Queensland will be in the gun under this act.

It is worth also reflecting on the Labor government's first attempt to do vegetation management back in the Beattie era under the Vegetation Management Act 1999. One of the key aspects arising out of that act which was canvassed then but did not get much publicity last term in 2016 when they sought to criminalise farmers through mistake of fact and reverse onus of proof and last term when they finally passed their vegetation management agenda was the loss of value in private property. Those opposite will say that there is no loss of value to private property under this act. I think that is up for serious debate. However, what I do think is irrefutable is that there will be an impact on the value of adjoining properties.

The value of adjoining properties, as has been so eloquently canvassed already by so many on this side of the House, will be determined by a range of factors. I think the member for Gregory referred to it as national parks being the Noah's ark equivalent of pests, feral dogs and feral pigs. If I recall correctly, the member for Gregory said that weeds and natural pests such as grasses, weeds and the like are the feed bank. It is going to be very challenging for adjoining landholders to maintain the value of their property once this act is brought into force.

I will return to the Vegetation Management Act 1999, because it was clear from a range of jurisprudential thinkers at the time what would happen. I recall that constitutional law lecturer from the University of Queensland, Suri Ratnapala, delved deeply into this because it was an attack on the value of people's private property. Again, the Labor government cannot help themselves. They go back into this territory. They will not stay away from private property in Queensland.

I will return to the Property Council's submission. We have established that the government has a very broad set of categories, whether it be environmental, economic or community interests. What makes this worse is that there is actually no criteria involved with these processes. We have these broad categories, but there is no defined criteria as to what will be caught under these categories. There is great uncertainty around personal property rights for those people who have been identified within a special wildlife reserve. More disturbingly, for those adjoining landholders who do not wish to sign up to the special wildlife reserve or are outside of it, their private property rights will also be negatively impacted in some respects. As I said, this is due to the bank of plant based weeds and the Noah's ark of pests—the dogs and the pigs—that will destroy the value of adjoining properties.


We heard the member for Burnett talk this afternoon about the bushfire crisis that we experienced across the summer. That crisis was in large part due to unmanaged national parks where the fuel loads increased and the fires were severely worsened because of the lack of management. Now we will have this challenge on adjoining properties because of this act.

Let me turn for a moment to the seriousness of what this means. This act essentially means that, if private property falls within a special wildlife reserve and the landholder signs up to it, it will have a caveat put on it for perpetuity. I do not know whether anybody has had any dealings with freehold property and removing a caveat, but essentially it is nearly impossible. It will require nearly an act of parliament to overturn the special wildlife reserves when they are enacted. As I have already stated, the criteria and the categories by which a property might be caught are extraordinarily broad and are extraordinarily within the discretion of the minister of the day.

The member for Glass House referred to the obvious attack on mining interests in this bill. This is locking up certain land for agriculture, but we can never deny that this act is targeted at limiting mining interests in remote areas of Queensland. It is locking up the value of our nation. It is clear from our battles on vegetation management and our battle today on this bill that this is a government that has no regard for agriculture, no regard for mining and no understanding of what has made our state great. Our primary production of resources, of agriculture—

Mr Watts: It's on the coat of arms.

Mr JANETZKI: I will take that interjection from the member for Toowoomba North. It is on our coat of arms. More than that, it runs through our blood and this government should hang their heads in shame for their lack of support for it.

 **Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (4.53 pm): I rise to make a short 10-minute contribution. I am very tempted to change the long title of the bill to the 'Lock Up Viable Land Nature Conservation Bill' because that is exactly what this bill is intended to do and that is exactly what the outcome will be in years to come.

We all support the maintenance and preservation of worthwhile, valuable green open space right across Queensland. This side of the House in particular has been very proactive in making that come to fruition. I am very proud of the fact that in my time on the Albert Shire Council we introduced a green levy to the south-east corner and we bought thousands of hectares with that green levy that all the ratepayers chipped in for. That was a very worthwhile exercise in preserving viable land. This particular legislation is all about adding to the percentages—the green land-grab targets locked up in numbers of hectares and percentages of Queensland—to satisfy the looney lefties with how much of Queensland they have actually locked up.

I refer back to one of the great pleasures I had in my council life of attending citizenship ceremonies and welcoming about 6,000 new Australian citizens. I want to draw an analogy here between this bill and the citizenship of Australia. We said in those citizenship ceremonies that there are many rights and privileges of becoming an Australian citizen and with this bill there are rights and privileges to that land, but associated with citizenship are obligations and responsibilities and in this bill there is no mention of obligations and responsibilities. In other words, when this land is locked up and forgotten about then, yes, it will be a good statistic to put in the *Courier-Mail* in terms of green credentials, but there is no mention of how we are going to manage the feral pests, cats, foxes, pigs and dogs that are going to be utilising these special wildlife reserves and creating havoc for other people.

This will not occur only in western areas and grazing areas. I can just see this legislation being applied across Springbrook and some of the grazing land there where Dr Aila Keto, leader of the green bandwagon, if you like, has resided for many years. It will be used to lock up particular blocks of land in perpetuity. As our shadow minister pointed out to the House, trying to remove that locked up viable land syndrome will be very, very difficult and will have to be done through the House in the future.

Bill Potts is a great solicitor from the Gold Coast and president of the Law Society. When he says it is bad law, then it is bad law. I notice the member for Toohey agreeing and smiling over there. As a lawyer extraordinaire, he agrees with the president of the Law Society that this is bad law. If the member for Toohey was not worried about other matters in Toohey, then he might be a bit more keen to espouse the problem he has with this being good law or bad law. We would like to get an opinion but I am sure that will not be forthcoming at the current time.

The fact is that this is just a green levy grab. On the Gold Coast, we were able to put away green areas. We purchased them. One example is Green Heart at Merrimac, right in the middle of the Gold Coast.

Mr McDonald: Great decision.

Mr STEVENS: That was absolutely a great decision. It is a wonderful part, and in the years to come as the Gold Coast grows to over a million people then there will be this big green space but it is not a special wildlife reserve. There will at least be obligations on that community to look after that reserve and preserve it, and there will not be dogs, cats and feral pigs running around—

Mr McDonald: Or feral people.

Mr STEVENS: I take the interjection from the member for Lockyer. That is the proper way to approach the preservation of valuable, good green space right across Queensland—not this very blatant land grab to build up the numbers to satisfy the green elements out there that look at the numbers and the statistics of hectares across Queensland. That is why, unfortunately, this particular piece of legislation will threaten the farmers who live next to these blocks of land. It will put another onus on them when managing their own farms, with the extra problems from these special wildlife reserves. It can be guaranteed that the build-up of timber and other flammable material on these special wildlife reserves will put at risk these property owners in times of bushfires et cetera and will put another financial burden on the people who abut these special wildlife reserves.

The legislation is flawed. The Law Society has quite clearly enunciated that it is a bad law and yet we are pushing forward. It will most likely pass on the numbers in the House this evening. Unfortunately, it will be another demonstration of how beholden this Palaszczuk Labor government is to the green push, the loony left in the party associated with some other members of the party—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Weir): Member for Mermaid Beach, it now being time for the private member's motion I ask that you move the debate be adjourned.

Debate, on motion of Mr Stevens, adjourned.

MOTION

Child Sex Offender Register



Mr WATTS (Toowoomba North—LNP) (5.00 pm): I move—

That this House calls on the Palaszczuk government to implement the LNP's plan for a public child sex offender register.

I want to start today by quoting the Premier. She said—

This issue has been canvassed at length over many, many years. It has been genuinely the view of most people that a register at this point in time is not needed. However, having said that, of course we are a government that listens and we are more than happy to speak to people about any views that they particularly have.

That was said in September 2017. Let's find out if this government will listen. Let's find out if this government will listen, because the public are very clear on their view of what should happen with regard to a public sex offender register.

I want to outline a little bit about the LNP's proposal so people can understand. The LNP has been leading this charge because we truly care about the safety of our most vulnerable in our community: our children. We believe that parents and communities deserve the ability to protect their family members and their children. Knowledge and information is always going to be power when it comes to who people's neighbours are, where they live and who has access to their children. The LNP will always favour community safety over child sex offenders. We need this register in order to deal with these people and to ensure that families have the opportunity to protect their loved ones.

Let's have a look at what it is we are proposing. The LNP's plan would provide parents with access to three tiers of information on sex offenders. The first one is a missing offenders register. Under the honour system that exists at the moment, if someone fails to register, nothing particularly happens.

Having a missing offenders register would mean that their photos would be displayed and the community would be able to look at the missing offenders register to be alert and be observant in their community if they see this person.

The local offender search is the second tranche, where someone can input their suburb after being correctly registered and then uncover photographs of child sex offenders who live in their suburb or adjacent suburbs. I believe the community should have the right to view the photographs of child sex offenders living in their community so they can identify them. If they are in someone's street or if they are a neighbour, those people should at least know the offender's history so they can protect their family.


The third tranche is a community protection disclosure scheme. Parents or guardians will be able to apply to the police to enquire if a person who has regular, unsupervised contact with their child is a reportable sex offender. Anyone who uses false information to request a disclosure or misuses the information provided by police could face seven years imprisonment.

This is a very important part of the legislation. We are not looking to start vigilantism in our community. We have very strong legislation that empowers the community and empowers families to understand who their neighbours are. However, there are also very strong protections to make sure that the police apply the rule of law clearly in Queensland. People can use this to protect their families, they can use this to take precautions, but they cannot use it to take the law into their own hands. That will always be unacceptable to the LNP. We need to make sure that people have the information.

We know that this legislation is working well in Western Australia. We know that it is working in England and Wales. My question to the Premier and to those in the government is: if the release of Robert John Fardon is not a wake-up call and a red flag that we need to change the way we manage this kind of offender in our community, then what is? We were told that he would be GPS tracked, but we know he is not. We were told that we would be able to know where he is, but we do not. Stephen Cohen, a survivor of Robert John Fardon, condemned Labor for their actions by saying—

Labor have shown their contempt for the ordinary people in the street. Their solution was to gag Sharon—

(Time expired)

 **Hon. MT RYAN** (Morayfield—ALP) (Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services) (5.05 pm): The Palaszczuk government's first priority when it comes to child sex offences is the victim. The plight of the victim guides all our thinking, all our policy formulation and all our legislating. The victim's situation provides the context, the perspective, the analytical framework when it comes to formulating laws around child sex offenders. Queensland has a child sex offender register. The expert advice, the evidence, states that a child sex offender register monitored by police or other authorities is by far the superior model. This is what currently operates in Queensland.

In 2014 Protect All Children Today stated—

It is our firm view that that the release of information via a website will not adequately protect vulnerable children.

Vigilantism may result in offenders ... going underground to protect their privacy and physical safety, posing a greater risk to the community and vulnerable children.

As this statement highlights so clearly, we must always think from the victim's perspective. We must always guard against unintended consequences. In short, the moral is that when it comes to matters around child sex offences, thought bubble policy lets down those who matter most. Ill-conceived policy based on the shaky foundations of political populism does not work.

In 2014 parliament's Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee came to precisely that view and the LNP voted accordingly. The committee said further research was needed to produce an evidence based policy. In fact, the committee and the then LNP police minister said that the preferred approach to this matter was to first wait for a review of the Western Australian register model before progressing any public register proposal in Queensland. What is interesting is that the member for Toowoomba North, the mover of this motion, was a member of that committee in 2014. He supported its recommendation not to introduce a public offender register and to wait until a review of the WA register was completed.

What has changed since 2014? I am informed that there has not yet been a review of the WA register. However, the Australian Institute of Criminology has conducted a review of registers generally and made comments about the WA model. That review says that public registers do not reduce recidivism and have little effect on levels of fear in the community. The report also says that registers

like the Queensland model are effective in reducing reoffending. There is evidence a public register not only does not achieve the objectives it aims for but, worse, produces unintended consequences including driving offenders underground and having the massive potential to identify and retraumatise victims.


I am advised that the majority of child sex offending is perpetrated by someone known to the child. In these cases, a public register would contribute to a perverse outcome. To identify the offender publicly would identify the victim publicly. Such an approach does not put victims first, and that is where we always must return to: the victims. Victims will always guide this government in our lawmaking. That is why we took the strongest child protection laws in the nation and made them stronger.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members to my left, I sat here and listened to the contribution of the member for Toowoomba North. There were strong points made and some were provocative, but there was not the same level of interjection. I ask you to extend the same courtesy to the member currently on his feet.

Mr RYAN: In September last year we changed the law to ensure that certain child sex offenders will continue to be monitored by police even after their supervision orders had expired. We backed our tough laws with a \$25 million funding boost for police surveillance and enforcement. Our laws will also make it easier for police to obtain offender prohibition orders. Under these orders an offender can be forced to wear a GPS tracker and ordered to reside at a particular address.

We understand community expectations, but most of all we always think about the victims, and I cannot emphasise that enough. Our focus as a government will always be on the victims—saving them, protecting them and delivering justice for them. Certainly we will hold to account those people who want to commit the most heinous crimes against some of the most vulnerable people in our community. It is our government's commitment to those victims that we will always put them first.

 **Mr BENNETT** (Burnett—LNP) (5.11 pm): I believe that parents should be able to find out the identity of child sex offenders living in their neighbourhoods, and that is why the House should support this motion tonight. A publicly available sex offender register will allow parents to check the background of anyone who has unsupervised access to their children. The plan, modelled on systems in Western Australia and the UK, would include safeguards to prevent vigilante action against sex offenders. Protecting children is more important than protecting the anonymity of paedophiles.

Queensland police run the Child Protection Offender Register, which requires sex offenders to keep police informed of their whereabouts. I say that we should show respect and a commitment to the woman who was raped at gunpoint by the notorious predator Robert Fardon when she was 12. Sharon Tomlinson knows the community has right to information about sex offenders in their community. Let's show support and commitment to the Queensland parents who need to know if an offender is living in their midst. Nothing is more important than protecting our kids from these sexual predators.

Let's support not-for-profit agencies like Bravehearts that support those affected by child sexual assault and who have been advocating for change for a long time. Let's show respect and commitment to the memory of 13-year-old Daniel Morcombe, who vanished while waiting to catch a bus to go Christmas shopping on 7 December 2003. It would be years before Daniel's grief-stricken family and the rest of the world learned that a cold-blooded killer named Brett Peter Cowan was responsible for their son's death. This predator previously spent time in jail for raping and bashing two boys within an inch of their lives, one in Darwin and one interstate. He should never have been on the street without people knowing where he was.

Let's support the Morcombes, who have said that it is quite simple to implement. At the end of the day it will make a massive difference to children right around our state. Parents will be able to educate their children on what these predators get up to, the numbers of these predators and where they live geographically in our midst. Mr Morcombe also said that it would be a great way to implement additional deterrence against those who attack our most vulnerable. If you are a person with a warped interest in young children, we need to know where you are. Mr Morcombe also said, 'They're not going to get a slap on the wrist through the courts, their name has the potential to be listed on this website forever and surely as a human being ...' and as a nation we need to know where they are there.

I call on the House tonight: let's become the first jurisdiction in Australia to make photos, regional locations and other details of convicted serious sex offenders available to the public online. That is why the LNP will enforce strong measures to protect against vigilantism. That is why, under the LNP's proposal, any person who accesses but misuses the information will face a penalty of up to 10 years


imprisonment. For example, any person who harasses or distributes a listed offender's name or photograph will be held to account. A person who makes a false application in an attempt to obtain information will also be held to account for up to seven years. These strong measures, which have been in place in Western Australia for over five years, are proof that they do deter vigilante attacks.

Will Labor ever trust the community to use the information sensibly and without misuse so they are able to make informed decisions with regard to their children's safety? It appears that tonight that is not going to be the trust the community can expect from Labor. What will it take for Labor to put survivors before offenders? Sharon Tomlinson, a survivor of Robert John Fardon, claims that not informing the community of an offender's whereabouts is more likely to cause vigilantism.

I remind the House that there have been over 40 different reports into child safety reforms in this state in the last 10 years which have all alluded to more protections and more reforms around child safety. On an ideologically based view why would you not at least give this a chance to be developed into a policy position that all sides of this House could be proud of. We talk so much about bipartisanship in this place and about those most vulnerable, but again we are playing to another political agenda here tonight. Just because it is us, you will not support it.

I say to you that my role will be to tell every one of those stakeholders exactly how disrespectful you have been to them. I will tell all of those stakeholders who engage with me in my portfolio responsibilities just how important vulnerable children are. If this place cannot take a stand on strong reforms against those perpetrators in our community, we must worry about what the future of child safety looks like and, more importantly, future convictions and dealing with those perpetrators. There is a strong argument for everyone in this House tonight to reflect and think about what the Western Australian model could look like for our great state. Let's not put politics above the most vulnerable in our community. The children of this state need our help.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Burnett, in terms of your future contributions, I would ask that you consider standing order 247 in terms of addressing your comments through the chair.

 **Ms LINARD** (Nudgee—ALP) (5.15 pm): I rise to speak against the opposition's motion. First and foremost, during these debates it is important to recognise the victims of sexual offending. Our public policy should be directed towards protecting the ongoing interests of victims in our community and to do all we can to prevent others from becoming victims in the future. This government will always do everything within our power to ensure the highest possible level of protection for children in this state, as successive Labor governments have done. I am no stranger to this topic. I have seen the devastation that such offences cause in families and communities—as it did in mine—and I have taken many opportunities in this House to speak on this issue, however difficult, and I will continue to do so.

On a personal note, I do not appreciate what I think are akin to threats. We just heard that statements will be made about people on this side of the House and our commitment to child protection. I say that as a member of this House and as the member of a family who has been directly affected by child sex offending.

Respectfully, this motion and this policy do not afford our community extra protection. To do that you need evidence based solutions that can achieve our goals of building safer communities. Research shows that there is no discernible reduction in recidivism as a result of public register regimes. As recently as 2018 the Australian Institute of Criminology published findings which concluded that there is little evidence that such registers have reduced reoffending amongst registered sex offenders. In fact, some studies have shown increased sex offence recidivism.

Further, interviews with key stakeholders, including police and practitioners—the very individuals who administer such schemes—have raised concerns that public registration is counter-rehabilitative and again could increase the risk of reoffending. The AIC report also pointed out that when it comes to the WA scheme—the scheme that the LNP has used as the basis for their ideas—the impact of that scheme has not even been measured. One of the most serious risks raised in the public debate of public sex offender registers is the false sense of security it can create. The register gives the impression that the safety of our children depends on a list of unknown people in the community, but the sad reality that needs to be acknowledged is that, when it comes to sexual offending, it is all too often committed by somebody known to the child or their parents. All too often it is committed by people who have established a relationship of trust. All too often the offending is intrafamilial.


When it comes to reoffending, evidence from the California reporting scheme shows that 87 per cent of people who reoffended while subject to a public register offended against a child who was known to them. It is a confronting but important conversation that needs to be had with the community. It is all

too easy for the LNP to suggest that a public register of people in the community will make children safer, but the horrible truth is that all too often children actually need protection from those people closest to them.

Australia already has a child protection offender reporting scheme. The Queensland component of that scheme, managed by State Crime Command within the Queensland Police Service, requires child sex offenders and other defined categories of serious offenders against children to keep police informed of their whereabouts and other personal details to protect the community. I have great faith in the professionalism and expertise of the Queensland Police Service.

In the three years I spent prior to parliament working as the senior policy advisor for police, not once did the police ask for such a register. Not once did the very people who are sworn to protect our most vulnerable say that such a register would make children safer in this state. In fact, the opposite is true. They have raised concerns with such proposals, as have the Law Council of Australia and child safety advocates, in regard to similar calls at the federal level. Child safety advocates are speaking against such a proposal. That should be cause for concern and pause.

I started by acknowledging that we need to keep victims in the forefront of our minds in this policy area, and that is the note I will finish on. This issue is beyond politics and it should never be used as such. We must always remain vigilant in looking for ways to further strengthen the protections we have in place to keep our community safe, particularly our most vulnerable—these aims are never far from my mind and, I know, ours as a government—but this policy does not further those aims. It is little more, unfortunately, than populist policy which the community themselves do not believe will reduce child sex offences in our community, with four out of five people surveyed recently saying such. It is for these reasons and the behaviour of those opposite that I oppose the motion.

 **Mr PURDIE** (Ninderry—LNP) (5.20 pm): David and his two brothers were only young when their father left. When David was eight his mother, desperate for a father figure for her boys, met Manuel Siguas. As he was skilled in the art of manipulation, this vulnerable young family was an easy target for Manuel. David loved Manuel, who showered him with gifts and affection. Devastatingly, within six months Manuel was raping and molesting David.

For 10 long years it was David's way of life. Simply longing for love and the attention of a father figure, David did not know it was wrong. When he was sent down to the park to befriend other young boys and bring them home, David did not know it was wrong. When Manuel invited other adult males over for drinks and they used him as a sex toy, David did not know it was wrong. David did not know it was wrong until he walked into the Sunshine Coast district Child Protection and Investigation Unit to seek some advice when he was 18 years old. A few days later he returned to the house of horrors, the house where his life had been destroyed, to confront the monster who destroyed it—but this time, bravely, he was wearing a wire. My team and I had the house surrounded. We were listening intently—waiting, praying for the admissions we needed to storm the house and make an arrest. Unfortunately, this story is not unique. There are many more that are just as horrific.

In the short time I have this afternoon I want to talk about three things: why the current child protection offender reporting system, known as CPOR, is broken; how the LNP's sensible policy could have saved David and many other vulnerable young kids like him; and how other jurisdictions have used this solution to successfully address this problem.


There are currently around 2,800 registered child sex offenders in Queensland—2,800 offenders like Robert John Fardon who have been convicted of molesting young children; 2,800 offenders, some worse than Fardon, at large in our community, possibly living right next door to you and you would not know. Making matters worse, these offenders are being monitored by only 33 police officers—33 overstretched, underfunded and under-resourced officers. On the Sunshine Coast there is only one CPOR officer trying to monitor around 130 child sex offenders. In some police districts the ratio is one officer to 180 offenders. These officers do not even have police cars. They rely on the honesty and integrity of upstanding, law-abiding paedophiles living in our community to report online any change in their circumstances—like, for example, that they have befriended a family with three vulnerable young boys.

The system is broken. That is why I strongly support the motion moved today by the member for Toowoomba North. The introduction of a public child sex offender register will give every parent an effective tool to protect their child from paedophiles. The register will put innocent and vulnerable children before the interests of paedophiles living in our communities. It includes robust safeguards to protect against vigilantes, with any person misusing the information liable to up to 10 years in prison.

Similar laws in Western Australia and the UK have been effective and are used responsibly by the community. The system has been operating in Western Australia for five years and has proven to be successful. Why does Labor not trust the community to use the information sensibly and not misuse it? What will it take for Labor to put our kids before paedophiles?

Manuel Siguas had a long history of offending against children, including offences overseas and interstate. A public register may have saved David and his family from more than 10 years of horrific abuse. It is one thing to fail on roads, to fail on trains, to fail on hospitals, to fail on debt and to fail on energy, but you cannot get much lower than failing our kids. If this government supports the right of every Queensland child to live without the threat of abuse, it must support this motion.

In closing, I am pleased to advise the House that Manuel Siguas is now serving 16 years in jail for the rape and indecent treatment of seven young boys spanning two decades. David, not his real name, has recently celebrated the birth of his first child. He is trying hard to repair his life and I wish him well, but it should never have come to this.

 **Hon. DE FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (Minister for Child Safety, Youth and Women and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (5.25 pm): I rise to oppose this motion. Child sexual abuse is abhorrent, unacceptable behaviour and it is a terrible crime. It is one of the most traumatic experiences a person can ever suffer, with devastating lifelong impacts for those who experience it. One need only read the stories of those who gave evidence at the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse to understand just some of the impact on every aspect of a person's life. We have heard some more of those stories tonight.

For the families of those children in our community, I cannot even begin to imagine the pain. It is why in this House we must be committed to seeing victims and their families supported. It is why we must do what we can to keep our children out of harm's way. It is why we must not give false hope to people who have already suffered so much. It is why we must do the things that work. It is why, after the cuts imposed by the LNP on our child safety system, which was the system to keep our kids from harm—they cut staff; they cut money—we have tried to right those wrongs. We have injected into the child protection system over \$560 million and 480 new staff.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Members to my left, the minister is not taking your interjections.

Ms FARMER: Despite the increasing complexity of the problems we are seeing and the increasing demand on our system, as a result of our investment we have had record success in our ability to respond to the most urgent cases. Our case loads are now down below 17. Our early intervention with families is achieving real results in keeping kids safe.

The five-year Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse focused on preventing abuse; improving the way perpetrators are investigated, prosecuted and sentenced; and improving access to justice and ongoing support for people who have experienced abuse. It delivered a comprehensive way forward to drive community-wide cultural change, to keep children safe and to prevent child sexual abuse. It is why we are implementing those recommendations. It is why we are delivering on evidence based reforms to better prevent and respond to child sexual abuse.

The LNP does not have a history of protecting the most vulnerable in our society from the scourge of sexual violence. It sat on the Smallbone report into youth sexual violence. While in government it cut funding to child sexual assault services. We are funding those services. We are currently rolling out a \$12 million investment in the area of youth sexual violence. This week I have commenced public consultation right across Queensland on a sexual violence prevention framework for Queensland. This will help us work towards ending sexual violence.

Mr Boothman interjected.


Mr SPEAKER: Member for Theodore, your comments will come through the chair.

Ms FARMER: We are being supported by a panel of experts to develop this framework. Our focus is not only on making people feel safer; it is on actually making them safer.

The proposal from the LNP is for a public sex offender register. Those opposite say that the purpose of this register is to protect the community and prevent child sexual abuse from occurring. If there was evidence that this worked I would support it, but its proposals are not based on evidence of what works. They are not based on solving the problem and we owe it to those victims and their families to solve the problem and not give them false hope. The facts around sex offence registers can be clouded by emotions, but we know that evidence from other jurisdictions shows that they do not reduce reoffending and they do not prevent offending.

A 2008 American study of the federal sex offender regime in the United States, known as Megan's Law, and sex offender registers in the US found that there was no demonstrable effect in reducing sexual offending. I understand that the opposition's proposal is based on systems in WA and the UK, and there is a similar lack of evidence to support the efficacy of those registers. In fact, key stakeholders in WA, including police and practitioners, identified concerns that public registration is counter-rehabilitative and could actually increase the risk of reoffending.

We have talked about the 2018 report that found little evidence to support claims that they make children safer. At best the negative consequences of registers were found to cancel out any benefits in deterring offending and at worst that they might lead to higher rates of reoffending. Since 2015 we have made it an absolute priority to address these issues to keep our kids from harm. We are opposed to this motion because it will not work and we owe it to victims and their families to do the things that work and to not give them false hope.


 **Mr MOLHOEK** (Southport—LNP) (5.30 pm): With every part of my heart I wish that we could simply leave this matter to the police. I wish that it was as simple as saying that the police are monitoring this issue in our communities so that we can all sleep well at night. Recently I heard that police from the Southport station were not only undermanned by about a dozen officers but the officers that it had were being used to help ferry prisoners from the Southport watch house to the Brisbane Watch House and back again because of the increased demand for juvenile detention at the Brisbane Watch House. Unfortunately, our police are not there. They are not always available when we need them to monitor this issue in our community. I would simply say that people need to know where these offenders are. As a parent and as a grandparent now, I believe that our kids and our families have a right to know what is going on in their neighbourhoods. If there is a family dealing drugs up the street, it is usually pretty obvious. If there is a household in the street that is doing a few break and enters or driving illegal cars or undertaking other illegal practices, it is usually pretty obvious. Unfortunately, you cannot trust sex offenders and it is not always obvious.

In 1969 a client of my dad sexually abused me as a 10-year-old child—and it only happened once, and I thank God that it only happened once—but it was not until 1998 that it occurred to me that maybe I should do something about that. I went to the Surfers Paradise Police Station then as an adult and reported it because I thought, 'If they've got other evidence on this particular person, it might just be my testimony that helps bring this perpetrator to justice.' I was pleased to find out that the perpetrator had since deceased, and I will not go so far as to say what I was thinking about saying with respect to paedophiles. We cannot trust these people and I believe that we do have a right as a community and as a society to know where they are.

The minister, in response to a question that I placed on notice in February, advised that there are some 3,486 reportable offenders in Queensland. I want to know where they are. Very recently I had cause to pull my son aside because he was planning to go visit somewhere in Queensland. I had to pull him aside and suggest that maybe they should stay somewhere else because I had concerns for the safety of my first granddaughter.

This is an insidious and heartbreaking act. The perpetrators often cannot help themselves. The perpetrators are often recidivist. In the interests of protecting our kids, I believe that families absolutely deserve to know where paedophiles are—where sex offenders are living—and there needs to be tougher legislation. That is why I am more than proud to stand up this evening to speak in support of the LNP's policy and proposal on this. Our plan would also require the establishment of a missing offenders' register which would display photos and personal details of people who fail to report, and how important is that? We would also implement a local offender search which would provide parents with the ability to uncover photographs of child sex offenders who live in their suburb. We would also implement a community protection disclosure scheme so that parents or guardians would be able to apply to the police to inquire if a person who has regular unsupervised contact with their child is a reportable offender.

Both sides of the House have undertaken many measures to deal with this issue, but I would simply suggest that we cannot go far enough. There is no reform that will ever be enough and every child in our state deserves to enjoy the freedom and the privilege of growing up in a state where they are free from harm, where their innocence is protected and they are given every opportunity to thrive without the damaging effects of sexual abuse occurring in their lives.

 **Mrs McMAHON** (Macalister—ALP) (5.35 pm): I rise to speak against the motion. This government will always put victims first. We will stand with victims, we will stand with the community and we will stand up against anyone who preys on our children. This government has made our tough laws on child

sex offenders even tougher. We have the toughest monitoring regime in the nation. We have the most stringent reporting conditions in the country. We have the strongest laws for the police and the courts and we will always put victims first.

It is important to note in this debate that Queensland already has a child offender register and that all details of registered sex offenders in Queensland are kept on a national child offender register. Police are kept well informed about sex offenders. Their whereabouts and their personal details are known by police in this state. A crucial component of this register is the requirement for any reportable offender to comply with strict conditions. If they move address, they must tell police. If they change their appearance, they must tell police. If their personal details change, they must tell police.


Good policy is based on evidence. I am an evidence kind of girl—we are on this side of the House—so let us look at the evidence. A recent review by the Australian Institute of Criminology concluded that public sex offender registers do not reduce recidivism. A 2011 US paper compared research on offending rates of sex offenders who appear on public registers and those who do not. It detected little difference in the rates of reoffending between the two groups. Further, these registers can have other unintended consequences that include creating community panic and vigilante attacks.

The evidence shows that police are best placed to monitor reported offenders and with our tough laws—the toughest in the nation, I might add—Queensland police are leading the nation in tracking down child sex offenders. This government's new organised crime legislation allows for police to further crack down on online child sex offending and exploitation. The reputation of our very own Task Force Argos continues to grow here and internationally. Task Force Argos continues to target and prosecute people who would offend against our children. Police who work in this internationally recognised task force have helped rescue 358 children nationally and worldwide through their sheer determination and backbreaking analysis of seized data from over 69 million media files. Queenslanders can rest assured that our state has the toughest post-conviction monitoring system in the country.

It is populist policy on the run for the opposition to announce plans for a public register while a proposal is currently under investigation by the federal government. In 2014, the Child Safety Legislation Action Network commented that a public register would create a false sense of security in communities and see offenders going to ground. That is the worst possible scenario. The Western Australian Police Union president said—

Once their name is on a database and available to the public, they will go underground. They will move to different locations, won't make contact with police and the only time we would come into contact with them is when they re-offend.

I ask members to think about that. As a former police officer and as a mum, I know full well what that means. I know that, since 2005, the Queensland Police Service has managed Queensland's Child Protection Offender Register. I know that a key component of that register is the requirement for any reportable offender to comply with strict conditions. I know that police rigorously and stringently monitor reportable offenders in the community. I know they are doing their job and I will back them in doing their job. I know that we have given them the toughest, strongest legislation in the country to put victims first and keep communities safe. Therefore, I oppose the motion.

 **Mr HUNT** (Nicklin—LNP) (5.40 pm): Of the 30 years I spent as a police officer in this state, the most difficult of those years, the most disturbing of those years, but the most rewarding of those years were those spent working in the child abuse unit fighting for the bravest of the brave children preyed upon by the most evil of the evil in our community, child sex offenders. Over the past year I have watched members of this Labor government in this House vote down any good idea that is not theirs. Today, the government has the opportunity to finally show some sense and resolve to protect our children by supporting this motion for a public child sex offender register. I know that there are members on that side of the chamber who support this motion. Hopefully, the member for Maryborough will get a chance to have a say on this motion, because I understand that he has supported it in the past. However, I fear that the LNP is the only party that will protect our children.

When it comes to protecting our community, Labor has already shown its hand by voting against our GPS tracking laws for sex offenders. Labor's weak alternative has resulted in no GPS tracking of any sex offenders. In September 2017 the Premier, in response to a question on notice, said—

It has been genuinely the view of most people that a register at this point in time is not needed.

Was it one of Labor's famous online surveys that came up with that conclusion? On my very last shift as a police officer in this state I was honoured to do a child safety video with Bruce and Denise Morcombe. They are great Queensland community champions of child protection in my electorate inspired by the memory of their son Daniel. I invite the Premier, who believes that the view of most

people at this point in time that a register is not needed, to ask Bruce and Denise Morcombe what they think. I can assure the Premier that they know more about protecting our children than those in the disconnected bubble the Premier is obviously getting her advice in. I also invite the Premier to ask Sharon Tomlinson, a survivor of one of the worst sex offenders in this state's history, what her view is. Sharon Tomlinson said—


It is important that the community is informed of these predators' whereabouts at all times.

I agree with Sharon. The public has a right to know if a dangerous sexual predator lives in their community. Knowledge is power. Too many times I witnessed sexual predators infiltrate unsuspecting families and abuse their children. These predators are cunning, calculated and more often than not clever at gaining the trust of the groups and families they target.

I understand that we have some protections in our blue card system, but you do not need a blue card to move into a neighbourhood with children. You do not need a blue card to move next door to a family with children. You do not need a blue card to move in with a family with children.

A child sex offender register would provide information to parents and families of the dangers that lurk in their community. The privacy concerns regarding child sex offenders are surely overridden by the balance of protecting our children and families. Surely, nothing could be more important.

Today, Labor has an opportunity to stand with the LNP to protect our families. When a predator makes a choice to abuse a child, and when a predator makes a choice to sexually assault a child, and when a predator makes a choice to rape a child, that child's life will never be the same and so should it be for the predator.

 **Mr WHITING** (Bancroft—ALP) (5.45 pm): I rise to speak against the motion. I speak in this debate as someone who wants more than anything for kids in this state to be safe. I am the father of three young children. Many of us on this side of the House are parents of young children.

When making laws in relation to child sex offenders there are two primary considerations. One is that those laws are in the interests of the victims. The second critical factor is that any new legislation be evidence based. We believe those who know best about these matters—who have daily contact with the victims and offenders and who understand how those laws affect them, who think and know more about the interests of the victims—are the police.

In Queensland, we have the strongest child protection laws in the nation. Then in September last year, we made the nation's strongest laws even tougher. We changed the law to ensure that certain child sexual offenders will continue to be monitored even after their supervision orders have expired. Our changes mean that the Police Commissioner will always know where they live, where they travel and where they work. From now on, they will be monitored for the rest of their lives and police advise that these laws are working well.


It is important to note that, as we have heard, Queensland has a child sex offender register already—one that is monitored by the experts, and that is the Queensland police. When it comes to the proposal for a public child sex offender register, the Queensland Police Service has clear views. The police—the experts—advise that community notification schemes have no clear or sure effect in improving public safety and reducing sexual reoffending, can inhibit offender rehabilitation and reintegration, and may increase fear in the community. Research also suggests that public registers drive reportable offenders underground, inhibiting the ability of authorities to adequately manage the offenders. There is a risk of victims being traumatised again and psychological harm to victims having their offender's details published that may lead to the victims being identified, especially in small communities. Community notification schemes may lead to complacency within the community due to an overreliance on this information. It could give a false sense of security without decreasing the number of child sex crimes. Parents and guardians may become less vigilant regarding the risk posed by other persons who are not included on the community notification scheme.

That is the advice from the Queensland Police Service. This motion moved by the LNP shows that its policy is clearly inferior to the government's policy. It is pure political opportunism. It is as simple as that. The LNP does not have a plan; it has a press release. This motion comes at a time when the federal LNP government is seeking views on a national register. No decision has been made and views are being sought. I hope that evidence is being sought, because the analysis from the Australian Institute of Criminology in May last year showed that public sex offender registries do not reduce recidivism. Speaking plainly, they do not stop repeat offenders.

The Australian Institute of Criminology is part of the Home Affairs portfolio and is accountable to the Minister for Home Affairs. This minister has sanctioned the reduction of 30 staff from the Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission headquarters here in Brisbane. A third of the workforce is being sent from Brisbane to Canberra. They are highly skilled specialists who work in national security and child protection.

Queensland has the toughest laws in the country when it comes to protecting our children. These laws are backed by the collective might of 11,000-plus police officers. We will always protect the most vulnerable. We will always ensure that our laws are strong and workable. We will put the victims first.

I will point out quickly a problem with the issue of a public portfolio of photos: about 10 years ago my community thought they had Denis Ferguson in the community. The trouble is it was not. It was someone they mistook for him. I am concerned about where this vigilantism will go.


 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (5.50 pm): The first responsibility of any government is to protect the community. There is no-one more important in our community than our children. As a previous speaker on the LNP side has said tonight, here we have an opportunity to listen to our communities which are screaming out for a public register of child sex offenders. Tonight in this chamber we have heard some heartbreaking stories. I want to thank those members for putting on record their stories on behalf of the children of this state.

I also want to highlight the combined years of experience that we have on this side of the chamber in the child protection investigation unit. The member for Bundaberg spent two years of his life in that unit protecting our children. The member for Nicklin, who spoke in this chamber tonight, spent three years protecting Queensland children in that unit. The member for Ninderry, who spoke in the chamber tonight, spent 10 years listening, hearing and understanding what the community want and need in relation to the protection of children. We have listened to our communities.

The deputy leader, Tim Mander; the shadow police minister, the member for Toowoomba North; and I have held crime forums across the state and listened to communities. With the release of Robert John Fardon, the No. 1 issue in crime forums was not the fact that under Labor the budget has gone down and the police are screaming out for resources, it is not the fact that the bikies are back on the Gold Coast, it is not the fact that many get their cars stolen from out the front of their workplaces, it is not the fact that their houses are getting broken into; it is the fact that they do not know that their children are safe because where the heavens is Robert John Fardon living? That is the No. 1 issue.

Sharon Tomlinson and Stephen Cohen—two survivors of that vile human being who violated those two good people as children—and the police officers on this side of the chamber are the people I believe in. They are the people who the LNP have based this policy on. They are the people who are crying out for change. They are crying out for more building blocks to keep our communities safe. We on this side of the chamber have never said that this is the solution. We have never said that this is the one thing that will fix everything. What we have said is that this is but one building block in keeping our communities safe. Communities around Queensland are asking us why we are trusting a serial sex offender—who has done time, been released and reoffended—to tell us where he lives. We are trusting a serial sex offender who is out on our streets to self-report? No-one in our community knows where this man is. We are meant to trust a serial sex offender.

We have listened to those on this side of the chamber who have worked in the field, we have listened to survivors like Sharon Tomlinson and Stephen Cohen, and we have listened to our communities. They have asked us to put forward as a policy a child sex offender register, and that is exactly what we have done. I plead with the Labor Party to back the LNP's policy and implement a child sex offender register.

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (5.55 pm): I rise to speak in opposition to this motion. In doing so I say that this government is determined to make Queensland the safest place to live and raise a family. The protection of our children and our community is of vital importance. Those are not my words—but I absolutely endorse them and it is the view of this government—those are the words of the former minister for police, fire and emergency services, the former member for Bundaberg, the honourable Jack Dempsey, when he stood in this chamber in 2014 to argue why he did not support a public register in the form of the Western Australian model in a debate on a private member's bill. He stood and he praised the child protection offender reporting scheme as a strong scheme.

Mrs Frecklington: He is no longer in the parliament.

Mrs D'ATH: I will take the interjection from the member for Nanango that he is not here anymore, but the member for Toowoomba North is. He was a member of the parliamentary committee that considered that bill and made one recommendation—that the bill not be passed—and in doing so reflected the various concerns of many stakeholders in relation to that bill.

What the LNP said at that time is that they would be watching the Western Australian model but they want to see it comprehensively reviewed first. There has not been a review of that, but there has been a paper released by the Australian government Australian Institute of Criminology titled *Trends and issues in crime and criminal justice*, a review of empirical studies of the US, the UK and the Australian jurisdictions in relation to a public and non-public offender registry. I strongly encourage those on the other side to read that. I am happy to table a copy because I think it is important when we are out talking to the public and victims to explain why it is that we have to be careful about public registers.

Tabled paper: Australian Institute of Criminology: Document, dated May 2018, titled 'Trends & Issues in crime and criminal justice: What impact do public sex registries have on community safety?' [419].

We have heard from those on the other side, and this motion, that we should be implementing the LNP's plan. With all due respect, it is a media release. Where is the detailed plan? The media release states that it is modelled on systems in Western Australia and the UK. Bravehearts, in releasing its own discussion paper on November 2017 on community notification of sex offenders, said—

The registry that operates in Western Australia differs from sex offender registries implemented in the US and UK. The criteria for offenders listed on the register in Western Australia are further restricted, only showing dangerous, high-risk and recidivist offenders who reside in close proximity to the person conducting the search.

They are not the same systems. We are asked to vote in this House to implement a plan, but we do not know which plan is being talked about. Members opposite have referred to the US plan, the UK plan and the Western Australian plan. What is the actual plan? Is it a broad plan that picks up everyone that CP(OR)A picks up? Is it only dangerous, high-risk, recidivist offenders? If it is the Western Australian system, the Institute of Criminology report states—

The WA semi-public sex offender registry's impact on recidivism has yet to be measured. However, interviews with key stakeholders, including police and practitioners, have raised concerns that public registration is counter-rehabilitative and could increase the risk of reoffending.

Let us assume we are basing this on the West Australian model, and we have just heard that those opposite do not like CP(OR)A. Somehow it is an honour system. It is a voluntary system. There is a lawful obligation to report, but failing to report is an offence that carries up to five years imprisonment. That is like saying, 'Drink-driving is voluntary. It is honorary. You do not have to follow the law if you do not want to.' Those opposite say that everyone has a right to know where Robert John Fardon is. It is important to note that, if we want to rely on the West Australian system, right now in Western Australia there are 25 serious, high-risk sex offenders missing, and one of them has been missing since 2002. Those opposite should not lead victims to believe that this will give them security. Read the evidence. This is complex. You have to base it on evidence.

(Time expired)

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

AYES, 42:

LNP, 37—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 47:

ALP, 46—Bailey, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Miller, Mullen, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.


Grn, 1—Berkman.

Pair: Boyd, Crandon.

Resolved in the negative.

SPEAKER'S RULING

Tabling of Documents

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, in the debate on the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, the member for Southport made reference to the ability of ministers to make declarations over land such as Carey Park in his electorate being at risk to a casino development.

The member then sought to table documents showing the boundaries of Carey Park. The Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef took objection to the member tabling the document as it was not relevant to the bill. The Deputy Speaker in the chair allowed the provisional delivery of the documents to the table pending my review.

As has been pointed out by previous Speakers, unlike other houses of parliament, members of this House have an almost unfettered right to table documents, at least in the first instance. In most other houses of parliament the tabling of documents is limited to particular classes of documents or documents tabled by ministers or otherwise only if the leave of the House is given or the chair is first sought and given. However, Speaker Simpson on 30 April 2013 and Deputy Speaker Watts on 22 May 2013 made rulings to the effect that documents tabled should be relevant to the matter under consideration and had asked the Clerk to return the documents to the member where not relevant.

It is very unusual for members to object to documents being tabled by other members; however, the point of order having been taken, it should be considered and be dealt with appropriately.


I consider the member for Southport's contribution at the relevant time as not being strictly relevant to the bill and neither are the documents. The documents are not to be tabled, and I ask the Clerk to return the documents to the member.

NATURE CONSERVATION (SPECIAL WILDLIFE RESERVES) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 782, on motion of Ms Enoch—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Mr HUNT** (Nicklin—LNP) (6.08 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. Like my colleagues on this side, I oppose the bill as we see the march of the Left through the Labor Party and we see them beholden to their Greens mates and their Greens preferences in the inner cities.

The objectives of the bill, as contended by the Labor government, are to amend the Nature Conservation Act to establish a new class of privately owned or managed protected area, a 'special wildlife reserve'; to simplify procedural requirements for record keeping of conservation agreements and protected area declarations; and to clarify who is bound by a conservation agreement entered into by a landholder. They are also to amend the Land Act and the Land Title Act to streamline the process by which conservation agreements for new and existing protected areas survive tenure dealing processes such as tenure conservation and lease renewal. They are also to clarify that, where a protected area declaration is made over a lease, the purpose of the underlying lease is consistent with nature conservation.

They also contend that the objectives of the bill are to amend the Environmental Offsets Act 2014 to: recognise the new class of protected area, special wildlife reserve, under the Nature Conservation Act and to clarify administrative arrangements for approving offset approvals under part 6 of the Environmental Offsets Act 2014 in relation to offsets that have or may be granted under the Planning Act. These are supposedly the objectives of the bill, but we know the real objectives of the bill. The real objectives of the bill are to please the Greens, to please those in the inner city and to have a go at our farmers once again.

There were a lot of issues in relation to the bill that were brought forward during the committee process. There have been numerous major concerns raised by stakeholders through the committee's consideration of the bill, largely relating to the murky creation of the special wildlife reserves or the SWRs.

As other members have alluded to, Bill Potts from the Queensland Law Society stated outright that it is not a good law. The QLS raised the following concerns in their submission. They stated—

The amended drafting actually expands the matters to be considered when preparing a proposal to declare, effectively allowing the determination to be made based upon either or both of:

- the 'economical, environmental or community interests' (as determined by the minister) under the definition of 'State interest';
- the second branch of the proposed section which may be applied so as to encompass land areas that do not fit easily into the definition of 'State interest'.

Other submissions made by stakeholders raised issues and concerns with the bill around the removal of land from agricultural production or economic development. The Queensland Resources Council raised major concerns around SWRs being declared over land where there is active exploration underway and recommended a clarification by the government.

Like the native vegetation legislation that was passed to purely prop up the Treasurer's seat against the militant Greens, this bill is a ruthless and unjustified attack on Queensland graziers. The Queensland Farmers' Federation raised concerns with the committee regarding restrictions arising from SWRs, saying—

Management of SWRs will have flow on effects to the management of adjacent productive agricultural land. It is therefore essential that restrictive management practices imposed on SWRs do not negatively impact productive agricultural land and the overall management of the farming system.

The management of pests and weeds on crown land have created ongoing issues for landholders that abut these government-managed lands. The management practices used can be restrictive and frequently do not manage pests and weeds effectively.

The LNP holds serious concerns about the impact SWRs may have on adjacent agricultural producers, impacts similar to those experienced by landholders adjacent to parts of Queensland's national park estate where the inadequate management of pests, both animal and weeds, continues to negatively impact on agricultural producers trying to make a living on their land. The lack of clarity provided by the department about how owners of SWRs will be policed in the implementation of management plans on SWRs only adds to these concerns that, once declared, there is a good chance that SWRs will not be adequately managed and adjoining landholders will, of course, suffer as a result.

There continue to be a huge number of other concerns that have not been addressed by the government. For example, the National Parks Association of Queensland, NPAQ, and the Wildlife Preservation Society of Queensland have raised grave concerns with respect to the opportunity for rorting this legislation. In a damning accusation, the NPAQ slammed this bill in their submission to the committee. They stated—

The Bill currently includes no provision for management programs SWR to be reviewed or accessed by the public. Public scrutiny is necessary to ensure the areas meet their obligations under the legislation and provides a mechanism to minimise rorts. Where government funding is provided, provision should be made for public access to the management programs. Sections 120EA-EF of the Bill should be amended to require management programs for SWRs that receive government incentives to be made available to the public.

Once again we see a piece of legislation that is an attack on our farmers. Once again we see a piece of legislation from the Labor government beholden to their Left faction and the Greens. We see the march of the Left in the Labor Party that brings these laws into this place. I urge all members in this House to vote against the bill as we will be.

 **Mr BATT** (Bundaberg—LNP) (6.16 pm): I rise to make a contribution on the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. The bill was referred to the Innovation, Tourism Development and Environment Committee for consideration. I start by thanking the committee members and the secretariat for the time taken to put the report together. It should be noted that the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2017, which is substantially the same as the 2018 bill, was originally referred to the Agriculture and Environment Committee prior to the dissolution of parliament for the 2017 election.

The Innovation, Tourism Development and Environment Committee made three recommendations, including that the minister look at reasonable amendments that would improve public accountability with respect to management programs for special wildlife reserves, which we have heard mentioned several times today.

There have been numerous concerns raised by stakeholders through the committee's consideration of the bill, largely relating to the creation of special wildlife reserves, or SWRs. While the minister claims that the bill has been amended to clarify the criteria by which the minister must consider in declaring an SWR, the stark reality is that the amendments have made matters worse.

This position has been scrutinised by stakeholders including the Property Council and the Queensland Law Society. Recognising the fundamental flaws riddled throughout this legislation, in a significant statement against the bill the Queensland Law Society has stated outright that it is 'not good law'. The loose parameters regarding a 'state interest' seek to give the minister unfettered control to make declarations. At the very least, meeting the criteria should require 'economical, environmental or community interests' and 'state interests' to be satisfied. The department's responses to stakeholder submissions on this issue did little to clarify the criteria.

The Queensland Resources Council raised major concerns about special wildlife reserves being declared over land where there is an active exploration underway and recommended a clarification by the government. The LNP considers provisions to prevent commercial grazing within a 100-metre buffer between the SWR and the next property to be an unacceptable violation of the property rights of landholders.

This bill is yet another grab on the property rights of landholders. Combined with the fact that neighbouring graziers might not even be considered for consultation as a 'materially affected' party, this will be a body blow to farming families across Queensland who are already struggling with drought and flood.

The bill does not even provide a clear framework by which ecotourism proposals may be considered on land where an SWRW has been declared. We hold concerns that the bill will result in the permanent loss of valuable farming land and echo the concerns of AgForce Queensland in both this inquiry and the one undertaken in 2017.

This is not only about vital horticulture, beef and other agricultural uses that are readily identifiable with Queensland. The committee heard that even beekeeping would be considered incompatible with the SWR management principles.

The LNP hold serious concerns about the impact that an SWR may have on adjacent agricultural producers, impacts similar to those experienced by landholders adjacent to parts of Queensland's national park estate where inadequate management of pests, both animals and weeds, continues to impact negatively on agricultural producers trying to make a living on their land.

Under this bill, conservation agreements for the proposed special wildlife reserves will be perpetual—that is, future owners will be tied to the agreement. The LNP has serious concerns about the property rights of future landholders and the ability to review or renegotiate an SWR. There are very limited circumstances in which an SWR can be revoked, requiring a resolution of the parliament.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order! In accordance with the business program agreed to by the House, time for debate has expired.

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

AYES, 48:

ALP, 46—Bailey, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Miller, Mullen, B. O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 41:

LNP, 37—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Pair: Boyd, Crandon.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Mr SPEAKER: The minister's amendments Nos 7 and 8 are outside the long title of the bill and therefore require leave of the House. Is leave granted?

Leave granted.

Question put—That the minister's amendments Nos 1 to 8, as circulated, be agreed to and clauses 1 to 63, as amended, stand part of the bill.

Amendments as circulated—

1 Clause 12 (Insertion of new pt 4, div 3B)

Page 13, line 5—

omit, insert—

- (3) Also, the Minister may enter into a conservation agreement for a proposed special wildlife reserve in the Cape York Peninsula Region only if—
- (a) native title for the area has been extinguished; or
 - (b) for an area for which native title has not been extinguished—
 - (i) there is an indigenous land use agreement for the area; and
 - (ii) the dedication of a special wildlife reserve over the area is allowed under the indigenous land use agreement; and
 - (iii) the conservation agreement is consistent with the indigenous land use agreement.

(4) In this section—

2 Clause 12 (Insertion of new pt 4, div 3B)

Page 13, line 18—

omit, insert—

- (c) contain details of the management program for the special wildlife reserve; and
- (d) contain terms prohibiting the following—

3 After clause 28

Page 28, after line 7—

insert—

28A Amendment of s 132A (Committees for protected areas in Cape York Peninsula Region)

Section 132A(5)—

omit.

4 Clause 36 (Amendment of schedule (Dictionary))

Page 32, after line 7—

insert—

Cape York Peninsula Region means the Cape York Peninsula Region under the *Cape York Peninsula Heritage Act 2007*.

5 Clause 47 (Amendment of s 19 (Environmentally relevant activity may be prescribed))

Page 37, lines 27 to 29 and page 38, lines 1 to 12—

omit, insert—

(1) Section 19(1)(a) and (b)—

omit, insert—

- (a) that—
 - (i) a contaminant will or may be released into the environment when the activity is carried out; and
 - (ii) the release of the contaminant will or may cause environmental harm; or
- (b) the activity will or may otherwise adversely affect an environmental value of the marine environment.

(2) Section 19—

insert—

(1A) Without limiting subsection (1), a regulation under that subsection may prescribe an activity carried out in a relevant Great Barrier Reef Marine Park area as an environmentally relevant activity.

6 Clause 47 (Amendment of s 19 (Environmentally relevant activity may be prescribed))

Page 38, after line 18—

insert—

relevant Great Barrier Reef Marine Park area means an area—

(a) partly within the State and partly outside the State, but within the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park; or

(b) of which—

(i) part is within the State but not within the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park; and

(ii) part is outside the State but within the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park.

7 After clause 60

Page 42, after line 4—

insert—

60A Amendment of ch 15, hdg (Transitional provisions)

Chapter 15, heading, after 'Transitional'—

insert—

, declaratory and validating

60B Insertion of new ch 15, pt 16

Chapter 15—

insert—

Part 16 Declaratory and validating provisions relating to regulations

865 Declaration about *Mineral Resources Regulation 2003*

(1) The repealed *Mineral Resources Regulation 2003*, as in force from time to time before its repeal, is taken to have had effect for the declaration period as if it were amended as provided in this section.

(2) Schedule 4, part 2, section 2, after 'royalty rate for bauxite'—

insert—

sold, disposed of or used in a return period by the holder of the mining lease for the bauxite

(3) Schedule 4, part 2, section 2(a), from 'if it is sold' to 'for the bauxite'—

omit, insert—

if the bauxite is mined for consumption outside the State

(4) Schedule 4, part 2, section 2(b), from 'if it is sold' to 'for the bauxite'—

omit, insert—

if the bauxite is mined for consumption within the State

(5) Schedule 4, part 2, section 2(b)(i), from 'for a holder' to 'outside the State'—

omit, insert—

for a holder who has also sold, disposed of or used bauxite in the return period that is mined for consumption outside the State

(6) In this section—

declaration period means the period from the commencement of the *Mines and Energy Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2008* until the commencement of the *Mineral Resources Regulation 2013*.

866 Declaration about *Mineral Resources Regulation 2013*

(1) The *Mineral Resources Regulation 2013* is taken to have had effect for the declaration period as if it were amended as provided in this section.

(2) Schedule 3, section 4, after 'royalty rate for bauxite'—

insert—

sold, disposed of or used in a return period by the holder

- (3) Schedule 3, section 4(a), from 'if it is sold' to 'for the bauxite'—
omit, insert—
if the bauxite is mined for consumption outside the State
- (4) Schedule 3, section 4(b), from 'if it is sold' to 'for the bauxite'—
omit, insert—
if the bauxite is mined for consumption within the State
- (5) Schedule 3, section 4(b)(i), from 'for a holder' to 'outside the State'—
omit, insert—
for a holder who has also sold, disposed of or used bauxite in the return period that is mined for consumption outside the State
- (6) In this section—
declaration period means the period from the commencement of the *Mineral Resources Regulation 2013* until the commencement of the *Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2019*, part 10A.

867 Application of ss 865 and 866 for all purposes and validation of relevant acts

- (1) Sections 865 and 866 apply for all purposes, including for the purpose of any of the following that has been done, or is done, under this Act—
- making an assessment;
 - lodging a royalty return;
 - paying a royalty-related amount;
 - making a requirement to make a payment, keep a record, give a royalty estimate or do anything else relating to a royalty.
- (2) A person's liability to pay a royalty-related amount and all other rights and liabilities are declared to be, and to have been since the commencement of the *Mines and Energy Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2008*, for all purposes the same as if the regulations mentioned in sections 865 and 866 had been amended as provided in those sections.

868 Application to all legal proceedings

This part applies for the purpose of any legal proceeding, including a proceeding started before the commencement of this part.

8 After clause 61

Page 42, after line 8—

insert—

Part 10A Amendment of Mineral Resources Regulation 2013**61A Regulation amended**

This part amends the *Mineral Resources Regulation 2013*.

61B Amendment of sch 3 (Royalty payable for minerals)

- (1) Schedule 3, section 4, after 'royalty rate for bauxite'—
insert—
sold, disposed of or used in a return period by the holder
- (2) Schedule 3, section 4(a), from 'if' to 'for the bauxite'—
omit, insert—
if the bauxite is mined for consumption outside the State
- (3) Schedule 3, section 4(b), from 'if' to 'for the bauxite'—
omit, insert—
if the bauxite is mined for consumption within the State
- (4) Schedule 3, section 4(b)(i), from 'for a holder' to 'outside the State'—
omit, insert—
for a holder who has also sold, disposed of or used bauxite in the return period that is mined for consumption outside the State

Motion agreed to.

Amendments agreed to.

Clauses 1 to 63, as amended, agreed to.

Third Reading

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

AYES, 48:

ALP, 46—Bailey, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D’Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Miller, Mullen, B. O’Rourke, C. O’Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 41:

LNP, 37—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O’Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Pair: Boyd, Crandon.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title

Question put—That the minister’s amendment No. 9, as circulated, be agreed to.

Amendment as circulated—

9 Long title

Long title, after ‘*Mineral Resources Act 1989*,’—

insert—

the Mineral Resources Regulation 2013,

Motion agreed to.

Amendment agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to.

JUSTICE LEGISLATION (LINKS TO TERRORIST ACTIVITY) AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 13 November 2018 (see p. 3391).

Second Reading



Hon. YM D’ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (6.33 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

On 13 November 2018 the Palaszczuk government introduced the Justice Legislation (Links to Terrorist Activity) Amendment Bill 2018. The bill creates new presumptions against bail and parole for persons with links to terrorism. The parliament referred the bill to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee for consideration and requested that the committee report on the bill. The committee tabled its report on 7 March 2019 and made just one recommendation—that the Justice Legislation (Links to Terrorist Activity) Amendment Bill 2018 be passed.

I thank the committee for its consideration of the bill and for its careful consideration of the public submissions received. I would like to thank all those who made submissions to the committee, many of whom also provided earlier feedback during consultation on the legislative reforms contained in the bill. I again acknowledge that stakeholders have raised concerns that the higher thresholds introduced by bail and parole under the bill represent departures from legal principles and could be viewed as an erosion of the general protections that the criminal justice system affords to defendants and prisoners.

The threat posed by terrorism to the safety of our community remains ever present. Nowhere is immune. All Australian governments have a duty to work together and take appropriate action to respond to this threat in the interests of community safety. Sometimes this means taking extraordinary measures that may impact adversely on the rights and liberties that underpin our free and democratic society. Ultimately what is important is ensuring that an appropriate balance is struck between the right of all citizens to go about their daily activities free from acts of violent terror and the rights of individuals who come before our criminal justice system to be dealt with fairly.

This balancing exercise is complex, but I can assure the House that the amendments contained in this bill strike the right balance. This bill reflects important lessons learned from previous terrorist incidents in Australia. It proceeds on the basis that the ultimate goal in our fight against terrorism is to prevent terrorist acts from occurring. In recent years Australian authorities have successfully disrupted a number of planned attacks. We cannot be complacent, though. The risk to community safety posed by people with demonstrated and substantive links to terrorism must be capable of being acted upon. The nature of the terrorist threat we are faced with today shows us that motivated individuals can act quickly to carry out attacks with limited preparation but with devastating consequences to the community.

The bill's amendments act to ensure that the opportunity to address the terrorist risk posed by certain persons at crucial junctures in their interactions with the criminal justice system is not lost. The bill does this by requiring courts and the Queensland Parole Board to directly consider the risk posed by persons with terrorism links regardless of the nature of the offending to which their considerations primarily relate.

The bill also aligns with agreed national principles developed to ensure the application of the presumptions against bail and parole across Australia in agreed circumstances. Nationally consistent approaches are fundamentally important to the effectiveness of our efforts to combat terrorism, not least in the legislative arena. As I referred to in my speech introducing this bill, the bill's amendments implement the agreement of the Council of Australian Governments to ensure that there will be a presumption against bail or parole for persons who have demonstrated support for or who have links to terrorist activity.

I now turn to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee report on the bill. Once again, I thank the committee for its comprehensive consideration of the bill and welcome its overarching findings that the bill's provisions are warranted on the basis of overriding considerations of public safety. I would like to draw the attention of the House to one small point in the committee's report that requires clarification.

The Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee noted that amendments to section 13 of the Bail Act provide that only a court may grant bail to a person who has previously been convicted of a terrorism offence or who is, or has been, the subject of a Commonwealth control order. The amendments clarify that for the purpose of such grants of bail a court does not include a justice or justices. The committee goes on to state that this would preclude a magistrate or Magistrates Court from granting bail to a person in these circumstances. I acknowledge the comment of the committee. However, I want to be very clear in my advice to the House that this is not the intent of the amendment.

The exclusion of a justice or justices from the meaning of court within the new section 13(2) should be read alongside the definition of 'justice' in the Acts Interpretation Act 1954 which means a justice of the peace. The amendment is not intended to restrict bail applications to the higher courts. While I applaud the hard work and dedication of Queensland's justices of the peace, the intent of this amendment is to confirm that only a court constituted by a judicial officer, that being any court including a Magistrates Court, may grant bail in these circumstances.

I will now further outline the bill's significant amendments. Before I begin I would note that both Minister Ryan and Minister Farmer are also intending to speak to this bill given its amendments to the Corrective Services Act 2006 and the Youth Justice Act 1992. I will provide a broad outline of the bill's amendments to these acts. However, I take this opportunity to note that my ministerial colleagues the Hon. Mark Ryan, Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services, and the Hon. Di Farmer, Minister for Child Safety, Youth and Women and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, will provide the House with additional information with respect to amendments in this bill which relate to their portfolio legislation and responsibilities. I thank my ministerial colleagues and their departments for their cooperation throughout the development of this legislation.

The bill amends the Bail Act and the Youth Justice Act to reverse the presumption in favour of bail for an adult or child who has previously been convicted of a terrorism offence or who is or who has previously been subject of a Commonwealth control order. These presumptions apply regardless of the offence the person is alleged to have committed.

For bail to be granted for offenders falling into these categories, the court must be satisfied that exceptional circumstances exist to justify granting bail. Such offenders have been found to pose a serious risk to community safety in accordance with high legal thresholds. It is therefore appropriate that such persons not be granted bail unless they can establish to the satisfaction of the court that exceptional circumstances exist to justify their release on bail. As I mentioned earlier, only a court—and this includes a Magistrates, District or Supreme Court—will be able to grant bail in these circumstances.

The bill specifically provides that the court may have regard to any relevant matter when considering whether exceptional circumstances exist. The bill makes it clear that, in addition to being satisfied that exceptional circumstances exist, the existing general considerations relating to a decision to grant bail continue to apply. This means a court cannot grant bail to a person who is otherwise an unacceptable bail risk because, for example, they would fail to appear in court, would commit an offence or endanger the safety or welfare of a person or should be in custody for their own protection even if exceptional circumstances exist.

Importantly, as I indicated in my speech introducing the bill and wish to reinforce here today, the bill retains all existing procedural safeguards and appeal and review mechanisms available in relation to both bail and parole applications.

The bill will reverse the presumption for bail for children under the Youth Justice Act for the first time. The bill introduces additional factors that a bail decision-maker must consider when determining bail for any defendant, not just those subject to the new presumption against bail. These amendments add to the existing non-limiting list of specified considerations in both the Bail Act and the Youth Justice Act to signal the importance of having regard to the risk of links to terrorist activity for the purpose of assessing whether a defendant currently poses an unacceptable risk if released on bail.

The amendments require a bail decision-maker to consider any promotion by the defendant of terrorism or any association the defendant has or has had with a terrorist organisation or a person who has promoted terrorism when considering whether a defendant is an unacceptable risk for release to bail. A person has promoted terrorism if they have carried out an activity to support the carrying out of a terrorist act, made a statement in support of the carrying out of a terrorist act, or carried out an activity, or made a statement, to advocate the carrying out of a terrorist act or support the carrying out of a terrorist act.

The bill makes it clear that when considering promotion of terrorism any reference to a terrorist act includes a terrorist act that has not happened and is not limited to a specific terrorist act. As I mentioned on introducing the bill, the concept of promoting terrorism is adopted consistently in amendments to all four acts amended. It is imperative that the court should be required to consider these additional factors when determining the issue of unacceptable risk. The bill does not change the overriding requirement that all matters considered by the court in assessing unacceptable risk must be relevant. This will ensure that any inadvertent links to terrorism are not captured by the new provisions.

Amendments to the Youth Justice Act clarify that only associations of the child that are for the purpose of supporting a person or terrorist organisation in carrying out a terrorist act or promoting terrorism are relevant matters for consideration. This explicitly recognises the vulnerability and lack of autonomy of children in their associations.

The bill amends the Corrective Services Act to create a presumption against parole for prisoners who fall into one of two categories. The first category includes prisoners who have been convicted of a terrorism offence, who are subject of a control order or who the Parole Board Queensland are satisfied have promoted terrorism. The second category includes prisoners who have been charged but not convicted of a terrorism offence, who have previously been the subject of a control order or who the Parole Board is satisfied have associated with a terrorist organisation or a person who has promoted terrorism. This second category only applies where the Commissioner of Police has provided a report to the Parole Board identifying that there is a reasonable likelihood that a prisoner may carry out a terrorist act. In all of these circumstances, the bill provides that parole may only be granted if the Parole Board Queensland is satisfied that exceptional circumstances exist.

The bill allows the Parole Board to request that the Commissioner of Police provide a report in relation to specified links to terrorism as well as the likelihood of a prisoner carrying out a terrorist act. The Commissioner of Police can refuse to provide information to the Parole Board in certain circumstances. These exceptions to the requirement that the Commissioner of Police provide information ensure that sensitive information can be appropriately protected while also ensuring that the Parole Board can access relevant information about a prisoner's links to terrorism.

Additional powers are provided to the Parole Board to support the amendments in the bill. These include powers to suspend or cancel a prisoner's parole order if the Parole Board becomes aware that the prisoner poses a risk of carrying out a terrorist act.

The bill also contains amendments to the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992 to apply the presumption against parole to Queensland's system of court ordered parole. Under the Penalties and Sentences Act, a sentencing court is required to set a court ordered release date for persons sentenced for offences where the maximum penalty is three years or less and the offence is not a serious violent or sexual offence. The bill's amendments introduce a discretion for the sentencing court to decline to order a parole release date and instead enable the court to order a parole eligibility date for offenders who have been convicted of a terrorism offence or who are the subject of a Commonwealth control order. The discretion also applies where the court is satisfied that the offender has carried out activities, or made statements, in various circumstances relating to terrorist acts.


The bill's provisions balance the practical advantages of court ordered parole against the need to ensure the protection of the community from persons with links to terrorism. Importantly, the bill also provides additional powers to the Parole Board to suspend or cancel parole if the board becomes aware that a prisoner on parole poses a terrorist risk.

The bill also accommodates the fact that there is no system of parole for children in Queensland. Queensland's Youth Justice Act provides for a system of supervised release of children into the community after they have completed a detention order. Children sentenced to detention must serve 70 per cent of the period of detention in a youth detention centre. They then spend the remaining time in the community under a supervised release order. A sentencing court has discretion to reduce the period to be served in actual custody from 70 per cent to a minimum of 50 per cent of the total period of detention ordered, if special circumstances exist.

In balancing the benefits to be derived from the child serving part of a detention order under supervised release in the community against the need to protect the community from an identified terrorist risk posed by the child, the bill removes the ability of the court to reduce the prescribed period of 70 per cent for certain offenders with terrorism links. Child offenders who have previously been found guilty of a terrorism offence, who are the subject of a control order or who the sentencing court is satisfied have promoted terrorism and who are sentenced to a detention order will be required to serve 70 per cent of the period of detention in custody.

Importantly, the bill's amendments retain the ultimate discretion of the sentencing court in relation to the range of sentencing options available to it, including the appropriate length of any detention order it is minded to impose. Following the release of a child from detention, a supervised release order must be made in relation to the child. The bill ensures that any residual terrorism risk posed by the child offender upon release is managed via appropriate conditions designed to reduce the risk of the child carrying out a terrorist act or promoting terrorism.

Finally, I want to close by reaffirming this government's commitment to doing whatever it can to keep Queenslanders safe from the enduring threat posed by those who wish to do us harm and attack our very way of life. These new bail and parole laws form a discrete yet very important part of the comprehensive work this government and its core agencies are continually undertaking in order to confront the threat of terrorism in Queensland and across Australia. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr JANETZKI** (Toowoomba South—LNP) (6.48 pm): I rise to be lead for the opposition on the Justice Legislation (Links to Terrorist Activity) Amendment Bill 2018 and confirm that the opposition will be supporting the bill. Mr Deputy Speaker Stewart, with your brief indulgence, I do not think I can make a contribution on this bill without acknowledging recent events in Christchurch. From me personally, I send my sincere condolences to the loved ones of everyone who lost their life in Christchurch. It was deeply disturbing that an Australian would perpetrate such violence. It was even more disturbing that it was done at a time of peaceful prayer. It is deeply saddening that the Muslim community in Christchurch has been so deeply impacted and my sincere condolences go to them.

I also acknowledge that I represent a significant Muslim population in Toowoomba. I was unable to be present at the Garden City Mosque when our community gathered together to respect those from the Muslim community in Christchurch who had lost their lives. However, it was heartening to see our community out in force—Christians, Muslims, Buddhists, Zoroastrians. Whatever religion we had in our city, they were there in force; our community was out in force. Our local government passed a resolution acknowledging the loss in Christchurch.

As I said, I did not think I could make a contribution to this bill without saying how deeply saddened I personally was and how I am very honoured to stand with our Muslim community in Toowoomba and their leaders—our imam, Abdul Kader, and our Islamic Society of Toowoomba leader, Shahjahan Khan—in condemning the violence. I am very fortunate to represent their interests in this House as well.

I turn to the bill itself. It is true that the threat of terrorist attacks in Australia and obviously around the Western World and in other places of the world remains elevated and Australians are viewed as targets by people who do want to do us harm. This is why we must ensure tough measures are in place against people who have been convicted of terrorism offences. On 9 July 2017 the Council of Australian Governments—COAG—agreed that there will be a presumption that neither bail nor parole will be granted to those persons who have demonstrated support for, or have links to, terrorist activity, which was the COAG commitment. As the Attorney-General has outlined with great detail, this bill delivers on this COAG agreement.

If honourable members recall, at that time there had been a number of terrorist attacks in Australia. Man Haron Monis, the Lindt Cafe, Sydney siege perpetrator had received bail and Yacqub Khayre was out on parole when he shot a man and took a woman hostage in Melbourne. Those were the circumstances which led to the COAG discussion which has ultimately led to the bill before the House this evening.

A nationally consistent approach is fundamental in combatting terrorism, and Queensland must be proactive to match the evolving threat of terrorism with strong safeguards to protect our community. To deliver on this it is imperative that this state joins forces with other states and territories to deliver one united approach to terrorism. As the scale and tempo of the threats evolve, so too must our response. As I said already, this bill implements the COAG agreement that there will be a presumption that neither bail nor parole will be granted to those persons who have demonstrated support for, or have links to, terrorist activity.

There are amendments to section 16 of the Bail Act to add new subsections (g) and (h) to include new matters that the police or court must have regard to when deciding whether to refuse bail. In assessing whether there is an unacceptable risk to refuse bail, the court or police officer must have regard to any promotion by the defendant of terrorism or any association the defendant has or has had with a terrorist organisation or a person who has promoted terrorism. A new section 16A will also be inserted into the Bail Act, which will require a court to refuse to grant bail to any person previously convicted of a terrorism offence unless the court is satisfied exceptional circumstances exist to justify granting bail. This will reverse the statutory presumption in favour of bail.

I note that the presumption against bail applies to people who have a previous terrorism conviction. I also note that a person with a previous terrorism conviction who at a later date is charged with a minor criminal offence, for example a break and enter, will also have their presumption of bail reversed. This new section relating to the presumption against bail relates only to persons convicted of terrorism offences but not those charged with terrorism offences. I note the Bar Association made submissions in this regard and raised concerns about the new section 16A, noting that—

It is important to note that none of the proposed amendments concerning bail are intended to apply to any person (child or adult) who has been charged with a terrorism offence. They talk only to those previously convicted of such offences.

The Association could well understand the necessity for a more stringent test for those actually charged with a terrorism offence. However, the circumstances which give rise to the need for this test to apply to any person previously convicted of such an offence are unknown and certainly not explained in the material provided.

The bill also creates a presumption against parole for prisoners who have been convicted of a terrorism offence or who are the subject of a control order as well as those who have promoted terrorism. This ensures those offenders with demonstrable links to terrorist activity are captured by the reforms. The presumption for parole is also reversed in circumstances where the Commissioner of Police provides a report to the Parole Board identifying that there is a reasonable likelihood that a prisoner may carry out a terrorist act.

The bill amends section 227 of the Youth Justice Act to remove the discretion of a sentencing court to order a release date any earlier than after serving 70 per cent of a period of detention. This will apply to a child who has been found guilty of a terrorism offence who is the subject of a control order or who has promoted terrorism. I acknowledge that the Attorney-General has said that her ministerial colleagues the member for Bulimba and the member for Morayfield will provide more details in respect of the amendments to the acts in their particular portfolios in this regard.

I want to turn next to the issues raised by the Queensland Law Society and the Bar Association of Queensland. The Attorney-General has mentioned them, but I felt it worthy of some further examination. They relate to the balancing of civil liberties with community security. They are worthy questions to be asked of us as politicians by the judiciary and by lawyers, and it is important that we address them. Right across the nation various other jurisdictions have grappled with these issues, whether it be Victoria or New South Wales, and have ultimately sided with community security, community safety, putting the communal interest ahead of the rights of those who would seek to do us harm through terrorist activity or through threats of terrorism. I take this question back to 2005.

The first major attack that brought this threat of terrorism to us was obviously September 11, 2001 with the felling of the Twin Towers. The second major terrorist attack that brought this to our attention was in London—the London bombings on 7/7. In response to that it was the Howard government that introduced a range of offences or took a range of steps that raised these questions of balancing civil liberties with the communal interest of security and brought them to the public attention. Some of those early matters related to control orders, the preventative detention without charge or trial of potential terrorist suspects and warrantless searches. Many of these issues were broad in nature. They did go against centuries of Western legal thought—there is no denying it—but they were done to address the particular threat of the moment in the same way the law was changed in the United Kingdom to address the threat of the IRA in the 1970s and 1980s. The question of civil liberties and our balancing of that harmony between civil liberties of the individuals of our state with the communal interest has always ebbed and flowed, and that will continue to be the case.


I always think that if there is a curtailment of civil liberties in our nation it must be necessary and it must be proportionate. I believe—obviously in our support of this bill tonight—that that standard, that threshold, has been met. I speak with some personal experience on this as I was present in London and lived through the terrorist attacks of 7 July 2005. I worked beside somebody who lost a loved one in that attack. If honourable members recall, 52 people died in that attack and over 700 people were injured as the commuters of London went to work. Those attacks were at three tube stations, one near Russell Square and two along the Circle line at Aldgate and Edgware Road, and there was a bus at Tavistock Square. This was indiscriminate terror launched against the commuters of London, unsuspecting, innocent civilians as they went to work. In my workplace a number of people who had been on the Piccadilly line came in covered in soot, unaware of what had happened.

If you recall, this was a time before iPhones and mass communication. Some of us had Blackberries, but nobody had iPhones and cameras. It was very unclear as to what was happening, but what was clear was terror. There was terror on the streets of London that day. I will never, ever forget the sound of sirens in the two weeks following 7 July. London was full of sirens, and some of the suicide bombers who had failed to detonate their bombs were on the loose.

Debate, on motion of Mr Janetzki, adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

Caloundra Electorate; Governing from the Regions, Sunshine Coast

 **Mr McARDLE** (Caloundra—LNP) (7.00 pm): Recently the Sunshine Coast was subjected to a visit by the Palaszczuk Labor government. The best we can say of the visit is that at least they now know where it is—or at least their drivers do. We were promised that Labor would govern from the coast. What they failed to do was provide for the coast. Their daily pronouncements often made an appearance on page 8 or 9 of the local paper. After they left I believe that Mayor Mark Jamieson made the comment that the coast had gained nothing from them. I am surprised the mayor thought that we would. Let's be truthful: I do not believe the Palaszczuk government has any real understanding of the needs or aspirations of Sunshine Coast residents.


Whilst they were there I received a phone call from the local ABC Radio, saying they were doing a live morning broadcast from Kings Beach and would I attend. I readily agreed. On getting there, the announcer said on air that they had made two telephone calls to the Premier asking if she would talk

to them, but she did not. They even suggested she do a telephone interview; she did not. When we talk about governing from the Sunshine Coast, it appears that Labor is not interested in hearing from the people of the coast or, indeed, Caloundra. In fact, the telecast was adjacent to Kings Beach—one of the best beaches on the coast—just outside two restaurants that abut the beach. There could not have been a better spot for the Premier to hear from the people of Caloundra. There would have been 30 or 40 people there at any given time, with people moving in and out of the two restaurants. She could have sent somebody else down—maybe even the Deputy Premier or maybe even Mark Bailey, the transport minister, who could have spoken about the road network in Caloundra—but she did not.

One announcement that was made by the transport minister concerned an amended bus service through Bellvista. The only problem is that they cut existing bus stops, which means that people have to walk longer distances to catch a bus. Many of these people are retired and simply do not have the ability to do so. That did not worry the transport minister: he simply cut the services. To my knowledge there was no prior consultation; he simply made the announcement. Ironically, the local Labor Party arranged a meeting with the minister, but it would appear that the minister did not tell his own party what his intention was. In fact, I have not heard one public comment from the ALP in Caloundra condemning the minister.

As I said, the Labor Party government may now know where the coast is, but they have no understanding of the needs of the coast's residents nor, indeed, any part of Noosa or the Sunshine Coast as a whole.

Berminham, Ms C


 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (7.03 pm): Tonight I rise in the adjournment debate to pay tribute to a great Labor stalwart, a friend of mine and a friend to many in this chamber. I do want to acknowledge that shortly after me the member for Greenslopes will make a contribution with regard to Catherine Berminham.

I acknowledge in the gallery tonight members of Catherine's family. Catherine passed away last December, tragically just a few days before Christmas and very suddenly without any warning. I knew Catherine for the entirety of my membership of the Australian Labor Party. As a local councillor in the Holland Park ward and then the East Brisbane ward, Catherine was a fantastic local representative and a true champion for the local community. She was always out and about ensuring that the needs of her community—whether they were residents, environmental groups or businesses—were represented forcefully and compassionately within council chambers.

When I was very heavily pregnant with my first son, Leo, I remember volunteering on one of her campaigns. Can I say that it was less of a campaign office and more of a creche. There were lots of women, lots of babies and lots of activity happening in order to get ready for the council elections. I am very, very proud of the contribution that I made to Catherine's role as a local councillor and as a representative of the Labor Party. I am also incredibly pleased that had she had an opportunity to spend some time working for me when I became the member for South Brisbane. I always appreciated and respected her advice and hard work. Catherine was the type of person who was a friend, but she would also work hard for you. I know that later she went on to fill a similar role for the member for Greenslopes as well, and she loved working for Joe.

To her family, can I acknowledge that have you lost such a big part of your family and such a big part of your heart. Catherine loved you so tremendously and constantly talked about you and your achievements and things that were happening in your lives, particularly the grandchildren. I want to acknowledge your loss and pay my condolences to Damien, Lee, Vanessa and Ursula, her children whom she loved so much, and to Ron, her partner in life. She absolutely loved you. I wish you all the best and may she rest in peace.

Gregory Electorate, Renal Dialysis Services

 **Mr MILLAR** (Gregory—LNP) (7.06 pm): Today I table a nonconforming petition of 655 electors from the Gregory electorate.

Tabled paper: Nonconforming petition regarding delivery of local renal dialysis services to Emerald and Longreach [\[420\]](#).

This petition seeks to draw the attention of the House to the urgent need of renal dialysis services in Emerald and Longreach hospitals. This is a matter of great urgency because of the hardship that the lack of services places on my constituents. Renal dialysis is not optional: it is an ongoing and life-saving treatment.


Take the case of Lyndell Polkorny. Lyndell and her husband, Neil, from Longreach, have been in Rockhampton for over three months now in order for Lyndell to receive a five-hour dialysis treatment three times a week. With no dialysis chair in Longreach, Lyndell and her husband, Neil, have been forced to lock up their home in Longreach and relocate to Rockhampton for an unspecified and unpredictable period of time. This means that they have both had to quit their jobs. They are living in a small cabin in a caravan park which is paid for by the Central Queensland Health and Hospital Service. They are very grateful for this, but they are worried that this funding may expire before Lyndell's treatment is completed.

Recently Lyndell had to travel from Rockhampton to Brisbane for additional treatment which is connected to her condition. Even though the trip was only a couple of days, and even though the trip was medically prescribed, and even though Lyndell had to return immediately to resume dialysis, Neil and Lyndell had to pack and store their belongings in their car so the cabin could be vacated for their brief absence. There is no sense of security and wellbeing, but there are no flights between Longreach and Rockhampton and return trip by road is around 1,400 kilometres.

Take the case of Mr Ian Williams of Emerald. Emerald is four hours closer to Rockhampton, so Ian takes the bus to Rockhampton for his treatments. It is a six-hour round trip, and Ian can only travel according to the bus schedule. His specialist prescribed five hours of dialysis three times a week alternatively on Monday, Wednesday and Friday one week and Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday the next. Due to the bus and hospital schedules he does not receive the prescribed amount on the prescribed schedule.

In answer to a question on notice in August last year, the health minister advised that he had commissioned a statewide review of renal services in Queensland to assist in planning for improved statewide services. As we approach the budget period I plead with the Minister for Health, Steven Miles, not to forget the constituents of Gregory and the need for renal dialysis chairs in Emerald and Longreach hospitals when he puts his funding plans together. He has opened a service in Bowen, which is closer to Mackay than Emerald or Longreach are to Rockhampton. I ask the minister to please put his commitment behind this petition and deliver the constituents of Gregory renal dialysis, which is life-saving treatment. It is needed in the area. We need to have that sort of care in regional and rural Queensland.

Bermingham, Ms C

 **Mr KELLY** (Greenslopes—ALP) (7.09 pm): I join the Deputy Premier in saying a few words in memory of Catherine Bermingham. I acknowledge Catherine's husband, Ron, who is in the gallery, along with other family members and friends. I pass on my condolences and those of my family, her co-workers, many of our branch members and local community members.

Like a lot of good political friendships, ours began with a verbal joust across a room. Catherine was the councillor for East Brisbane and attended every branch meeting when I was first involved in the Labor Party. She kept branch members informed and was not afraid of a robust debate. Catherine had a wicked sense of humour, and any debate with her was always enjoyable and enlightening—and we had many of them!

As I left my house this morning I saw the road safety measures that were put in place near our local school by Catherine many years ago. When I told her about my concerns about road safety at the local school she came out straightaway, had a look at the problem and came back with a solution. She worked hard to get funding for the measures to improve safety. We are still benefiting from her work all these years later.

As I stepped out of my door this morning I was reminded of one of my other early interactions with Catherine. Coming home from the hospital following the slightly difficult birth of our eldest daughter and an extended stay in the special care nursery, we found a present on our doorstep from Catherine. It was the very first present our daughter received. That says a lot about the sort of person Catherine was.


Catherine was a hard worker. She always arrived at my office first. In fact, for a few weeks I tried to beat her in. I would set my alarm, get up early and get organised. I would get to the office early, thinking, 'This is the day. I'm going to get there.' I can advise the House that she always beat me in to the office and she worked hard all day long. She was well loved by the people in our community. When she started in my office she had been out of the council for 10 years, but there was a constant stream of people coming to see Catherine.

Catherine was born in humble circumstances. She was a St Ursula's Toowoomba girl. She was committed to building a fairer society and held her Labor values dear. She knew that for Jim Soorley or any other leader to stand and implement Labor policy an army of very average people had to stand next to signs on corners, fill letterboxes, raise money, lead community debates and knock on doors—and she never shied away from these tasks, even after leaving office as a councillor. She continued to support the Labor Party wherever she was living. She was a true believer and was deeply respected in the Labor Party and across political lines. The attendance at her funeral of Kevin Rudd, Jim Soorley and a host of other Labor Party members, including people from this House and former council colleagues from all parties, reinforced for me the high regard in which she was held.

My wife and I visited Catherine and Ron last year in Toowoomba. She showed me her lovely garden and her art studio full of amazing work. I spoke to Catherine by chance the day before her unexpected passing. We discussed art, gardening and of course politics. She was helping with campaigns right until the end.

Catherine knew what was important in life and she committed herself to these things totally. Family was her No. 1 priority. I am so pleased to have some of her children and grandchildren still living in my electorate. She loved art and she loved gardening, but she loved politics—not for the power but for the capacity it has to improve our society. Vale, Catherine Bermingham.

Nolan Jr, Mr B; Pfeffer, Mr L; Raine, Prof. S


 **Mr WEIR** (Condamine—LNP) (7.12 pm): In the past six months the agricultural sector in Queensland has lost three prominent men, all taken too early: Professor Steven Raine, Basil Nolan Jr and Lyndon Pfeffer. All three played significant roles in each of their agricultural pursuits. Queensland agriculture has lost a wealth of knowledge with their passing.

Basil Nolan Jr was a multigenerational thoroughbred breeder. He owned and managed the Raheen Stud at Gladfield, near Warwick. The whole racing industry across Australia knew the name Basil Nolan Jr and his love of thoroughbreds. Basil was described as one of the industry's true gentlemen who was a great horseman, a warm and generous man devoted to his family and a wonderful advocate for the thoroughbred industry. It was with great sadness that I heard of the terrible accident that had taken Basil's life at such an early age. He will be truly missed by all who knew him, as well as for his contribution to the thoroughbred industry in Queensland.

Lyndon Pfeffer passed away several weeks after being involved in a two-vehicle accident as he was turning into his property at Pampas. Lyndon was the former AgForce grains president, a position he held from 2005 until 2010. His input and knowledge of the grains sector had many positive outcomes and did much to advance the industry. Lyndon was dedicated to his community and the grains industry, culminating in him winning the Queensland Grain Grower of the Year in 2012, where he was presented with the Jason Rae Memorial award. Lyndon was a prominent farmer on the Darling Downs, known and respected by many in the district. His untimely death was a sad loss to the grains industry in Queensland.

Professor Steven Raine was a man I admired from the first time I met him. His enthusiasm and passion for the agricultural sector were infectious. To lose such a brilliant mind to brain cancer was particularly sad. Steve joined USQ in 1995 as associate head of the agricultural and environmental engineering faculty and held a number of other positions before becoming executive director of the Institute for Agriculture and the Environment in 2013. During his time at USQ Steve developed and presented education and training programs to engage industry partners and encourage effective educational partnering within the community. All levels of government regularly sought his advice on many agricultural matters, and he was regarded by industry and government as one of Australia's key agricultural research leaders and industry champions. In Steve's own words, he was 'dedicated to a positive sustainable future for global agriculture, achieved through building a broad community of trust based on collaboration and effective communication of science'. I offer my sympathies to the families and friends of these three remarkable men.

Operation Energise

 **Mr KING** (Kurwongbah—ALP) (7.15 pm): I am always amused at the constant barrage of negativity from those opposite about the union movement while they appear to ignore any transgressions from banks and employer and industry groups that advocate on behalf of business, farmers and others. It seems that only the representatives of workers come under LNP fire. When a

union—in this case the mighty Electrical Trades Union—steps up to help a community, I wait to see if those opposite will rise and thank the great unionists and businesses who have come together to help out, in this case in our state's north.

Operation Energise is an ETU initiative that mobilises every time our state suffers from a natural disaster or a community is impacted by loss of electricity to a large number of residents. Their work is done for free to provide electrical work and testing to home owners and community groups who have copped nature's worst. The service is largely for those who are uninsured, as there are local electrical contractors who are very busy doing insurance work and need that work themselves to rebuild and should not have their livelihoods taken, even for such a good cause.


A few weeks ago I was honoured to be invited along to the Operation Energise Townsville premobilisation briefing here in the parliamentary precinct. I was very impressed at the professionalism of the team and the project overall. I have participated in an Operation Energise, helping out in Bundaberg after its devastating flood event, so I have firsthand experience of how lives can be changed due to this work. On the day briefings were given by not only Keith Mackenzie, the ETU organiser running the operation, but also the Electrical Safety Office. Mates in Construction were also on hand to offer their support and knowledge. Mates in Construction had a representative in the area during the course of the operation to provide support not only to the Operation Energise crew but also to residents who were feeling the overwhelming weight of these circumstances and needed emotional support.

It was nice to see Minister Lynham attend to show support. The Deputy Premier and ministers Cameron Dick and Mick de Brenni also dropped by to show their appreciation. Other members who dropped in were the member for Redlands, Kim Richards, and the member for Thuringowa, Aaron Harper, who, along with his Townsville colleagues, has dealt with the devastation firsthand on a daily basis. I know that the hardworking local members would have been out there every day helping to clean up as much as possible.

During the course of this exercise over 90 jobs were completed in the region. I place on record my appreciation of the industries that continually support this important operation. I also mention Electro Group Apprentices, Powerlink, the Electrical Trades Union, Energy Super, Mates in Energy and the Electrical Safety Office.

The 10 members of this deployment are now part of history, and I look forward to catching up with them again at a thankyou barbecue soon. What they have experienced together is something they will talk about for the rest of their lives. They should hold their heads high, knowing they did their bit to support the community of Townsville.

Hit-and-Run Laws


 **Mr KNUTH** (Hill—KAP) (7.18 pm): There is overwhelming sentiment and outrage statewide about our weak hit-and-run laws. This outrage is demonstrated in two petitions calling for tougher penalties for hit-and-run offenders. One is from a family in my electorate who recently submitted their petition online calling for tougher penalties for hit-and-run offenders. This petition has attracted over 22,000 signatures. I ask members to imagine if their son or daughter was hit by a car and left to die at the side of the road while the offender simply drives away, not bothering to stop to see if their life could be saved. Then you find out that the maximum penalty for hit-and-run offences is 12 months—hardly an adequate penalty for taking a life or causing a serious injury. This is the situation faced by many Queensland families, including three cases that I know of in Far North Queensland.

Our state's hit-and-run penalties are the softest in Australia and we are allowing perpetrators to walk free. We are far behind other states such as New South Wales, the Northern Territory, Victoria and South Australia where hit-and-run penalties allow up to 10 years in prison if an incident causes death or seven years for serious injury. Tougher hit-and-run penalties will make drivers stop and think before leaving the scene of an accident. They will also act as a deterrent for those considering drink driving, driving while under the influence of a drug or driving while unlicensed or suspended. Hit and runs are viewed by Queenslanders as a cowardly act. Offenders show absolutely no regard for human life.

I want to acknowledge and thank the member for Barron River, who is also sponsoring a Queensland parliamentary petition to change outdated Queensland laws that allow hit-and-run perpetrators to walk free. Like me, the member's petition is calling for increased maximum penalties for drivers who fail to remain at the scene of a road accident and fail to assist an injured person. The petition also calls for those who fail to remain at the scene to be automatically deemed as driving while under the influence. Further to this, an offender's driver's licence would immediately be suspended and

lost for incidents that result in grievous bodily harm or death. This is not an issue that should be fought along political lines or beliefs; it should be a bipartisan call for action to change the penalties for what is an obvious flaw in our sentencing laws for hit-and-run offenders. As I said, the overwhelming sentiment is that we need stronger penalties for hit-and-run offenders to save lives. We owe it to the families devastated by these tragedies.

Townsville Electorate, Floods Recovery Assistance


 **Mr STEWART** (Townsville—ALP) (7.21 pm): I want to thank all members in advance for their support for the Premier's flood relief event tomorrow night and encourage them all to make sure that they dig deep in their pockets and bring out as much cash as they possibly can because they will be supporting the people in the north who have lost everything. Probably one of the best things they could do is come and visit—come up to Townsville and see the Cowboys play and go across to Magnetic Island and spend some time on the beautiful secluded beaches over there. People should come, bring their families and spend some time in our great part of the world.

Last week I attended a small business recovery centre workshop along with the member for Thuringowa to determine how better-do centres like this support small businesses affected by catastrophic events like our flooding. The feedback was that we are doing well, but obviously there is certainly room for some improvements. The Queensland Rural and Industry Development Authority, or QRIDA, has as of midday today approved 161 grants to the value of \$2.5 million across the Townsville region. That is certainly helping some of those businesses get back on their feet. The Palaszczuk government is committed to helping the business community affected by floods get back on its feet as quickly as possible. I must congratulate the Premier for her support post flooding events. She has been in Townsville that many times that I think I am almost ready to put her on the electoral roll.

However, there are still over 1,400 houses that are still deemed to be uninhabitable, forcing families to live in accommodation across our city. In a recent meeting with insurance providers, builders, subcontractors and tradies, we were informed that the recovery time for some of these homes could be as long as 12 to 18 months. Insurance companies also told us that this is the quickest recovery time they have ever experienced, with builders and tradies working exceptionally long days to get people back in their homes. I can attest to that: I hear it all on Sunday morning kicking off at seven o'clock down my street!

We also heard from insurance companies that there will be an avalanche of work for tradies in the coming weeks, especially in the cabinet making industry with approximately \$500,000 of work each week going into the industry. My concern is for the local builders and tradies to ensure that they get every opportunity to rebuild our community. We know that when local workers get contracts for work they keep money in our local community and that keeps our locals employed. We also want our locals being paid at local prices, not predetermined prices set by insurance companies based on southern undercut rates. Panel builders who come into our city and undercut our builders and tradies will create greater problems. After panel builders are gone, any rectification or defect work from repairs has to be done by local tradies who missed out on the original work. We do not want to see these seagulls fly into our city, mess all over the place and fly out, leaving us to clean up the mess. It is also a warning to our local builders and tradies: this is not an opportunity to price gouge your community.


Theodore Electorate, M1 Motorway Upgrade

 **Mr BOOTHMAN** (Theodore—LNP) (7.24 pm): The M1 motorway exit 57 is a topic that I have spoken about in this chamber many times. It is a critically important interchange in the Theodore electorate. Since it was first constructed in 2001, it has become one of the busiest interchanges on the northern Gold Coast. During the last state election both major parties committed to funding an upgrade of this interchange, which was certainly welcomed by local residents, but in May 2018 residents were horrified when they saw solar panels being installed on the land that residents were hoping would become a slip lane to bypass the congestion and have direct access to the M1 motorway. Residents demanded a petition to force the government to install that slip lane and remove the solar panels which 1,416 residents signed. Unfortunately, this was ignored.

Last week the Minister for Transport and Main Roads must have been so embarrassed about the plans for upgrading exit 57 that he announced them from Brisbane. This upgrade includes the removal of right-turn lanes which would hurt local businesses and force traffic on to an already congested local road network with multiple entrances and exits for shopping precincts. This is a \$25 million upgrade. What value for money are taxpayers receiving in my region? I will tell members now: no right-turn lanes, extra line markings, ramp-metering traffic lights on the southbound merge and a couple extra lanes.

Furthermore, the minister has ignored residents' pleas for a direct access slip lane that bypasses the traffic signals that would increase traffic flow. Residents are also pleading for traffic signals that react to traffic volumes and adjust accordingly, again increasing traffic flow. We also need another bridge across the motorway to take traffic away from the heavily congested exit 57. Finally, we need another arterial road to cross the Coomera River to give local residents an alternative to the only arterial road—the M1 motorway—on the northern Gold Coast, again reducing the need for motorists to travel on the M1's exit 57. We need to get motorists home sooner and safer, not waste fuel by sitting in congestion at multiple traffic lights looking at solar panels. My residents are demanding action on this matter and they feel that the minister is wrong. They want him to listen to the people of the northern Gold Coast and implement a meaningful upgrade that will reduce congestion and give motorists an alternative while not destroying local businesses.

Morrison Government, Education Funding

 **Mr WHITING** (Bancroft—ALP) (7.27 pm): Tonight I want to talk about a federal funding issue regarding schools. Queensland needs that federal funding for our schools. We need our fair share from the federal government, but in the last week the only thing of any substance from the federal government is that the minister has announced a \$1 million fund for schools to teach civic values—to teach students how to be politically engaged and about the democratic process. The crux is that we need fairer funding for schools. We need to meet needs based funding for our schools. We are \$1.9 billion worse off compared to the arrangements that were previously in place. That represents a true \$1.9 billion worth of cuts under the Morrison government, and those facing the most cuts are the ones most in need.

Under the Morrison government nine out of 10 public schools are still below the national resource standard. Let us compare that to what Labor has announced. It wants to advance more funding to put into early childhood to educate three-year-olds as well as four-year-olds so that they are ready for their school journey. Besides the fact that we need that funding to counter those cuts the federal government has made, we do not need values projects because values projects are already being taught at our schools. Over 20 years as an elected person in my community I have learnt a lot about values from my school communities, particularly from the state schools. I have learnt about tolerance and acceptance. I have learnt about embracing diversity from state high school students because they live these values side by side with many different people.

Some 25 per cent of the Deception Bay State High School is Samoan and it has not been easy creating a harmonious school there. Some have had to struggle to overcome prejudice and some have struggled to overcome the idea that it is easier to resort to violence, and these are things that they learnt from home. The point is that the federal government could learn something about political values from our state high school students. They have recently shown that they are ready to take collective action. They have shown that they want to directly address an outstanding public policy issue. They have shown that they are prepared to sacrifice something of themselves to make this better outcome, and they have shown that they are prepared to take action directed at a better outcome for the future.

I say to the federal education minister: we need our fair share of funding for schools. That is what we really need. My community does not need the federal Liberals coming around lecturing us about values, because I believe that our kids could teach them about values. We need them to fulfil the promise that was highlighted by the Gonski review all those years ago. We need fairer funding.

The House adjourned at 7.31 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Andrew, Bailey, Bates, Batt, Bennett, Berkman, Bleijie, Bolton, Boothman, Boyce, Brown, Butcher, Crandon, Crawford, Crisafulli, D'Ath, Dametto, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Frecklington, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hart, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Hunt, Janetzki, Jones, Katter, Kelly, King, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Lauga, Leahy, Linard, Lister, Lui, Lynham, Madden, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Mickelberg, Miles, Millar, Miller, Minnikin, Molhoek, Mullen, Nicholls, O'Connor, O'Rourke B, O'Rourke C, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Perrett, Pitt, Powell, Power, Pugh, Purdie, Richards, Robinson, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Trad, Watts, Weir, Whiting, Wilson