



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

Tuesday, 14 May 2019

Subject	Page
ASSENT TO BILLS	1493
<i>Tabled paper.</i> Letter, dated 7 May 2019, from His Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to certain bills on 7 May 2019.	1493
PRIVILEGE	1493
Alleged Contempt of Parliament	1493
<i>Tabled paper.</i> Extract, undated, from the Twitter account of the member for Capalaba, Mr Don Brown MP, in relation to a tweet about the member for Oodgeroo, Dr Mark Robinson MP.....	1493
REPORT	1494
Auditor-General	1494
<i>Tabled paper.</i> Auditor-General of Queensland: Report to Parliament No. 17: 2018-19—Managing consumer food safety in Queensland.	1494
SPEAKER'S RULING	1494
Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by a Minister	1494
<i>Tabled paper.</i> Correspondence regarding a complaint by the member for Burleigh, Mr Michael Hart MP, regarding comments made in the House by the Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning, Hon. Cameron Dick.....	1494
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	1494
Addressing the Speaker, Microphones	1494
PETITIONS	1495
TABLED PAPERS	1495
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	1497
Resources Projects, Jobs	1497
Premier's Reading Challenge	1497
NRL Magic Round; Women's Rugby League	1497
Federal Election, Economy	1498

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 14 May 2019

Olive Downs Mine.....	1499
Health Infrastructure	1499
Youth Justice.....	1500
NAPLAN	1501
Ports.....	1501
SportAccord World Sport and Business Summit; NRL Magic Round	1502
Resources Industry	1502
Back to Work Program.....	1503
Queensland Housing Strategy.....	1503
MOTION	1504
Suspension of Standing and Sessional Orders.....	1504
ETHICS COMMITTEE.....	1504
Reports	1504
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Ethics Committee: Report No. 184, 56th Parliament—Matter of privilege referred by the Speaker on 26 October 2017 relating to alleged deliberate misleading of the House.....	1504
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Ethics Committee Report No. 185, 56th Parliament—Matter of privilege referred by the Speaker on 9 August 2017 relating to alleged deliberate misleading of the House.	1504
NOTICE OF MOTION	1504
Disallowance of Statutory Instrument.....	1504
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	1504
Youth Detention.....	1505
Youth Detention.....	1505
Infrastructure, Federal Funding.....	1506
Palen Creek Correctional Centre, Leave for Inmate	1506
Exports.....	1507
Youth Detention.....	1507
Cross River Rail.....	1508
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Extract, undated, from the trevorevans.com.au website regarding Cross River Rail.....	1509
Youth Detention.....	1509
Palaszczuk Labor Government, Infrastructure.....	1510
Palen Creek Correctional Centre, Wedding	1511
North Queensland, Tourism.....	1511
Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services.....	1511
Gold Coast, Health Services	1512
North-West Queensland, Workforce	1512
Education.....	1513
Gladstone Ports Corporation, Workforce	1514
PRIVILEGE.....	1515
Conduct in Chamber	1515
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	1515
Gas Industry, Policy	1515
Public Guardian.....	1515
MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.....	1516
Palen Creek Correctional Centre, Leave for Inmate	1516
PRIVILEGE.....	1516
Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by the Premier	1516
MOTION	1516
Business Program.....	1516
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Bundle of bill debate speaking lists from the sitting week of 30 April to 2 May 2019.	1518
Division: Question put—That the amendment to the amendment be agreed to.	1521
Resolved in the affirmative	1521
Division: Question put—That the amendment, as amended, be agreed to.	1521
Resolved in the affirmative	1521
Division: Question put—That the motion, as amended, be agreed to.	1521
Resolved in the affirmative	1521
MEDICINES AND POISONS BILL.....	1522
Introduction	1522
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Medicines and Poisons Bill 2019.	1522
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Medicines and Poisons Bill 2019, explanatory notes.	1522
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Draft Medicines and Poisons (Medicines) Regulation 2019.	1522
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Draft Medicines and Poisons (Medicines) Regulation, explanatory notes 2019.....	1522
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Draft Medicines and Poisons (Pest Management, Poisons and Other Regulated Substances) Regulation 2019.	1522
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Draft Medicines and Poisons (Pest Management, Poisons and Other Regulated Substances) Regulation 2019, explanatory notes.	1522
First Reading	1523
Referral to Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee.....	1524
THERAPEUTIC GOODS BILL.....	1524
Message from Governor	1524
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Message, dated 14 May 2019, from His Excellency the Governor recommending the Therapeutic Goods Bill 2019.	1524

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 14 May 2019

Introduction	1524
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Therapeutic Goods Bill 2019.....	1524
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Therapeutic Goods Bill 2019, explanatory notes.....	1524
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Draft Therapeutic Goods Regulation 2019.....	1525
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Draft Therapeutic Goods Regulation 2019, explanatory notes.....	1525
First Reading	1525
Referral to Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee	1525
NATURAL RESOURCES AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	1526
Second Reading	1526
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019, explanatory notes to amendments to be moved during consideration in detail by the Hon. Dr Anthony Lynham.....	1529
MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST	1536
Youth Detention	1536
Federal Election, Campaign	1538
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from the <i>Courier-Mail</i> , dated 11 December 2018, titled ‘Peter Gleeson: It’s war between Deb Frecklington and Scott Morrison and Campbell Newman’.....	1538
Crime	1539
Federal Election, Electoral Donations	1540
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Bundle of photographs depicting political advertising for the Federal member for Bowman, Mr Andrew Laming MP.....	1540
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Extract from the Electoral Commission of Queensland report, dated 13 May 2019, regarding disclosed gifts to the Liberal National Party.....	1541
Law and Order	1541
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Nonconforming petition regarding crime.....	1541
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 17 October 2018, from the Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services, Hon. Mark Ryan, to the member for Toowoomba North, Mr Trevor Watts MP, in response to Mr Watts’s request to meet with all Queensland Police assistant commissioners.....	1541
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Emails, dated 20 and 23 November 2018, between the Toowoomba North electorate officer, Ms Elysia Ruttley, and Chief of Staff, Commissioner’s Office, Queensland Police Service, Superintendent Mark Wheeler, regarding a request for the member for Toowoomba North, Mr Trevor Watts MP, to visit the Brisbane watch house.....	1541
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Emails, dated 24 October and 1 November 2018, between the Toowoomba North electorate officer, Ms Elysia Ruttley, and the Office of the Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services regarding a request for the member for Toowoomba North, Mr Trevor Watts MP, to do a ride along with the Queensland Police Service Townsville Rapid Action Patrol Group.....	1541
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Emails, dated 5 and 6 March 2019, between the Toowoomba North Electorate Office and Ministerial Liaison Officer, Queensland Police Service, Office of the Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services, Inspector Peter Stacey, regarding a request for the member for Toowoomba North, Mr Trevor Watts MP, to visit the Cairns and Townsville watch houses.....	1541
Townsville, Youth Crime	1542
Climate	1543
Capricornia Electorate, ALP Candidate	1544
Youth Detention	1545
Ipswich West Electorate, Shows	1546
NATURAL RESOURCES AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	1547
Second Reading	1547
ELECTORAL LEGISLATION (POLITICAL DONATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL	1573
Second Reading	1573
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Copy of signature block, undated, of Assistant Electorate Officer, Maiwar electorate, Ms Emerald Moon.....	1585
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Extract from Facebook, dated 31 January, depicting Greens candidate for Bowman and others.....	1585
ADJOURNMENT	1588
Coomera Electorate, Palaszczuk Labor Government	1588
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Brochure, undated, titled ‘The truth about who sold Queensland’s assets’.....	1588
Redlands Electorate, Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month	1589
Warrego Electorate, Roads	1589
Maryborough Electorate, Labour Day	1590
Scott, Mrs A; Heit, Miss L	1591
Bancroft Electorate, Federal Election	1591
Rural and Regional Queensland, Housing Market	1592
Boyne Tannum Hookup	1592
Anzac Day; Nominate your Favourite Tradie Competition; North Kirra Surf Life Saving Club	1593
Bayside Community Collective, Domestic and Family Violence	1594
ATTENDANCE	1594


TUESDAY, 14 MAY 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.

ASSENT TO BILLS

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I have to report that I have received from His Excellency the Governor a letter in respect of assent to certain bills. The contents of the letter will be incorporated in the *Record of Proceedings*. I table the letter for the information of members.

The Honourable C.W. Pitt MP

Speaker of the Legislative Assembly

Parliament House

George Street

BRISBANE QLD 4000

I hereby acquaint the Legislative Assembly that the following Bills, having been passed by the Legislative Assembly and having been presented for the Royal Assent, were assented to in the name of Her Majesty The Queen on the date shown:

Date of assent: 7 May 2019

A Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Evidence Act 1977 and the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992 for particular purposes

A Bill for an Act to amend the Education (Queensland College of Teachers) Act 2005 and the Education (Queensland College of Teachers) Regulation 2016 for particular purposes

A Bill for an Act to establish Health and Wellbeing Queensland to improve the health and wellbeing of the Queensland population, and to amend this Act, the Hospital Foundations Act 2018, the Public Service Act 2008 and the State Penalties Enforcement Amendment Act 2017 for particular purposes

These Bills are hereby transmitted to the Legislative Assembly, to be numbered and forwarded to the proper Officer for enrolment, in the manner required by law.

Yours sincerely


Governor

7 May 2019

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 7 May 2019, from His Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to certain bills on 7 May 2019 [\[719\]](#).

PRIVILEGE

Alleged Contempt of Parliament

 **Dr ROBINSON** (Oodgeroo—LNP) (9.31 am): The member for Capalaba has recently tweeted comments with respect to me. Attached to that tweet was a doctored flyer with a photo of me, Pauline Hanson and the One Nation logo, giving the impression that I serve as a One Nation member of parliament, or at least as its candidate. I table a copy of the tweet and the flyer.

Tabled paper: Extract, undated, from the Twitter account of the member for Capalaba, Mr Don Brown MP, in relation to a tweet about the member for Oodgeroo, Dr Mark Robinson MP [\[747\]](#).


Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members to my right, I ask that you hear the member on his feet. Member, will you be writing to me on this matter?

Dr ROBINSON: Yes. I take offence at both the tweet from the member for Capalaba and the flyer. If the artwork of the flyer was prepared by the member for Capalaba or his office then I believe a serious contempt, if not fraud, has been committed by the member. I will be writing to you about this as I believe the Ethics Committee should investigate this matter.

REPORT


Auditor-General

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I have to report that I have received from the Auditor-General report No. 17 of 2018-19 titled *Managing consumer food safety in Queensland*. I table the report for the information of members.

Tabled paper: Auditor-General of Queensland: Report to Parliament No. 17: 2018-19—Managing consumer food safety in Queensland [718].

SPEAKER'S RULING

Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by a Minister

 **Mr SPEAKER:** On 8 April 2019 the member for Burleigh wrote to me alleging the Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning deliberately misled the House during statements made on 3 and 4 April 2019. On the information before me I consider that the minister has made an adequate explanation and apology in relation to his 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: Correspondence regarding a complaint by the member for Burleigh, Mr Michael Hart MP, regarding comments made in the House by the Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning, Hon. Cameron Dick [748].

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

Leave granted.

SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED DELIBERATELY MISLEADING THE HOUSE

MR SPEAKER: Honourable members,

On 8 April 2019, the Member for Burleigh wrote to me alleging that the Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning deliberately misled the House during statements made on 3 and 4 April 2019.

The matter relates to statements made by the Minister about the budget record of the Newman LNP Government and whether any budget surpluses were delivered by that government.

In his letter to me, the Member for Burleigh contended that the Minister's statements were incorrect and misleading because the Newman LNP Government did deliver budget surpluses in 2013-14 and 2014-15.

I sought further information from the Minister about the allegation made against him, in accordance with Standing Order 269(5).

The Minister advised me that the statements he made in Parliament were based on statements made by the respective Treasurers in their relevant budget speeches, which did not promise or claim a surplus for a full financial year in which they were in government.

However, after having had the opportunity to review a broader range of documents, the Minister has accepted that the Newman LNP Government delivered an operating surplus in 2013-14. The Minister also accepts that an operating surplus was delivered in 2014-15, though notes there was a change in government during that financial year.


The Minister has since clarified his statements of 3 and 4 April 2019 in a Ministerial Statement to the House on 30 April 2019. The Minister also apologised to the extent that his statements inadvertently or unintentionally misled the House.

On the information before me, I consider that the Minister has made an adequate explanation and apology in relation to his 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.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Addressing the Speaker, Microphones

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, some members have developed a habit of turning away from the microphone when they contribute to debate, essentially speaking to the back of the chamber rather than the chair and into the microphone. Hansard has reported difficulties in being able to hear

members when they turn away from the microphone. I remind all members that standing order 247 requires members to address the Speaker when making their contributions but, importantly, please make Hansard's life easier.

PETITIONS

The Clerk presented the following paper petition, lodged by the honourable member indicated—

Bupa Aged Care Facility and Sheridan Meadows Daycare Facility, Bus Service

Hon. Pitt, from 866 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure a bus service is provided for the Bupa Aged Care Facility and Sheridan Meadows Daycare facility, Progress Road, White Rock [723].

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

Taxi Subsidy Scheme and Lift Payment

From 358 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure the Taxi Subsidy Scheme and Lift Payment for Queensland National Disability Insurance Scheme participants does not end on 30 June 2019 [724].

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

Gympie Road Northern Transitway

Mr Nicholls, from 274 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure residents and local businesses have their say on the Gympie Road Northern Transitway [725, 726].

Moore Park Beach

Mr Bennett, from 157 petitioners, requesting the House to construct and maintain a suitable enclosed swimming area at Moore Park Beach [727, 728].

Driving Offences, Penalties

Hon. Crawford, from 9,634 petitioners, requesting the House to provide harsher penalties for hit and run driving offences and dangerous driving causing death or grievous bodily harm [729, 730].

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

Samford, Prospect and Taylors Roads, Traffic Signals

Mr Mander, from 111 petitioners, requesting the House to construct dedicated right turn arrows at the traffic lights of Samford Road, Prospect Road and Taylors Road at Gaythorne [731].

Murgon, Youth Crime

Mrs Frecklington, from 423 petitioners, requesting the House to consider additional strategies to combat youth crime for the township of Murgon [732].

Childers Courthouse, Resources

Mr Bennett, from 274 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure the Childers Courthouse is better resourced to meet the needs of the community [733].

Petitions received.

TABLED PAPERS

PAPERS TABLED DURING THE RECESS (SO 31)

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

3 May 2019—

[693](#) Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 38, 56th Parliament, May 2019—Subordinate legislation tabled between 13 February 2019 and 26 February 2019

[694](#) The second review of the Lake Eyre Basin Intergovernmental Agreement, May 2018

7 May 2019—

[695](#) Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Hon. Bailey), to a paper petition (3113-19) presented by the Clerk under provisions of Standing Order 119(3), from 509 petitioners, requesting the House to cause a boat ramp to be built at Seagull Street, Slade Point

13 May 2019—

[696](#) Education, Employment and Small Business Committee: Report No. 17, 56th Parliament, May 2019—Disability Services and Other Legislation (NDIS) Amendment Bill 2019

[697](#) State Development, Natural Resources and Agricultural Industry Development Committee: Report No. 30, 56th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 13 February 2019 and 2 April 2019

- [698](#) Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019, erratum to explanatory notes
- [699](#) Transport and Public Works Committee: Report No. 21, 56th Parliament, May 2019—Subordinate legislation tabled between 13 February 2019 and 26 March 2019
- [700](#) Economics and Governance Committee: Report No. 25, 56th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 13 February 2019 and 26 March 2019
- [701](#) Education, Employment and Small Business Committee: Report No. 13, 56th Parliament, February 2019—Working with Children Legislation (Indigenous Communities) Amendment Bill 2018, government response

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS (SO 32)

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

The following statutory instruments were tabled by the Clerk—

Marine Parks Act 2004, State Penalties Enforcement Act 1999:

- [702](#) Marine Parks and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2019, No. 64
- [703](#) Marine Parks and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2019, No. 64, explanatory notes

Plumbing and Drainage Act 2002:

- [704](#) Standard Plumbing and Drainage (Plumbing Code of Australia Compliance) Amendment Regulation 2019, No. 65
- [705](#) Standard Plumbing and Drainage (Plumbing Code of Australia Compliance) Amendment Regulation 2019, No. 65, explanatory notes

Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2019:

- [706](#) Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 66
- [707](#) Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 66, explanatory notes

Planning and Environment Court Act 2016:

- [708](#) Planning and Environment Court (Mediation) Amendment Rule 2019, No. 67
- [709](#) Planning and Environment Court (Mediation) Amendment Rule 2019, No. 67, explanatory notes

Aboriginal Land Act 1991:

- [710](#) Aboriginal Land (Girramay and Wulli Wulli) Amendment Regulation 2019, No. 68
- [711](#) Aboriginal Land (Girramay and Wulli Wulli) Amendment Regulation 2019, No. 68, explanatory notes

Coal Mining Safety and Health Act 1999:

- [712](#) Coal Mining Safety and Health (Requirements for Particular Records) Amendment Regulation 2019, No. 69
- [713](#) Coal Mining Safety and Health (Requirements for Particular Records) Amendment Regulation 2019, No. 69, explanatory notes

Fisheries (Sustainable Fisheries Strategy) Amendment Act 2019:

- [714](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 70
- [715](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 70, explanatory notes

Biosecurity Act 2014, Coastal Protection and Management Act 1995, Fisheries Act 1994, Marine Parks Act 2004, Nature Conservation Act 1992, Planning Act 2016, Rural and Regional Adjustment Act 1994, State Penalties Enforcement Act 1999, Transport Operations (Marine Pollution) Act 1995:

- [716](#) Fisheries (Sustainable Fisheries Strategy) Amendment Regulation 2019, No. 71
- [717](#) Fisheries (Sustainable Fisheries Strategy) Amendment Regulation 2019, No. 71, explanatory notes

MEMBERS' PAPERS

The following members' papers were tabled by the Clerk—

Member for Hinchinbrook (Mr Dametto)—

- [721](#) Media article, undated, titled 'Attention: The Premier of Queensland, The Honourable Anastacia Palaszczuk MP'

Member for Toowoomba North (Mr Watts)—

- [722](#) Nonconforming petition regarding crime


REPORT BY THE CLERK

The following report was tabled by the Clerk—

- [720](#) Final Annual Report of Travel Benefits Afforded Former Members of the Legislative Assembly—1 July 2018 to 31 December 2018

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS


Resources Projects, Jobs

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.36 am): We back the resources industry because resource projects mean jobs. I am pleased to announce that the Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy has granted the leases for the expansion of the \$167 million Resolute goldmine near Charters Towers. This has secured 380 jobs for the North Queensland region. The extension will add 13 years to the life of the mine and support 100 new construction jobs.

I can also advise the House that the Coordinator-General has provided conditional approval to the \$1 billion Olive Downs project in the Bowen Basin. I can further advise the House that 90 per cent of this mine is metallurgical coal. The mine is expected to create 1,000 operational jobs and 500 jobs during construction. The project will contribute an estimated \$8 billion to the local economy and more than \$10 billion to the Queensland economy.

We have helped facilitate more than \$20 billion in resources projects since we were elected. This has helped the Queensland economy continue to grow and it has helped contribute to the 192,000 jobs that have been created in Queensland since January 2015. We always stand for Queensland jobs.


Premier's Reading Challenge

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.37 am): Our schools place great value on reading, and last year more than 180,000 children from more than 1,000 schools read more than 2.46 million books in the Premier's Reading Challenge. Along with the member for Mount Ommaney, I was delighted to visit Jamboree Heights State School last week to launch this year's reading challenge, which officially started yesterday. It was a very special visit for me because I attended Jamboree Heights State School as a primary school student.

The reading challenge is about the future, and we want to build on the excellent improvement we have seen in our NAPLAN reading and spelling results across all year levels—3, 5, 7 and 9. This year we are encouraging every Queensland school and every student from prep to year 9 to break last year's reading record. For the first time, books in Indonesian, Italian, Chinese, French, German and Japanese will also be available for students.

Speaking of NAPLAN, more than 260,000 Queensland school students in years 3, 5, 7 and 9 will take part in NAPLAN testing this week. Of those, around 74,000 students at over 480 schools will do the tests online. Our message to all those students, their teachers and their families is: we wish you well, do your best and do not worry. We know that our Queensland students are doing a great job in NAPLAN.

NRL Magic Round; Women's Rugby League


 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.38 am): It was a magic weekend in Brisbane for Rugby League fans. Almost 135,000 people went to Suncorp Stadium, where all eight games were played in the first-ever magic round. I thank the Minister for Innovation and Tourism Industry Development and Minister for the Commonwealth Games for helping to secure this great deal for Queensland—one that I know was greatly appreciated.

The member for Gladstone and assistant minister said that people from Gladstone had also come down to view the magic round. Visitors from regional Queensland and from New South Wales joined Brisbane fans in an ideal mix of tourism and sport, bringing tens of millions of dollars into the local economy. NRL Chief Executive Todd Greenberg said that it was a wonderful success and the public's response was beyond expectations. He said that the crowds were fantastic and there was a festival atmosphere inside and outside the stadium. Mr Greenberg pointed out that the magic round is also about events away from the games themselves. Thousands of young footy players saw their heroes at 23 schools and junior clubs. There were Voice Against Violence workshops, as well as coaching and refereeing education events.

Still on Rugby League, today I can also announce a landmark television project for the Queensland Maroons women's team. As the team's No. 1 member, I am very happy to say that this project will build on the momentum in women's sport in Queensland, particularly in Rugby League. The Screen Queensland and Queensland Rugby League documentary series will follow the Maroons campaign for State of Origin glory from this year through to next year. The series will show us what it

takes to be an elite female athlete in a sport that used to be dominated by men. Women will also be behind the camera, with Screen Queensland calling for filmmakers to be part of the all-female crew. This is a great opportunity for Queensland's talented female filmmakers to advance their careers and create compelling content for local, national and global audiences. It is an important project for both women's sport and our ever-growing screen industry.

Federal Election, Economy

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (9.41 am): At the last state election, Queenslanders chose a strong stable Palaszczuk Labor government instead of the alternative, which was cuts and chaos. Since the Palaszczuk government was elected in 2015, we have delivered more than 192,000 jobs. Our economy is growing. We are delivering infrastructure and we have reversed the cuts to front-line services inflicted by the previous LNP government. We are investing in new industries such as aviation, advanced manufacturing, biofuels and renewables, as well as supporting our traditional strengths in resources, tourism, agriculture and construction. None of this would be possible without the stability and certainty that the Palaszczuk Labor government is delivering.

We can see writ large the effect that instability at a federal level is having on the national economy. Only last week the Reserve Bank made a statement on monetary policy and talked about the challenges facing the national economy. The RBA said—

Growth in the Australian economy has slowed and inflation remains low. Subdued growth in household income and the adjustment in the housing market are affecting consumer spending and residential construction.

It went on to say—

Weak growth in household income poses a key risk to the outlook for household consumption'.

In other words, growth is slowing, inflation is flatlining, wages are not growing and consumers are not spending. That is the price we are paying for political instability in Canberra.

I have been watching closely to see what each side of politics would offer Queenslanders. We unashamedly want the best outcome for our state so that we can continue to work with every level of government to deliver the jobs, services and infrastructure that we need to make our state fit for the future. The federal election this Saturday represents a choice for Queenslanders: a choice between more of the same cuts and chaos that would come from a Morrison-Palmer-Hanson federal government—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Members, I am not sure what part of calling the House to order you did not understand.

Ms TRAD:—or Queenslanders can choose a stable Shorten Labor government that will deliver—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr Purdie interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Ninderry, you are warned under the standing orders.

Ms TRAD: I will repeat what I was saying for the benefit of the House. The federal election represents a clear choice for Queenslanders: a choice between more of the same cuts and chaos that would come from a Morrison-Palmer-Hanson federal government or a stable Shorten Labor government that will deliver—

Opposition members interjected.


Mr Perrett interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Gympie, you are warned under the standing orders.

Ms TRAD:—more money for hospitals, for schools and for Queensland infrastructure. We can choose the same old neglect of our state's infrastructure needs under the Liberal National Party or the massive investment in roads and rail offered by Labor. We can choose to let the extreme right dictate the energy policy agenda of our nation or we can choose to tackle climate change as a nation and put

downward pressure on electricity prices. We can choose the same old approach to managing the economy where the top end of town is in the driver's seat or we can choose a strong economy that works for all Australians. The choice this Saturday is clear: only Bill Shorten will offer a fair go for Australia and a better deal for Queensland.

Olive Downs Mine

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning) (9.45 am): The Palaszczuk Labor government is committed to creating jobs in regional Queensland, including in our state's vitally important resources industry. Today I am pleased to announce that the independent Coordinator-General has approved a new coalmine for Queensland. The \$1 billion Olive Downs metallurgical coalmine in the Bowen Basin is now moving forward to deliver 500 full-time-equivalent jobs during construction and 1,000 full-time operational jobs—I repeat that for the benefit of the members opposite: 1,000 full-time operational jobs—on average over its 79-year life span. On top of that, the proponent, Pembroke Resources, will encourage workers to live in towns such as Moranbah, Nebo, Dysart and Middlemount, ensuring that regional communities benefit as required—

Opposition members interjected.


Mr SPEAKER: I am sorry, Minister. Members to my left, as I hear it, the minister is reading a factual ministerial statement. I would like to hear the statement. I ask that you cease your interjections.

Mr DICK:—by the Labor government's Strong and Sustainable Resource Communities Act. There will also be significant opportunities for local and regional suppliers, contractors, service providers and businesses. As a further local benefit, the Coordinator-General, for the first time, has nominated the construction phase for this project as being subject to the Strong and Sustainable Resource Communities Act. That means that local skilled workers will be protected by the act's prohibition on a 100 per cent FIFO workforce and the act's anti-discrimination provisions. When the mine is up and running, it has the potential to contribute up to \$10 billion to the Queensland economy, including \$1 billion in royalties.

Pembroke Resources will produce up to 15 million tonnes of coal per year, with 90 per cent expected to be metallurgical coal. Metallurgical or coking coal is used to make steel, a critical component of our modern economy that is used widely in the automotive, construction and manufacturing sectors. Steel is used to build railways, stadiums, skyscrapers, houses and airports. The world needs Queensland's metallurgical coal to make steel.

The proposed project includes coal handling and crushing facilities, a rail link to transport coal to the Dalrymple Bay Coal Terminal and a water pipeline and power transmission line. The Coordinator-General has imposed stringent conditions to mitigate impacts on the environment and nearby regional communities. I am very pleased that Pembroke has stated that it will start construction in 2020. I look forward to providing further updates to the House on how our government is growing Queensland's resources sector and creating more jobs for our state.

Health Infrastructure

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (9.48 am): The Palaszczuk government is delivering more and better health care for Queenslanders. In the process, we are not just creating jobs for doctors and nurses; we are creating jobs for builders, plumbers and electricians, too.

Since 2015 we have been expanding our hospitals to meet the growing demand for services right across Queensland. We have invested an additional \$69.4 million in total capital investment this financial year compared to the last—a total investment of almost a billion dollars. We are expanding and improving hospitals and health facilities right across Queensland. In Ipswich, Logan, Caboolture, Caloundra, Roma, Blackall, Kingaroy, Maryborough, Hervey Bay, Rockhampton, Townsville, Mareeba, Cairns and on the islands of the Torres Strait we are getting on with the job and delivering for Queenslanders. For example, I recently opened the Palm Island Primary Health Care Centre. This marks a historic shift to the way health care will be delivered in the region as it transitions over time from the Townsville HHS to a community operated board.


Hervey Bay Hospital's new Clinical Decisions Unit opened in March this year. This unit marks a critical next step of the \$44.66 million Hervey Bay Hospital expansion that also delivered a new ED for the region which opened in January. The state-of-the-art new ED includes more than double the

treatment spaces of the old facility. I also had the pleasure of opening the newly redeveloped Caloundra Health Service. The \$17 million redevelopment includes expanded palliative care and ophthalmology services, oral health, a diabetes service and a range of outpatient and community services.

These are just the projects we have concluded in the last few months. We have many more underway right now like the redevelopments of the Logan Hospital, the Caboolture Hospital, the Roma Hospital, the Kingaroy Hospital and the Torres Strait primary healthcare centre. The Palaszczuk government is building new health facilities, hiring doctors, nurses, health professionals and paramedics, and supporting communities right across Queensland.

If Australians elect a Shorten Labor government on Saturday, we will be able to achieve even more. A Shorten Labor government has committed \$60 million to expand cancer services at the RBWH. They have pledged \$15.1 million to build a new hybrid operating theatre at Townsville Hospital, \$15 million for the emergency department in Cairns and \$8.2 million for mental health facilities at Rockhampton Hospital, and they will buy the Mater hospital in Gladstone so the community does not lose that facility when the private operator closes—these commitments and so many more. In fact, our hospitals will be more than \$650 million better off under a Shorten Labor government because only Labor governments deliver the critical infrastructure that Queenslanders need.

Youth Justice

 **Hon. DE FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (Minister for Child Safety, Youth and Women and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (9.51 am): The Palaszczuk Labor government is committed to changing the story for youth justice in this state for good. We are committed to keeping our communities safe and we are committed to changing the life trajectories of the young people in our justice system. In order to do this we must break the cycle of offending and reoffending by our young people.

Two weeks ago I announced a record further investment in Queensland's youth justice system of \$320 million over the next four years. This second tranche of the government's historic youth justice reforms brings to a total of over \$550 million since 2018 our commitment to reforming youth justice in this state. We will deliver a new 16-bed facility at the Brisbane Youth Detention Centre and a new 32-bed facility at Wacol. In addition, we are funding new programs to address the reasons that our young people are in the youth justice system in the first place.


In last night's *Four Corners* program there were several new allegations raised regarding youth detention. I want to assure all members that, as with all matters that have been raised with the department regarding these young people, any new allegations or issues will be thoroughly investigated. No-one wants a young person to be in a watch house any longer than is absolutely necessary. A watch house is not an environment I want for our young people. That is why we have made such a significant commitment to youth justice reform. If we continue to do the same thing in youth justice that we have been doing year after year—locking young people up and throwing away the key—we cannot expect the results to be any different.

Addressing issues of our youth justice system will not be a quick fix. However, we are already implementing our new initiatives including the \$5.58 million over two years for 30 new youth and family workers to be funded in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander family wellbeing services in 10 high-demand locations. The new positions will be located in Cairns, Townsville, Mount Isa, Brisbane, Logan, Ipswich, Rockhampton, Moreton Bay, Cherbourg, Toowoomba and the Gold Coast. In addition, we will be trialling family led decision-making in youth justice in four locations including Cairns, Brisbane North/Moreton, Brisbane South/Redlands, Logan and Toowoomba.

The Indigenous family wellbeing services have proven highly effective in engaging Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander families to increase their capacity to keep their children safe and well. Early figures indicate that these interventions significantly reduce the likelihood that children will come to the attention of the child protection system.

A further investment of \$1.26 million up until 30 June 2020 will enable us to test whether family led decision-making supports a decrease in a young person's risk of reoffending, as evidence has shown us has occurred in New Zealand. Recently I had the privilege of visiting Wuchopperen with the member for Cairns—one of the family wellbeing services in Cairns already doing great work and one of the services to implement our new initiatives. These constitute our commitment to youth justice—to change the dial for our community and for our young people. That is what we are intent on doing.

NAPLAN

 **Hon. G GRACE** (McConnel—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Industrial Relations) (9.55 am): As the Premier mentioned, from today around 260,000 Queensland school students in years 3, 5, 7 and 9 will take part in the annual NAPLAN testing. The majority of students will complete paper tests over the next three days. Around 74,000 students at more than 480 state and non-state schools will participate in NAPLAN online ahead of the scheduled full rollout by 2020. Schools will undertake the online testing in a window of time from today through to 24 May. We have worked to ensure that there will be no disadvantage for students undertaking either form of testing. Students will be tested in reading, writing, language conventions and numeracy, with the results to be used to monitor students' progress and assess their areas of strength and development.

It is important to remember that NAPLAN is just one of a number of tools used to monitor students' progress and assess their areas of strength and development, and to help track the progress of Queensland students as a whole. Parents can be confident that the great work that teachers and students do every day in the classroom prepares students well for the tests. Our teachers work tirelessly to support their students' wellbeing and learning. As a result, Queensland achieved some of its highest ever NAPLAN results in 2018, building on a long-term trend of positive literacy and numeracy results across the state.

Since 2008, Queensland students have improved in an outstanding 16 of 20 test areas. For example, last year our year 9 students achieved some of the highest results ever, while in reading and spelling we saw continued improvement across all year levels. In a report published late last year, the Grattan Institute described Queensland as the star performer, with our primary students making two months more progress in reading than the national average between years 3 and 5 and about one month more progress in numeracy over the same two years. As education minister, I want all students taking part in NAPLAN to give 100 per cent as they would any other form of assessment. However, I also want them and their parents to simply stay calm and do their best—great, helpful advice a teacher once gave me.

Research commissioned by the Palaszczuk government identified that there were a range of unintended consequences stemming from the now perceived high-stakes nature of NAPLAN testing. After more than 10 years, it is time for a national review of NAPLAN. While the Morrison government has resisted calls for such a review, federal Labor has committed to a comprehensive review if successful at the coming election, and I welcome this commitment. Queensland's work in this area means that we are ready and able to contribute our findings to a national review. I again call on the Morrison government to listen to all states and territories, parents, students and teachers and commit to a national review. I wish all students good luck: stay calm and try your best.

Ports

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (9.59 am): The Palaszczuk government is investing in Queensland's ports to create jobs, drive tourism and boost trade. We have kept Queensland's ports in public hands and the Palaszczuk Labor government will invest \$180 million this financial year in our ports.

I visited Cairns last week to inspect progress on the construction of a temporary pipeline for the \$127 million Cairns Shipping Development Project. This eight-kilometre pipeline will ensure an environmentally sustainable outcome, with dredging material to be pumped to the Northern Sands deposit site just off the Captain Cook Highway to be re-used instead of being dumped on the Great Barrier Reef. Widening and deepening the Cairns port channel will allow larger cruise ships to berth at Cairns and support the future expansion of HMAS *Cairns* base. This will grow the number of cruise ships visiting the port annually from 100 to 150 by 2031. The project will create up to 800 construction jobs over five years and up to 2,700 jobs after construction in Far North Queensland. Dredging is on target to start in July this year, with the project set to finish next year.

Townsville's economy will also be transformed by the \$193 million Townsville Channel Upgrade Project. We are widening the shipping channel to accommodate ships up to 300 metres long and expanding the port by 62 hectares—the largest expansion of Townsville port in its history. The project will create 120 North Queensland construction jobs and support 245 full-time jobs.

The Palaszczuk Labor government's record \$21 billion investment in Queensland infrastructure over four years is supporting these port projects as key parts of our supply chain, while ensuring their operations meet global environmental standards to protect the Great Barrier Reef.

I acknowledge recent media reports about a consultant subcontracting at the Port of Gladstone. The Gladstone Ports Corporation did not sack or suspend this consultant. I am advised that his employer, Welcon Technologies, directed him to other work after the port corporation raised concerns about his conduct on-site during a media visit. The port corporation temporarily suspended a contract with the company while the matter was investigated. The contract with Welcon was reinstated and port work is available for the consultant. However, this should never have happened. Let me be clear: any person should be free to approach elected officials or candidates and have an honest conversation—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Members to my left!

Mr Pegg interjected.


Mr SPEAKER: Who was that member?

Mr Pegg interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Stretton, you are warned under the standing orders. I had called the House to order.

Mr BAILEY: Let me be clear: any person should be free to approach elected officials or candidates and have an honest conversation about their policies. I have made my views about this clear to Gladstone Ports Corporation, which, as a publicly owned corporation, must uphold those values.


SportAccord World Sport and Business Summit; NRL Magic Round

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Cooper—ALP) (Minister for Innovation and Tourism Industry Development and Minister for the Commonwealth Games) (10.02 am): What a blockbuster, golden, magic week for sporting events we scored in Queensland last week. We kicked the week off down on the Gold Coast with perfect weather and welcomed more than 1,700 of the world's foremost leaders in sport administration at Australia's first ever SportAccord. The managing director of SportAccord, Nis Hatt, said there was no doubt that the Gold Coast had hosted the best ever SportAccord conference.

Straight after the Commonwealth Games, I led a delegation to Bangkok to bid for the event at SportAccord 2018 and secure this great conference for the first time in our country. As a result of our government's commitment, more than \$60 million worth of new events for Queensland have been secured. Having hosted SportAccord in 2019 and having held many meetings and delegations with international sporting federations, we hope to secure a further \$100 million in new events for Queensland. This is just another great example of the legacy of the Commonwealth Games.

We rounded out the week with Australia's first-ever NRL magic round. As the Premier has just said, more than 135,000 people attended the magic round. Importantly, from a tourism perspective, more than one-third of the crowd came from all over Australia wearing their teams' jerseys. While we did not get a Queensland win every night—although I want to count Melbourne as a Queensland team for Saturday—local businesses in my community are reporting it was a major win for our economy. Sarosh Mehta, the Caxton Street Development president, said it was absolutely fantastic and that local businesses were packed to the rafters. Our government is committed to events tourism because we know that it creates jobs and supports local businesses and local economies.

Resources Industry


 **Hon. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy) (10.04 am): Queensland's resources sector is going strong, creating jobs and business opportunities right across this state. Queensland's resources exports in the year to March 2019 rose 20.8 per cent. That is an increase from \$57.9 billion to \$69.9 billion, which is an increase of \$12 billion from last year. There has been growth in all areas. LNG exports rose by nearly \$5 billion, coal was up \$4.7 billion and minerals grew by over 13 per cent or \$1.2 billion. The minerals boost was largely caused by increases in zinc and aluminium. These outweighed the temporary decline in copper we had with the outage of the Mount Isa rail line.

I am pleased to be able to inform the House that we also have an existing North Queensland goldminer expanding their investment in Queensland. I have granted Rolute Mining Ltd nine mining leases for their \$167 million Ravenswood expansion project, as the Premier has said. The proposed expansion at Ravenswood will extend the mine's life by 13 years, ensuring 280 valuable jobs in that

area continue. It will also create another 100 jobs. This is especially good news around Townsville, Charters Towers and the Burdekin, because Resolute's preference is to employ people from within 150 kilometres of Ravenswood.

Resolute's existing Mount Wright underground mine is due for closure this year. These leases now mean that open pit operations can start at the adjoining Sarsfield and Buck Reef West deposits. Resolute is able to fast-track production by using its existing processing plant and equipment, and Buck Reef West is expected to be in production by July, reaching full capacity by 2024. This is another chapter in Ravenswood's rich mining history that dates back to 1868, and this is yet another project to add to the \$20 billion worth of resources projects that we have helped deliver since 2015, creating 7,000 jobs in our state.

Back to Work Program


 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Small Business and Minister for Training and Skills Development) (10.06 am): This week marks another incredible milestone for the Queensland government's Back to Work program. I am pleased to report to the House that we have supported over 9,000 businesses to have the confidence to be able to take on 19,000 previously unemployed Queenslanders—12,500 of whom are young people. Since 2015 more than 192,000 jobs have been created in Queensland, and our Back to Work program has played a strong role in this.

In just under three years, this program has provided opportunities and experience for previously unemployed jobseekers in industries including manufacturing, construction, food service and automotive. One of the things I take great pride in is the fact that Back to Work has also played a significant part in supporting employment and training pathways for so many Queenslanders. Almost one in four Back to Work jobs has supported a Queenslanders to undertake an apprenticeship or a traineeship.

It has also been an opportunity to shine a light on just how diverse our local small business community is—from our smaller rural operators to our larger city centres. One such business—Iron Shadow based in Gracemere near Rockhampton—has a unique origin story as well as being a supporter of our Back to Work program. Panelbeater Dennis Frahm and his wife, Alison, an accomplished graphic artist, combined both their passions to provide a car rescue, restoration and custom artwork service. Dennis said the business needed somebody to assist with the workload but they could not afford to employ anyone. Back to Work funding allowed this small business to employ an apprentice, Reece Jones, and provided them with an opportunity to pass on knowledge of this highly specialised work.

Reece had been unemployed for around four months prior to commencing his apprenticeship in a Certificate III in Automotive Body Repair Technology, and he has been working with the business since December last year. This is just one of the thousands of Back to Work success stories, and Reece is just one of the more than 4,600 apprentices and trainees who are earning and learning because of our government's program.

Queensland Housing Strategy

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works, Minister for Digital Technology and Minister for Sport) (10.09 am): Queenslanders understand the close link between a safe, secure and sustainable home and the opportunity it provides, particularly for young Queenslanders. A secure home is fundamental to securing one of the 192,000 jobs created here in Queensland.

In 2017 the Palaszczuk government commenced implementation of the Queensland Housing Strategy, a strategy that acknowledges the complex and unique challenges faced by every Queenslanders in their journey to housing independence. Sometimes a little boost is all that is needed to give Queenslanders a helping hand. Today we are pleased to introduce three new products to our suite of offerings that support Queenslanders under the Queensland Housing Strategy who are locked out of affordable housing options as a result of outdated federal tax settings and record low wages growth.

Under a new Helping Hand Headleases initiative we will lease private rental properties for a targeted group of Queenslanders who need support to build their rental history. We will assist victims of domestic and family violence and those experiencing discrimination due to their cultural identity, even the size of their family or perhaps a mental health condition. We will assist them to build a rental history on the pathway to housing independence. The initiative will also back up social housing supply for those Queenslanders who need immediate accommodation support right across Queensland.

A second Rental Security Subsidy initiative will now offer short-term assistance to reduce rental payments for those Queenslanders doing it tough—Queenslanders experiencing temporary hardship, for example, due to the impact of a bill from an accident or from a sudden dip in income due to the death of a partner—to retain their tenancy instead of shifting into homelessness. This immediate housing security subsidy could range from \$50 for one week or a couple of hundred dollars for a few weeks while we enact the necessary longer term support. We are stepping up so that Queenslanders avoid eviction and avoid homelessness.

Under the Palaszczuk Labor government in Queensland since last financial year, 4,464 young applicants have been supported with private market assistance. That is 16 young Queenslanders each and every day who have been supported into independent housing, 16 young Queenslanders a day who have not had to experience homelessness. We understand that more is needed, so a third initiative, the Home Headlease for Young Queenslanders initiative, is a direct response to assist young Queenslanders struggling to enter the private rental market. As we have identified the acuity of the challenge on the Sunshine Coast and the Gold Coast, this initiative will be rolled out there first. The initiative will see at least a further 58 young people supported into secure housing at any one time, keeping them focused on education and securing a job, not where they will sleep that night. This builds on the 243 new homes being constructed on the Sunshine Coast and 392 on the Gold Coast delivered under the Palaszczuk government's Queensland Housing Strategy.

MOTION

Suspension of Standing and Sessional Orders



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

That, notwithstanding anything contained in standing and sessional orders, general business order of the day No. 1 be postponed.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

ETHICS COMMITTEE

Reports



Mr KELLY (Greenslopes—ALP) (10.12 am): I table Ethics Committee report No. 184, titled *Matter of privilege referred by the Speaker on 26 October 2017 relating to alleged deliberate misleading of the House*.

Tabled paper: Ethics Committee: Report No. 184, 56th Parliament—Matter of privilege referred by the Speaker on 26 October 2017 relating to alleged deliberate misleading of the House [\[734\]](#).

I also table Ethics Committee report No. 185, titled *Matter of privilege referred by the Speaker on 9 August 2017 relating to alleged deliberate misleading of the House*.

Tabled paper: Ethics Committee Report No. 185, 56th Parliament—Matter of privilege referred by the Speaker on 9 August 2017 relating to alleged deliberate misleading of the House [\[735\]](#).

I draw the attention of all members of the House to clauses 105 and 106. I advise the House that the Ethics Committee has attached to these reports the submissions received in respect of, and an extract of minutes relevant to, the inquiries to comply with standing order 211B. I commend the reports and the committee's recommendations to the House.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Disallowance of Statutory Instrument



Mr HART (Burleigh—LNP) (10.13 am): I give notice that I shall move—

That the Electrical Safety (Solar Farms) Amendment Regulation 2019, subordinate legislation No. 46 of 2019, tabled in the House on 30 April 2019, be disallowed.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, question time will conclude today at 11.14 am.

Youth Detention

Mrs FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (10.14 am): My first question without notice is to the Premier. I refer to media reports that children as young as 10 are being held in adult maximum security watch houses with alleged murderers, rapists and adults severely affected by drugs and alcohol. Will the Premier take responsibility for this failed policy and remove children from Queensland watch houses today?

Mr SPEAKER: Before answering the question, member for Southern Downs, I caution you. I ask for silence during questions asked.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. It is a very serious question and a very serious policy issue and one that we take incredibly seriously. That is why my government is making the largest ever injection in youth justice history—an investment of over \$550 million. No-one wants to see young people in watch houses. In fact, it would be wonderful not to see young people in our youth detention centres. However, the reality is that the young people who are there have, in some instances, committed some very serious offences. They include assaults, assaults on police officers, armed robberies and sexual assaults. Of course, it is up to the courts to determine where these young people go.

Let me go back to the beginning. We made a decision in this parliament to remove 17-year-olds from adult correctional facilities.

Mrs Frecklington: How is that relevant?

Ms PALASZCZUK: It is highly relevant because those opposite did not support that.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members to my left, the Premier is being responsive to the question asked. I want to hear the answer.

Ms PALASZCZUK: As part of that \$550 million there is money towards the expansion of the Brisbane Youth Detention Centre as well as a new youth detention centre. As I said the other day, many of these young people are coming into contact with authorities due to a number of complex issues.

Mr Janetzki interjected.

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

Ms PALASZCZUK: Some of these young people have complex issues including drugs. Some of these young people come from broken homes. Some of these young people are homeless.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Isn't it wonderful? This is the same opposition that when in government set up boot camps. That is what they did.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I will wait for the House to come to order.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I think I heard the member for Kawana interject and say they were going to sort them out. However, the boot camps did not sort them out. What else did they do? They cut youth justice conferencing, they cut the Murri Courts and they denied Indigenous elders the right to go into youth detention centres. That is the record of those opposite. They cut the Special Circumstances Court, they cut the Drug Court and they cut youth justice conferencing. We have had to rebuild all of this in the state. I firmly—

Mr Crandon interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Coomera.

Ms PALASZCZUK:—believe that \$550 million investment—
(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: The Premier will resume her seat.

Youth Detention

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: My second question is also to the Premier. Will the Premier explain why a young girl was put in an adult maximum security holding cell with two alleged sex offenders?

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is a serious allegation, and that matter is currently undergoing a full investigation. I spoke to the director-general this morning. She has advised me that the matters that were raised on the *Four Corners* program that the minister was not aware of and that I was not aware of will be fully investigated.

Infrastructure, Federal Funding

Mr WHITING: My question is of the Premier and Minister for Trade. Will the Premier update the House on any recent analysis of federal infrastructure spending and how that funding varies from state to state?

Ms PALASZCZUK: Of course, we are on the countdown to the federal election this Saturday. A very key issue in this election and a key issue for Queenslanders is in relation to Queensland getting our fair share from Canberra. Over the last six years we have seen a lack of federal government investment coming into Queensland for infrastructure. What we do see is a lot of investment going into New South Wales and a lot of investment going into Victoria. It is about time that Queenslanders stood up for Queensland. It is about time that Queenslanders made their message heard very clearly at the ballot box this Saturday and say that we believe that we deserve our fair share when it comes to federal government infrastructure funding.

Just last week I had the pleasure of going to the Sunshine Coast to speak at an event put on by the *Sunshine Coast Daily*. I thank the *Sunshine Coast Daily* for organising that great event. I know a number of members opposite were at that event as well. We had the opportunity to hear from Bernard Salt. Everybody knows that Bernard Salt is highly regarded. He gave a presentation where he clearly articulated the lack of federal government investment in infrastructure—

Ms Simpson: They were state government figures!

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Maroochydore! Premier, resume your seat. Member for Maroochydore, you are warned under the standing orders. I will not tolerate outbursts when I believe members are not being combative in providing a response to a question asked.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Maroochydore for that interjection, because the members had to sit there and listen to a third party back up the premier of the day saying it is fact that the federal Morrison government failed to deliver key infrastructure money for Queensland. You should have seen them—their heads were down on hearing this news about the lack of infrastructure funding coming from Canberra. We know that there is a clear choice.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Here we go. They are not happy. It is an absolute fact. There is a very clear choice to be made this Saturday about whether people want to see a stable Shorten Labor government or the chaos of Morrison, Palmer and Pauline Hanson? That is the clear choice that Queenslanders have to make this Saturday. It is almost the same choice they had to make at the last state election. I know that Queenslanders will argue for their fair share.

Palen Creek Correctional Centre, Leave for Inmate

Mr MANDER: My question without notice is to the Premier. Media reports last week revealed that a lavish wedding for an inmate was hosted at the Palen Creek Correctional Centre. Will the Premier advise whether leave was granted to the convicted drug trafficker to spend his wedding night with his bride?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for the question. I did not think they would ask a question about the wedding; that was very highly unexpected when it was flagged on the TV last night. I have said publicly—and the minister has said this as well—that this was a very poor decision. I am not happy with it. The minister is not happy with it. The Corrective Services Commissioner advises that the decision was made by the deputy general manager and an acting general manager and it should never have been allowed. The Corrective Services Commissioner—

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Do they want the answer or not?

Mr SPEAKER: Members to my left, my patience is wearing very thin today. Interjections are not clever if they are designed to disrupt.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The Corrective Services Commissioner has ordered that from now on any permission for marriage approvals is granted by the deputy commissioner and the final say is delivered by the commissioner.

Mr Crandon interjected.

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

Ms Trad interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, I do not need your assistance.

Ms PALASZCZUK: An investigation into how this happened is underway and is being conducted by the Deputy Corrective Services Commissioner. Further, I advise the House that the minister also forwarded this matter to the CCC for a thorough investigation. I understand that that letter was forwarded yesterday.

Whilst I am on my feet, there have been two such—

Mr MANDER: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. On the point of relevance, the question was very direct: was leave granted to the inmate to spend his wedding night with his bride?

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Everton, I believe that the Premier has responded to your question. It may not be to your satisfaction; it is to my satisfaction. Does the Premier have anything further to add regarding the question asked?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I do, Mr Speaker. I am advised that two weddings at correctional facilities have been approved. They were both approved in the same format. That review has now commenced and things will not be occurring like that. The previous wedding was in 2013.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I appreciate that last night some members in the precinct did not get a lot of sleep. That is no excuse for this kind of interjection this morning.

Exports

Mr SAUNDERS: My question is of the Premier and Minister for Trade. Will the Premier update the House on Queensland's export performance?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Maryborough for the question. From the outset, can I say what a great member the member for Maryborough is—a great worker with Downer. I can advise the House that just last week the Minister for Innovation and I opened a Brisbane office for Downer, consolidating their businesses. This is a real commitment to Queensland—not just in the trains in Maryborough. It was also involved in Gold Coast Light Rail. It is very interested in working with coal companies on the future of hydrogen, something especially of interest to me. It is also in renewables. It is a great Queensland company doing great things.

I am also pleased to announce that in the year to March Queensland again recorded a record when it comes to exports. Exports were worth \$84.3 billion—a record 12-month total and 18.4 per cent higher than the year before. This is fantastic news for Queensland. It just shows that our economy is going strong, going from strength to strength. Our beef exports are up 21.7 per cent and cotton exports are up 18.7 per cent. I make a special shout-out to all of our trade and investment commissioners working across the world, hoping to secure even more markets for Queensland exporters.

Last week I also had the opportunity to drop in to Tritium. Tritium is also a great export story in terms of the future of electric vehicles, with one million electric vehicles on the roads in China at the moment. When I was in Germany I spoke to BMW and Volkswagen, both of whom are mass producing an affordable hybrid electric vehicle. This is what is happening around the world, and we also will see that happening in Australia.

Tritium started as a very small company of five or six and has grown to more than 200. It is now in over 20 countries. This is fantastic news—a great Queensland company. I am quite sure we will see even more growth in that company in years to come. It was awarded the Premier's export award last year. Nominations for this year's export awards are now open. I encourage as many Queensland companies as possible to apply.

(Time expired)

Youth Detention

Mr BLEIJIE: My question without notice is to the Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services. When did the minister or his staff first brief the Premier about incidents in watch houses, with children as young as 10 being held in adult maximum security cells with alleged murderers, alleged rapists and adults severely affected by alcohol and drugs?

Mr RYAN: This is a very serious matter. The Premier has already outlined the seriousness of this matter. The Minister for Youth has made a ministerial statement on this matter.

Mr Crisafulli interjected.

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

Mr RYAN: At the end of the day, no-one in our government wants to see young people—juvenile offenders—detained in watch houses. They should be detained in appropriate facilities. No-one wants to see that—not me, not the Premier, not the youth justice minister, not the Police Commissioner, not the Police Service and not the Police Union. No-one wants to have them there, but these young people have to be detained somewhere.

The Minister for Youth has outlined our government's approach to expanding capacity and investing in the front end—around prevention, diversion and early intervention. Those are worthwhile strategies to invest in, because they work and they ensure young people have the opportunities to lead positive lives.

The Queensland Police Service has been doing its job when it comes to lawfully detaining people in watch houses. It acts in accordance with law. That is what it does. If a court makes an order—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Members to my left, the minister is being responsive to the question asked. I ask that you hear his answer and cease interjecting.

Mr RYAN: I take the interjection of the member for Everton, who said, 'Let them out.' That would not only be contrary to law but also put at risk community safety and the safety of those young people. At the end of the day—

Mr Dick interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister for State Development, you are warned under the standing orders. You will put your comments through the chair.

Mr RYAN: The Queensland Police Service acts in accordance with law.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, you are warned under the standing orders. I have had to speak to you a couple of times today. I ask you to put your comments through the chair, as per my instructions this morning.

Mr RYAN: They act in accordance with law. When a court of law makes a legal order that a young person—or any person for that matter—is to be remanded in custody or detained in a facility, the police will comply with that law. They will not ignore that law, like the member for Everton has just said, and let them out.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order under standing order 118(b). I asked when the minister briefed the Premier about these instances, recognising that the minister has 38 seconds remaining.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Kawana, I have been listening to the minister's statement. I agree that the minister should return to the issue at the core of your question regarding advice to the Premier. However, I also note that I am hearing continued interjections from those to my left, and the minister is responding to those interjections as he is able to do because there are not meant to be interjections, period. The minister will come back to the question, under standing order 118(b), if he has anything further to add.

Mr RYAN: I receive regular briefings from the commissioner, the Minister for Youth receives regular briefings from her department and the Premier receives regular briefings from her department. The approach to youth justice is a whole-of-government response. Every agency is involved in this. That is how we will get answers. While I am on my feet, I want to call out those opposite for the continued denigration of our police.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr RYAN: Absolutely. They continually talk them down. Our police work hard. They are professional—

(Time expired)

Cross River Rail

Ms LINARD: My question is of the Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships. Can the Deputy Premier update the House on the federal government funding Cross River Rail?

Ms TRAD: I thank the member for Nudgee for her question. As her community relies very heavily on a heavy rail commute in to the city, she knows absolutely intimately the benefits Cross River Rail will deliver for her community in terms of faster heavy rail transportation into the city and back home so that people are not stuck in traffic and can spend time being productive in the economy or spend time at home with their families, which is incredibly important.

I was very interested in the Liberal National launch—or the Scott Morrison show—which took place on Sunday in Melbourne. What was very evident from that campaign launch is how worried Scott Morrison is about the seat of Higgins. From the Liberal National perspective, the federal election campaign has been the Scott Morrison show. It is very clear that the Liberal and National parties at the federal level have put into witness protection a number of ministers whom they will not let front the camera because of their appalling performance as ministers in our national government.

Let me focus on a big announcement made by the Prime Minister. That was a \$4 billion injection into the East West Link. This is a project that was progressed by a former Liberal government, that was killed off by a Labor government, that was taken to the last state election in Victoria and once again resoundingly rejected by the people of Victoria. In a last-minute attempt to revive this project, to get some infrastructure credibility in Victoria—

Ms Fentiman interjected.

Ms TRAD: I take that interjection from the Minister for Small Business and Minister for Training: to try to get Josh Frydenberg over the line in his electorate—they make a \$4 billion announcement about an infrastructure project that does not have a business case, that does not have the support of the state government and that does not have the support of the Victorian people.

What adds salt to the wound is the fact that they have promised more than double what we have asked the federal government to contribute in terms of Cross River Rail. What I found incredibly insulting, apart from that—Cross River Rail has a business case, widespread public support et cetera—is that it even has the support of Liberal and National candidates in Queensland. Trevor Evans, on his achievements page, has Cross River Rail down as an achievement.

Mr SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, will you be tabling those?

Ms TRAD: I will gladly table these pictures from his web page.

Tabled paper. Extract, undated, from the trevorevans.com.au website regarding Cross River Rail [749].

They will not fund it but they will take credit for it.

(Time expired)

Youth Detention

Mr BENNETT: My question is to the Minister for Child Safety, Youth and Women. When was the minister first made aware of the incidents in the maximum security watch house including self-harm, a child being 10 weeks pregnant, a child losing part of their finger and highly traumatic incidents involving children as young as 10 years of age?

Ms FARMER: I thank the member for his question. Along with every other person in this House, I do not want young people in our watch houses. It is why this government has made a massive commitment to youth justice reform. We have committed over \$550 million towards reforming youth justice in this state. It includes increasing youth detention centre capacity and an investment to stop our young people from getting into the youth justice system in the first place.

There are currently young people in our watch houses. We do not want them in our watch houses. That is why we are absolutely intent on changing the story and making sure that those young people do not enter the youth justice system or that they do not re-enter. There were a number of allegations raised in the *Four Corners* program last night. Any new allegations will be thoroughly investigated, as has every other issue and every other allegation—

Mr Hart interjected.

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

Ms FARMER:—that is raised about young people in the watch houses. This area is a very complex area and it is a difficult area and it requires leadership. We are seeing long-term leadership from this side of the House and those on the other side of the House still have not even decided what their position is on youth justice. Just before I heard the member for Everton say that we need to let all of the young people out.

Ms Simpson interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Maroochydore, you are under a warning. You will leave the chamber for the remainder of question time.

Whereupon the honourable member for Maroochydore withdrew from the chamber at 10.40 am.

Ms FARMER: Those opposite still have not decided what they even think about youth justice. This is a serious area that requires leadership. This week the member for Everton is saying, 'Let them out.' Last week he said, 'Keep them all locked in. Overcrowding doesn't matter.' One week the member for Nanango says, 'They're all young thugs and we've got to keep them locked up.' The next week she says that they need rehabilitation. One week the shadow minister says, 'We need to sort out these young people with early intervention and prevention.' The next week he says, 'We've got to keep them all locked up and keep them away from the community.' What our young people need is for those opposite to show some leadership. They went to the last election wanting to pull \$200 million out of the youth justice system.

Mr Hunt interjected.

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

Ms FARMER: Those opposite went to the election wanting to pull \$200 million out the Youth Justice budget. They promised to name and shame offenders. They promised to lobby the federal government to cut the welfare payments of families. This is about leadership on this side of the House and on the other side of the House it is a complete abrogation of their responsibilities.

(Time expired)

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Infrastructure

Mr STEWART: My question is to the Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning. Will the minister advise how the Palaszczuk Labor government is investing in infrastructure across Queensland and whether the minister is aware of any alternative approaches to the delivery of infrastructure in our state?

Mr DICK: I thank the member for Townsville for his question. I was delighted to be in Townsville last week to announce funding for two important infrastructure projects in his community. The first is a \$7.4 million pedestrian bridge to be funded by the Palaszczuk Labor government. That will connect Reid Park and the park-and-ride facilities with the magnificent new Townsville Stadium—a stadium that was the vision of our Premier and is being delivered by her government. There is also \$2.3 million for upgrades and a new car park at Magnetic Island to support more tourism at the Fort Complex.

Mr Stewart: Hear, hear!

Mr DICK: I take the interjection from the member for Townsville. The community of Magnetic Island has waited for this upgrade for 20 years and it is being delivered by the member for Townsville and the Palaszczuk Labor government. I also want to commend Bill Shorten's commitment—\$100 million to improve the Mount Isa railway line and \$144 million for the Townsville Ring Road, regrettably investments not matched by the federal coalition government.

I was asked what alternative approaches there are to infrastructure. I want to pick one project, and that is Gold Coast Light Rail. It was a project that was planned, designed and delivered by the state Labor government with support initially from the federal Labor government. What do we hear from Karen Andrews? What did she say about that project? This is the federal coalition government's approach to infrastructure. An article states—

Federal Minister Karen Andrews has what she thinks is the solution to the light rail funding war—just shorten the track.

The Gold Coast MP ... told a business breakfast yesterday it was time to rescope the project and cut the track short by 700m ...

That is the answer. There is Hillary and Tenzing Norgay 700 metres from the top of Mount Everest: 'Sorry, we've run out of money. Righto, Tenzing. Put the flag in. We're going home.' There is Armstrong and Aldrin coming down to the surface of the moon. Seven hundred metres from the surface of the moon Aldrin calls out, 'We're running out of money.' 'Fire up the retros. We're going home,' Armstrong says. That is the LNP's attitude. What a ridiculous comment. She is not a parliamentary secretary. She is not a backbencher. She is not a minister. She is a cabinet minister in the government of the Commonwealth of Australia, and that is her answer.

Let me say this: lazy LNP members on the Gold Coast on fat margins have never delivered anything for the Gold Coast—they have never delivered anything—and all of those opposite from the Gold Coast were completely mute this morning about this. There is only one way to fund infrastructure,

and that is backing Labor. Bill Shorten will not leave Queensland behind. He will fund infrastructure from Cairns to Coolangatta, and that is the difference—the difference that federal Labor governments make.

Palen Creek Correctional Centre, Wedding

Mr JANETZKI: My question without notice is to the Premier. It has been revealed that a senior officer at the Palen Creek correctional facility approved the lavish wedding, along with succulent Moreton Bay bugs, prawns and prime steak. Why did the Premier try to dismiss this issue last week and say it was only a junior person when the Corrective Services Act clearly states that a wedding can only be conducted with the chief executive's approval?

Ms PALASZCZUK: If the member for Toowoomba South had listened, I addressed that issue fully in my answer previously about how it was a delegated authority and the whole matter is under review. It has been referred to the CCC, and I addressed that at length.

North Queensland, Tourism

Mr HARPER: My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Tourism Industry Development and Minister for the Commonwealth Games. Will the minister update the House on the government's commitment to grow the tourism industry in North Queensland—the best place in the world?

Ms JONES: I thank the honourable member for the question and I am sure that the Speaker agrees that not only Townsville but also the whole of North Queensland and Far North Queensland—Tropical North Queensland—is a wonderful destination for tourists to visit. As the member for Thuringowa knows only too well, as does the member for Townsville and my ministerial colleague the member for Mundingburra, more than 90,000 people rely on the tourism industry for work in this important part of Queensland. That is why today I am very pleased to announce that, as part of the discussions we have been having with the tourism industry as a part of our resilience and recovery fund, the government has made available \$1 million for a tourism campaign to entice southerners to come north for the winter holidays. That is \$1 million of funding from the state government as part of our resilience fund to ensure that we are sending the message to Melbourne and to Sydney and throughout Victoria and New South Wales so that people can make the choice that during these upcoming cold winter months they holiday in Queensland.

I want to put on the record my thanks to the tourism organisations in those regions. The Whitsundays has just released its new Whitsundays campaign—the 'wow' campaign—which will drive visitors to the newly opened islands that we have been working with in terms of the issues there. We are very excited that through this support we can entice people to come back to those regions, support the 90,000 people who are working in that industry and get these communities back on their feet after devastating floods.

We also know that it is only our side of politics that is investing in tourism and tourism infrastructure. We know that we have seen almost no announcements from those opposite at all and indeed by their colleagues federally in this upcoming election. It is only a Labor government that will invest in tourism and tourism jobs. We know that the Leader of the Opposition when she was the assistant Treasurer cut \$188 million from tourism funding in this state—the blood line of jobs right across Queensland—and it took our government to come back into government to restore that funding.

In addition, we have kicked in \$180 million in new funding to support new airlines and new tourism infrastructure projects and to partner with the private sector to create jobs. Our solution is not to cut 700 metres from the train line—another example of the LNP short-changing Queensland. We know that the only way the LNP could ever devise any policy about tourism is that it would have to go and check with Pauline Hanson and Clive Palmer, and we know what their policies are: 'Asians? We don't want them!' The tourism industry will never forget how damaging the Hanson-Newman years were to tourism infrastructure in Queensland.

(Time expired)

Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services

Mr WATTS: My question without notice is to the Premier. Labor's police minister has referred to cracking down on crime being as easy as spraying cockroaches, has incorrectly told journalists that 10-year-olds were not being held in watch houses, and has presided over a lavish prison wedding for a convicted drug trafficker and a rapid escalation in the crime rate. Will the Premier finally make a decision and sack the police minister, who clearly is not up to the job?

Mr RYAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I have two points of order. The first one is I find references in the member's question offensive and I ask that they be withdrawn. Also, there are a number of matters that are factually incorrect and the member should be aware of these matters. Mr Speaker, I will be writing to you about the member misleading the House.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, in future I ask that, if you have a matter of privilege suddenly arising, you will make sure that you deal with that at the appropriate time. In regard to the point of order that has been put forward, member for Toowoomba North, the member has found parts of the question asked offensive and has asked that they be withdrawn. I do not want you to withdraw the question; I ask that you rephrase the question in a manner that is related to subject and policy matters.

Mr WATTS: I withdraw. My question without notice is to the Premier. Will the Premier finally sack the police minister, who clearly is not up to the job?

Ms PALASZCZUK: The answer is no.

Gold Coast, Health Services

Ms SCANLON: My question is to the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services. Will the minister outline the federal government's plans for Gold Coast health services and if there are any alternative policies?

Dr MILES: I thank the member for Gaven for her important question. I know that she is a passionate advocate for healthcare services on the Gold Coast. She is concerned, like all of us on this side of the House, about how the LNP's cruel cuts to our hospitals are affecting patient care.

We remember when, in 2013, Tony Abbott said that there would be no cuts to health. We remember when, in 2014, in his very first budget, Joe Hockey delivered a budget with massive cuts to health. He broke that promise. The Abbott-Morrison-Turnbull governments have cut \$57 billion from our hospitals plus \$10.4 billion from Medicare, dental and preventative health.

Ms Bates interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Mudgeeraba, I cannot see you, but I can hear you. You are warned under the standing orders. It is your fault, member for Glass House, that I cannot see the member.

Dr MILES: Although I know the member for Gaven opposed that budget and those cruel cuts, I was surprised to learn that one of the LNP aspirants on the Gold Coast was inspired by that budget. The LNP candidate for Moncrieff says that she was lucky enough to be in Canberra that night when Joe Hockey delivered his budget and that it inspired her to get into politics. That cruel budget cut health services, including \$27 million from the very health service that she now says she wants to represent. She goes on to say that Joe Hockey also went on to endorse her book, which she has not finished writing. We can look forward to that book when she eventually finishes writing it.

Government members interjected.

Dr MILES: Seven pages or 700 pages. In contrast, federal Labor will invest in our hospitals. Yesterday, the Labor opposition announced that, if elected on Saturday, it will invest—

Mr Powell interjected.

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

Dr MILES: Yesterday, federal Labor announced that it would invest \$8 million in a mental health stabilisation facility near the Gold Coast University Hospital, providing observation, intervention and stabilisation services 24/7 for mental health patients—getting them out of the emergency department. Also, yesterday federal Labor announced that it would invest nearly \$30 million to put an extra floor on the Logan Hospital development, delivering 32 beds and shelf space for 32 more when needed down the track. On the Gold Coast, just like all over the state, Queenslanders have a choice between Labor candidates who will stand up against the cuts and LNP candidates who are inspired by them.

(Time expired)

North-West Queensland, Workforce

Mr KATTER: My question is to the Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning. The local economies of Cloncurry and Mount Isa are being severely battered by the growing incidence of FIFO and contract workforces. The Strong and Sustainable Resource Communities Act has not addressed this issue in the north-west, so I ask: will the minister expand the scope of existing legislation to address these practices that are toxic to rural and remote mining communities?

Mr DICK: I thank the member for Traeger for his question. I might make a few comments about the SSRC Act first before turning to specific matters relating to the north-west. We are strongly committed to supporting jobs in regional Queensland. I reported that in the House earlier today. It was our initiative to implement the Strong and Sustainable Resource Communities Act. It was passed by the House in 2017. It was supported by the member for Traeger and all members of the LNP. They supported a Labor government initiative. That act commenced on 30 March 2018 and prohibits 100 per cent fly-in fly-out workforces where there are declared nearby regional communities, such as Mount Isa, Cloncurry and Moranbah.

The mine that I have announced today will be subject to that act and, for the first time ever, so will the construction of that mine. The workforce engaged to construct the Olive Downs mine in the Bowen Basin will be subject to the SSRC Act, meaning that the construction workforce will have to comply with the act. I understand that the proponent is proposing at least—at least—50 per cent of the workforce for the operational phase to be local. At least 500 of the 1,000 jobs will be local and I hope that that figure will increase.

In respect of the honourable member's electorate, Dugald River mine is subject to the provisions of the SSRC Act, as are nearby regional communities. I encourage the member for Traeger—or any member of the House—that, if they believe the law is not being complied with, to report that to the Office of the Coordinator-General. Round Oak mine is another mine in that area. The same concerns expressed by the member for Traeger were raised by me when, at the request of the Premier, I was out there after the floods to support the community. We are investigating those matters. The challenge might be that that mine may have 100 fewer employees.

I say to the member for Traeger that we undertook to review the act 18 months after it commenced. That review will be very important. I am currently working through the form that review will take. Mining companies need to know that, if they are benefiting from the resources of the state, they need to give back to our state. The principal way they can do that is by employing local people. We have seen a shift in what mining companies are doing. I am not going to have those workers and families in the north-west, which is such an important mining province in our state, not getting the benefit of mining. That is so important to our government. That is why we introduced this legislation. We will see that it is implemented.

I send that message today. I know that I am supported by the Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy in that, as I am supported by all the other members of the government. We expect mining companies to do the right thing. We are blessed to have mineral resources in this state that deliver so much to our state generally, but we need to get that benefit to regional communities as well.

Education

Mr POWER: My question is to the Minister for Education. Could the minister inform the House of the education related issues that she will be raising with the incoming federal government?

Ms GRACE: I thank the member for the question. I know how proud he is of the new high school we are building at Yarrabilba.

Mr Power: Fantastic, Minister.

Ms GRACE: I take his interjection. This government is committed to providing all Queensland students with a great start. We know that a high-quality education is the foundation to a successful future and we value the work that all schools do day in, day out towards achieving this aim.

Whatever the outcome of the federal election, we cannot afford more of the same. We cannot afford cuts of \$14 billion out of education funding at the federal level. That equates to \$2.1 billion over 10 years out of education in the state of Queensland alone—\$182 million just this year.

Mr Mander: False news!

Ms GRACE: I take the interjection from the member for Everton Park. Members may recall when those opposite were in government the member for Everton Park had to fight very hard to stop Everton Park High School from being closed down.

Mr Mander: And I won!

Ms GRACE: I take the interjection. His own Campbell Newman government wanted to put a for sale sign on Everton Park High School and he talks about saving it. You have got to be kidding me! We need that funding to come back into education. The only party that has committed to do that is a Shorten

Labor government. Can you imagine working in education with the deputy opposition leader Tanya Plibersek? Let me tell you, that would be a dream come true. I encourage every member to vote for a change because we cannot continue with the cuts and chaos in education that are happening federally. When you cut \$2.1 billion out of the education budget you are denying students throughout Australia the benefit of a great education.

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

Ms GRACE: Talking generally, when \$2.1 billion is cut out of education funding—if anyone does that, not anyone specific—through yourself, Speaker—that has a big dent on education. We need a commitment to restore that funding. We need to stop the cuts and chaos at a federal level.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The member for Kawana is warned under the standing orders.

Ms GRACE: We need every parent in this state who wants to see better education in Queensland schools to vote a Labor government in and to vote for Tanya Plibersek as education minister.

Gladstone Ports Corporation, Workforce

Mr MINNIKIN: My question is to the Premier. I refer to a father of three having his access card cut, personal belongings returned and job dumped by Gladstone Ports Corporation the day after he asked a simple tax policy question of Bill Shorten. Will the Premier establish an independent investigation into what involvement the former Labor candidate and Gladstone Ports Corporation boss, Peter O'Sullivan, had with the decision to cancel the worker's site access and return his personal belongings?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for the question. The minister addressed this issue in a ministerial statement earlier.

Mr Boothman: Come on, stand up for the worker!

Ms PALASZCZUK: I will always stand up for workers. Absolutely! I take that interjection. There is a bit of reinvention of history happening here. Those opposite seem to have forgotten there were 14,000 jobs axed. I still have people coming up to me to this day talking to me about what their family went through when those opposite cut those jobs. Today we also have a reinvention of history when the member for Everton talks about saving a school that those opposite wanted to close. The one who saved that school was our government.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. The Premier is answering the previous government Dorothy Dixier question, not the question asked by the opposition which was with respect to a sacked Gladstone port worker.

Mr SPEAKER: In response to your point of order, the Premier has addressed the question, has then taken an interjection. However, there is only a certain period that one can dwell on an interjection without coming back to the question that was asked. Premier, I ask you to return to the question under standing order 118(b).


Ms PALASZCZUK: Talking about the Gladstone worker, I absolutely believe that workers across the state have a democratic right to express their views about matters to any elected official, including people who wish to attain the highest office and that is of prime minister of our country. I say that very clearly. I also support the rights of workers across the state. Recently we celebrated Labour Day. We know what those opposite wanted to do for Labour Day—they got rid of Labour Day. That is how much they thought of workers. We also know what the federal government thinks about workers and their penalty rates. They want to get rid of penalty rates.

When it comes to issues like the Gladstone port and our energy companies, there would have been massive redundancies because those opposite wanted to sell those assets off to the highest bidder. Labor will always stand up for workers. We will back our workers. We will make sure that their rights are protected. The best thing we can do for people is to give them the dignity of a job to be able to pay the bills. Talking about lack of dignity, when those opposite were in government it was very clear they did not care about the dignity of workers through their broadscale sackings across the state. Every single member of this House should be reminded of that. It will stand in the history books for decades to come.

Interruption.

PRIVILEGE

Conduct in Chamber

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning) (11.07 am): Mr Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising. During the answer of the honourable Premier to that question, the member for Scenic Rim held up the self-same flyer that in the last sitting week you admonished members of the House for waving.

Mr SPEAKER: There is no matter of privilege, unless you can let me know what standing order has been offended.

Mr DICK: There was a ruling.

Mr SPEAKER: That was a ruling in relation to a number of members, not a single member, holding up a document. I ask you to please resume your seat.


Mr Minnikin interjected.

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

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Resumed from p. 1514.

Gas Industry, Policy

 **Mr BUTCHER** (11.08 am): My question is to the Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy. Will the minister inform the House of the impact of the government's gas policies and is he aware of any other alternatives?

Dr LYNHAM: I thank the member for the question. What a strong representative of a strong resource community like Gladstone. The Palaszczuk government is doing the heavy lifting to bring new gas to market. Manufacturers want gas both as an energy source and as a feedstock. Queensland has stepped up to the mark. We have released exploration blocks for domestic use only. We have also released acreage for gas for manufacturing industries only. This has received widespread acclaim.

Queensland also has a number of frontier basins, but their development depends on infrastructure. Last year I asked small to medium explorers what would be a real and practical impetus for them to get into those basins and they said pipelines. That is the game-changer to getting gas out of the ground and into our manufacturing plants to create more jobs in this state.

However, when we asked the federal government to step up with some nation-building infrastructure or incentives, sadly the Abbott-Turnbull-Morrison government did not have the vision to understand. Our pleas fell on some very deaf ears indeed. We heard not a word out of Canberra. There was no plan for new gas, no plan for infrastructure to bring gas to market and no meaningful effort at all out of Canberra. The only thing we got out of Canberra was a policy to reallocate Queensland gas. That is putting our royalties at risk. There was not one ounce of effort from those opposite. Where were you? Why weren't you asking your Canberra colleagues to step up for Queensland?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Minister, you will put your comments through the chair.

Dr LYNHAM: I am sorry, Mr Speaker. We heard nothing from those opposite—nothing at all. We heard not a word from those opposite to Canberra to help manufacturing industries or jobs in Queensland. Here was an opportunity to drive a new wave of resource development.

Mr Lister interjected.

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

Dr LYNHAM: Here was their opportunity and they choked, just like a New South Wales rookie on Origin night, with the tryline open, who drops the ball. They choked. Federal Labor can see an opportunity when an opportunity is there. Their Northern Australia policy will identify new pipeline opportunities to bring new gas to market from Queensland and the Northern Territory. Two years ago we needed a federal Labor government to help manufacturing industries grow in this wonderful state.

Public Guardian

Mr POWELL: My question is to the Premier. I refer to the courageous Public Guardian, who has been raising concerns for months about Labor's watch house policy, which is locking up children like caged animals. Will the Premier guarantee that the Public Guardian will not be given the same treatment as the Gladstone worker who questioned Bill Shorten's tax policy?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Glass House for the question. I remind the House of the time when members opposite were in government and they put gag clauses on people. They put gag clauses on organisations to stop them from speaking out. That is what they did. My understanding is that they put gag clauses into contracts to stop people from speaking out. We have the Public Guardian and the Anti-Discrimination Commissioner and, of course, they were granted access because that is about open and transparent government. They were allowed in. *Four Corners* was allowed in. They were not stopped. They were allowed in.

I point out the complete hypocrisy of those opposite. Today the member for Everton interjected and said, 'Let them out'. That is what the member for Everton said. It is on the record. They have no position when it comes to youth justice. I state again for the record: \$550 million, which is the largest investment. I re-emphasise that the best way to break the youth justice cycle is for young people to get a job. That is what it is about. Those opposite cut Skilling Queenslanders for Work. They did not want young people to get a job. There was no back to work program. That was started under this government.

Mr Powell interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Glass House, you are already under a warning today. You can leave the chamber for one hour.


Whereupon the honourable member for Glass House withdrew from the chamber at 11.14 am.

Ms PALASZCZUK: They could not even back Works for Queensland. There was no funding in their election campaign for Works for Queensland. My government is committed to jobs. We are committed to making sure that young people get a job. The best way to break the cycle is to give young people a job. That is exactly what we intend to do.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The period for question time has expired.


MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Palen Creek Correctional Centre, Leave for Inmate

 **Hon. MT RYAN** (Morayfield—ALP) (Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services) (11.14 am): Earlier in question time the member for Everton asked the Premier a question about a prisoner being granted leave. I can confirm that the prisoner in question was not granted leave and the prisoner did not leave the facility.


PRIVILEGE

Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by the Premier

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (11.15 am): Mr Speaker, I rise under standing order 267 on a matter of privilege suddenly arising. In an answer she gave earlier, the Premier said that the LNP got rid of Labour Day. That is misleading the House. We moved Labour Day. I will be writing to you with respect to that misleading of the House, Mr Speaker.

MOTION

Business Program

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (11.15 am): In accordance with sessional order 2B, I move—

1. That the following government business will be considered this sitting week, with the nominated maximum periods of time as specified:
 - (a) the Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, a maximum of four hours to complete all stages,
 - (b) the Working with Children (Risk Management and Screening) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, a maximum of six hours and 30 minutes to complete all stages, and
 - (c) the motion standing in the name of the Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef, Minister for Science and Minister for the Arts proposing the revocation of state forests and dedication of protected areas under the Nature Conservation Act 1992, a maximum of 30 minutes for debate.

2. The following time limits for the bills listed in paragraph 1(a) and (b) apply:
 - (a) for the Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, the minister to be called in reply 30 minutes before the expiry of the maximum time,
 - (b) for the Working with Children (Risk Management and Screening) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, the minister to be called in reply three hours before the expiry of the maximum time,
 - (c) question on third reading to be put two minutes before the expiry of the maximum time, and
 - (d) question on long title to be put one minute before the expiry of the maximum time.
3. If the nominated stage of each bill listed in paragraph 1(a) and (b) has not been completed by the allocated time specified in paragraph 2, or by 5.55 pm on Thursday, 16 May 2019, Mr Speaker:
 - (a) shall call upon the minister to table any explanatory notes to government amendments to be put,
 - (b) shall then put all remaining questions necessary to either pass that stage or pass the bill or motion without further debate,
 - (c) may interrupt non-specified business or debate on a bill or motion to complete the requirements of the motion, and
 - (d) will complete all stages required by this motion notwithstanding anything contained in standing and sessional orders.


In speaking to this motion, I acknowledge the member for Kawana, the member for Noosa and the member for Murrumba for participating in the business meeting last evening to negotiate the times that should be allocated to these bills. The bills being debated before the House this week will be the Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, the Working With Children (Risk Management and Screening) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and also a revocation put forward by the Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef, Minister for Science and Minister for the Arts in relation to dedicated protected areas under the Nature Conservation Act 1992, which are all important works for the parliament to consider this week. The times allotted were as a consequence of discussions at the committee meeting last night.

I note that the opposition have circulated and are intending to move amendments. Without pre-empting that debate, I say that I welcome the opposition now acknowledging the importance of allocating times for debating these bills and adopting the business program. Of course, in future I would like to see that input actually occurring at the meeting on a Monday evening, as opposed to amendments being put forward in this chamber. However, I recognise that the opposition now understands the merits of allocating time for debates to ensure that there is time for ministers to speak in reply and during consideration in detail. I look forward to, in future meetings, seeing genuine contributions about the times that should be allocated to bills.

I asked if there were any views that there should be a difference, particularly in relation to the blue card issue where the opposition had put forward a number of amendments. The government has indicated to the opposition that it intends to move amendments. I asked how much time they would like to see allocated in consideration in detail. The government had proposed three hours, because there is significant detail that I am sure the shadow minister would like to speak to in his amendments, as would the government. I asked the Manager of Opposition Business to come back if, after speaking to the shadow Attorney-General, there was a view that that three hours should be different. Instead of coming back to me as offered, they moved this amendment. However, as I say, I welcome the fact that the opposition has realised the benefit of this new program. I see it as a very positive step forward for the workings of this parliament.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Before I call the member for Kawana, I remind members in the House of those who are already warned. They are the members for Ninderry, Gympie, Stretton, Toowoomba South, Coomera, Broadwater, Woodridge, Nanango, Burleigh, Nicklin, Mudgeeraba, Kawana, Chatsworth and Southern Downs.

I also wish to advise members that we are being visited in the gallery this morning by students and teachers from Sherwood State School in the electorate of Miller.

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (11.19 am): I move the following amendment—

That all words following “nominated maximum periods of time as specified:” in paragraph 1 of the motion be omitted; and the following words be inserted:

- “(a) the Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, a maximum of six hours to complete all stages;
- (b) the Working with Children (Risk Management and Screening) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, a maximum of eight hours to complete all stages; and
- (c) the motion standing in the name of the Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef, Minister for Science and Minister for the Arts proposing the revocation of state forests and dedication of protected areas under the Nature Conservation Act 1992, a maximum of 30 minutes for debate.

2. The following time limits for the bills listed in paragraph 1(a) and (b) apply:
- (a) for the Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, the minister to be called in reply one hour before the expiry of the maximum time;
 - (b) for the Working with Children (Risk Management and Screening) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, the minister to be called in reply two hours before the expiry of the maximum time;
 - (c) question on third reading to be put two minutes before the expiry of the maximum time; and
 - (d) question on long title to be put one minute before the expiry of the maximum time.”

That was a nice try by the Leader of the House to convince this House that we have now come to the conclusion that this is a great process and that democracy is best served by yielding to Labor’s way. That was a nice try, but that is not what happened. Let me correct the record in terms of why I am moving such an amendment to extend the time.

The reason I am extending the time is that I suggested at the meeting on Monday that we ought to sit on Friday. Because of the amount of controversy and crisis surrounding this Labor state government at the moment, there is not sufficient time on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday to deal with it all. That is why I suggested we ought to stay here Thursday night and come back on Friday in order to have proper debate and to have another question time where we can question the government about the youth justice crisis, the drugs in prison, overcrowding, the watch houses, the crisis in the hospitals—all of those issues. When you mention Labor now, it is synonymous with crisis and chaos. Labor and crisis go together. Labor and chaos go together.

The reason we are moving said amendments is to allow more time—not appropriate time because I believe that we should not curtail any debate and that we should have no time restraints and no guillotine on any debate. For the sake of the government not agreeing to sit on Friday, we ought to have more time. That is why for the natural resources bill we are upping debate time from four to six hours and for the blue card bill we are upping debate time from six to eight hours to allow sufficient time—not sufficient time but more time for the shadow minister to move his amendments.

We recall that the blue card bill was due to be debated last sitting but the government was in such a fluster because we moved some cracking amendments that they had not thought about. Then they went, ‘Oh, what do we do? What do we do? Delay, delay, delay. Let’s bring on the education bill and take everyone by surprise.’ The process is not working. It is not creating an efficient parliament. It is just a guillotine of democracy. Each week I table the speaking lists of the bills that have been guillotined. I table them now.


Tabled paper: Bundle of bill debate speaking lists from the sitting week of 30 April to 2 May 2019 [750].

On the education bill 14 speakers were chopped—14 speakers did not get the opportunity to speak. On the Criminal Code bill 12 speakers got the chop—12 members of parliament were not afforded the opportunity to speak. On the Health and Wellbeing Bill 10 speakers were chopped. I put it to honourable members that it is not in the interests of members’ health and wellbeing to be denied the opportunity to speak. How does not having the opportunity to speak impact on the mental health of members of parliament? Members know what would happen to me if I did not get the opportunity to speak in this place when I wanted to and for however long I wanted to at all appropriate times. That is why members of parliament raise these important issues.

For the Leader of the House to say that we have drunk the Kool-Aid and come on board with this new, efficient way that parliament runs—no, it is not because it is a dictatorship. It is a dictatorship when the Labor government, having the majority of numbers, yield their big sword and say, ‘You will do this during the week.’ The Leader of the House says, ‘I look forward to next Monday’s meeting where we will all drink lemonade, hold hands and sing Kumbaya.’ It is not going to happen. I am sorry to cause such distress to the Leader of the House, but it is not going to happen because I will defend the right of every member of this House to speak for as long as they want to speak to debate the issues.

Some of the new members in this parliament have made great contributions on serious matters. The member for Ninderry, for example, has used speech after speech in this parliament to force the Attorney-General to appeal when she would not have done had he not been given the opportunity to speak. He has wanted more opportunities to talk about other issues but he keeps getting gagged. Every member in this House gets gagged. The crossbench each week vote against this motion but keep sending in the member for Noosa, who supports the government gagging debate. What we want is freedom of speech. We want the ability for members to talk about issues important to members’ electorates. That is what we are paid to do. This parliament is not a little plaything for the Labor Party to come in and do what they want, to get their agenda through come hell or high water with no questions asked. If it is an inconvenience for more debate and more divisions then so be it.

(Time expired)

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (11.24 am): I move the following amendment—

That the member for Kawana's amendment be amended by inserting the following words after paragraph 2(d):


- "3. If the nominated stage of each government business listed in paragraph 1 has not been completed by the allocated time specified in paragraph 2, or by 5.55 pm on Thursday, 16 May 2019, Mr Speaker:
- (a) shall call upon the minister to table any explanatory notes to government amendments to be put;
 - (b) shall then put all remaining questions necessary to either pass that stage or pass the bill or motion without further debate;
 - (c) may interrupt non-specified business or debate on a bill or motion to complete the requirements of the motion; and
 - (d) will complete all stages required by this motion notwithstanding anything contained in standing and sessional orders."

For the benefit of members, let me be clear what is happening here and what is going on with these amendments. The member for Kawana could have come along to our Business Committee meeting last night and tabled his amendment, and we could have had a discussion about how to manage the time of the House and about how to ensure that the motion that the Leader of the House moved accommodated the feedback of the opposition. He chose not to and chose instead to deal with this matter here on the floor of the parliament.

In good faith, the Leader of the House—in fact, the government—is willing to work with the opposition on this to ensure that their contribution and their wishes in terms of the business of the House and this motion regarding the business of the House are accommodated. We will, therefore, support the amendment moved by the member for Kawana including the amendment that I have moved to ensure that these important bills get passed in this sitting week. These are important bills. I assume that is why the member for Kawana thinks we need more time to debate them.

To be clear for the interest of members, the motion of the Leader of the House proposed four hours of debate on the Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill; the member for Kawana has proposed extending that to six hours. The government had proposed 30 minutes of ministerial reply and consideration in detail; the member for Kawana has proposed doubling that to an hour. The government had proposed 6½ hours of debate on the Working with Children (Risk Management and Screening) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill; the member for Kawana has proposed extending that to eight hours. The government had proposed three hours for ministerial reply and consideration in detail in consideration of the fact that most of the disagreement across the chamber relates to amendments; instead, bizarrely, the member for Kawana has proposed reducing the amount of time for consideration in detail.

As I say, in recognition of the very important progress we have seen here from the member for Kawana and those opposite, we will accept those variations of time, with my amendment requiring that these bills be dealt with this week. They are important bills and we want to see them voted on this week. As is the case every week, it is now up to all of us in the House, particularly the Leader of the House and the Manager of Opposition Business, to manage the debate, to manage the speaking times and to ensure that all of the matters that they wish to raise in those debates do get raised. I commend the motion, the opposition's amendment and my amendment.

 **Mr MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11.28 am): I rise to speak on this motion and in support of the amendments put forward by the Manager of Opposition Business. We will consistently get up parliamentary sitting after parliamentary sitting to talk about the democratic process that is being jeopardised by the guillotining and the programming that takes place each week. We have two important bills to speak about this week. We have the Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and we have the Working with Children (Risk Management and Screening) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. This bill I have here is the Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill—

Ms Leahy interjected.

Mr MANDER: I will take that interjection from the member for Warrego. It has 230 pages that will affect 29 acts. Here we have the explanatory notes—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Pause the clock. Member for Everton, I am pre-empting what you are going to say but I will just give you a warning to not pre-empt debate today.

Mr MANDER: No, I will not at all. The explanatory notes have 125 pages. The point that I am making is that this is a substantial bill. This is a bill that requires substantial examination—

Dr Rowan: Scrutiny.

Mr MANDER: I will take that interjection from the member for Moggill—and scrutiny but, no, we are going to be limited to four hours when we need to really get into this bill and ask questions. I doubt very much that the minister, with all due respect, could possibly have his mind around every aspect of this bill. In fact, I think it was this morning that he called the shadow minister in to talk about more amendments to this bill already. He did not leave the amendments with the shadow minister so we could examine them beforehand. No, we will hear about them for the first time when they come into the House. Again, our scrutiny and our examination of this bill—our ability as local members to ask questions about this bill—will be limited. That is simply not good enough.

The other bill is the working with children bill. It is an incredibly important bill about protecting our children. It is a bill that should have been discussed a couple of sittings ago, but the shadow Attorney-General put forward some very well-thought-out amendments which the Attorney-General took away to examine because she did not think about these things in the first place. These are incredibly important issues about definitions and making sure that—

Mr Janetzki interjected.

Mr MANDER: I will take that interjection from the shadow Attorney-General. They are about disqualifying offences, making sure that we capture everybody who should not be working with children. Again, in our opinion we are not getting enough time to examine that bill, and that simply is not good enough.

As the Manager of Opposition Business said, not only do we want to talk about those bills; we also want time to continue to keep this government accountable as it goes through crisis after crisis—whether it is crime out of control, whether it is the overcrowding in prisons, whether it is our youth justice system, whether it is the support of the resources industry where government members sit on the fence depending on whether they are speaking to people in the cafes of South Brisbane or whether they are in Rockhampton, Mackay, Townsville or Cairns. These are the questions that we want to ask.

Mrs Frecklington: What about the health system?

Mr MANDER: Not to mention the health system.

Mr Minnikin: What about 'rail fail'?

Mr MANDER: And the 'rail fail'. We had the situation today in parliament where the Premier and the Deputy Premier did not say one word in their ministerial statements about the crisis in our watch houses with young people. That shows a total failure of leadership.

Mr Deputy Speaker, I am pre-empting what you are about to say, so I will continue speaking to save you a breath. The other thing we want to know is whether the Premier will bail out of parliament and take the Agent-General's job in London—a job where it is our tip that—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Pause the clock. Member for Everton, you might have thought that you were a mind-reader, but I can guarantee that you are not. I was going to ask you to come back to the motion, please.

Mr Hinchliffe interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Sandgate. Member for Everton, you now have 21 minutes to come back to—

Mr MANDER: Okay, 21 minutes.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Correction, 21 seconds. Member for Everton, you have 21 seconds to actually talk on the motion.

Mr MANDER: Thank you. We need the time to keep this government accountable. That is the role of the opposition—

Mr Watts interjected.

Mr MANDER: I will take that interjection from the member for Toowoomba North. It is a lack of transparency. It is not good enough and Queenslanders are sick of it.

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

AYES, 47:

ALP, 45—Bailey, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, 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, 39:

LNP, 35—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, O'Connor, Perrett, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

KAP, 2—Dametto, Katter.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Ind, 1—Costigan.

Pairs: Boyd, McArdle; King, Nicholls.

Resolved in the affirmative.

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

AYES, 47:

ALP, 45—Bailey, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, 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, 39:

LNP, 35—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, O'Connor, Perrett, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

KAP, 2—Dametto, Katter.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Ind, 1—Costigan.

Pairs: Boyd, McArdle; King, Nicholls.

Resolved in the affirmative.

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

AYES, 47:

ALP, 45—Bailey, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, 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, 39:

LNP, 35—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, O'Connor, Perrett, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

KAP, 2—Dametto, Katter.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Ind, 1—Costigan.

Pairs: Boyd, McArdle; King, Nicholls.


Resolved in the affirmative.

Motion, as agreed—

1. That the following government business will be considered this sitting week, with the nominated maximum periods of time as specified:
 - (a) the Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, a maximum of six hours to complete all stages;
 - (b) the Working with Children (Risk Management and Screening) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, a maximum of eight hours to complete all stages; and
 - (c) the motion standing in the name of the Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef, Minister for Science and Minister for the Arts proposing the revocation of state forests and dedication of protected areas under the Nature Conservation Act 1992, a maximum of 30 minutes for debate.
2. The following time limits for the bills listed in paragraph 1(a) and (b) apply:
 - (a) for the Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, the minister to be called in reply one hour before the expiry of the maximum time;
 - (b) for the Working with Children (Risk Management and Screening) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, the minister to be called in reply two hours before the expiry of the maximum time;
 - (c) question on third reading to be put two minutes before the expiry of the maximum time; and
 - (d) question on long title to be put one minute before the expiry of the maximum time.
3. If the nominated stage of each government business listed in paragraph 1 has not been completed by the allocated time specified in paragraph 2, or by 5.55 pm on Thursday, 16 May 2019, Mr Speaker:
 - (a) shall call upon the minister to table any explanatory notes to government amendments to be put,
 - (b) shall then put all remaining questions necessary to either pass that stage or pass the bill or motion without further debate,
 - (c) may interrupt non-specified business or debate on a bill or motion to complete the requirements of the motion, and
 - (d) will complete all stages required by this motion notwithstanding anything contained in standing and sessional orders.

MEDICINES AND POISONS BILL

Introduction

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (11.47 am): I present a bill for an act to regulate activities in relation to particular substances, to repeal the Health Act 1937 and the Pest Management Act 2001, and to amend this act, the Drugs Misuse Act 1986, and the acts mentioned in schedule 2 for particular purposes. I table the bill and explanatory notes. I nominate the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Medicines and Poisons Bill 2019 [\[736\]](#).

Tabled paper: Medicines and Poisons Bill 2019, explanatory notes [\[737\]](#).

I also table a draft Medicines and Poisons (Medicines) Regulation 2019 and a draft Medicines and Poisons (Pest Management, Poisons and Other Regulated Substances) Regulation 2019.

Tabled paper: Draft Medicines and Poisons (Medicines) Regulation 2019 [\[738\]](#).

Tabled paper: Draft Medicines and Poisons (Medicines) Regulation, explanatory notes 2019 [\[739\]](#).

Tabled paper: Draft Medicines and Poisons (Pest Management, Poisons and Other Regulated Substances) Regulation 2019 [\[740\]](#).

Tabled paper: Draft Medicines and Poisons (Pest Management, Poisons and Other Regulated Substances) Regulation 2019, explanatory notes [\[741\]](#).

Should the bill be passed, the bill will commence by proclamation and the regulations will commence at the same time. New legislation is needed to modernise and streamline the regulation of medicines and poisons, making it easier for industry and the community to understand and apply them.

The Health Act is one of the oldest acts on the statute book and the current medicines and poisons regulation is difficult to apply in practice, outdated and unnecessarily prescriptive. For example, the Health (Drugs and Poisons) Regulation prescribes the exact measurements of bolts that are required when mounting cabinets or above-ground safes to store regulated drugs. This new legislation will establish a modern framework that enhances public safety and simplifies requirements for clinicians, pharmacists, industry and the community.

The creation of two regulations, the medicines regulation and the pest management, poisons and other regulated substances regulation, will ensure clarity for these two distinct areas. This bill will allow Queensland Health to implement a real-time prescription monitoring system. The database will monitor prescribing of certain dependence-forming medicines such as pharmaceutical opioids and other prescription-only medicines.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order, members. There is too much chatter in the chamber.

Dr MILES: These types of medicines are often associated with abuse and drug-seeking such as sedatives, sleeping tablets and some painkillers. This will help doctors and pharmacists with their clinical decision-making by providing them with access to real-time prescription information before they prescribe or dispense certain substances. It will provide lifesaving benefits to patients by reducing dependence on potentially harmful prescription drugs, minimising overprescription and reducing doctor shopping.

The Medicines and Poisons Bill also includes a number of tools to ensure Queensland Health is better able to monitor and respond to health risks in the community. The bill enables the chief executive to take immediate action to manage risk of significant harm or illness in an emergency situation by making an emergency order. An emergency order may be made, for example, during an outbreak of an infectious disease. The order would make sure a vaccine or medicine could be easily and quickly distributed to treat infection and help prevent further spread of the disease. The emergency order could also allow for additional authorised persons, who may not ordinarily be authorised, to treat patients and administer the medicine. Other emergencies could be disaster situations, severe weather events or biosecurity threats.

The bill also allows the chief executive to make an emerging risk declaration if there is a belief that an unscheduled substance or device poses a risk of injury or illness, for example, if new evidence emerges that a sports supplement contains substances that could harm human health. This will allow the chief executive to prevent substances that may pose a risk of injury or illness entering the marketplace until their safety can be determined or an alternative means of regulating the unsafe substance is implemented. The bill also allows the minister, chief executive or Chief Health Officer to make a public warning. A public warning may be issued in the public interest to warn or inform the public about anyone who has contravened the Medicines and Poisons Act.

The Palaszczuk government has always been a leader on medicinal cannabis access. The medicines and poisons framework further streamlines the process for prescribing medicinal cannabis in Queensland by enabling non-specialist medical practitioners to prescribe without the need for approval from Queensland Health.

The bill simplifies and streamlines licensing requirements in a number of ways. Manufacturers and wholesalers of medicines and poisons will benefit from automatic recognition of Commonwealth manufacturing licences. This means they will no longer have to hold a separate Queensland licence. Also, manufacturers and wholesalers who have multiple sites across Queensland will be able to obtain a single licence for all sites rather than needing a licence for each site. More flexibility will be introduced by allowing universities, research facilities and other entities to apply for a general approval to cover their employees instead of each individual employee needing their own approval. The bill replaces prescriptive rules with a new requirement for certain authority holders to develop a substance management plan.

Substance management plans will assist authority holders to consider and manage the risks associated with dealing with regulated substances. Substance management plans will be required for manufacturers, wholesalers and entities such as schools, hospitals, prisons and community pharmacies. These types of entities generally already have existing policies and procedures in place that may be used to meet the substance management plan requirements. This will provide industry with greater flexibility in the way compliance is achieved.

This legislation was developed following an extensive review of the existing legislation and significant consultation with a wide range of stakeholders. The bill will ensure that our medicines and poisons framework is contemporary. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. SJ MILES (Murrumba—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (11.53 am): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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

Motion agreed to.


Bill read a first time.

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

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

THERAPEUTIC GOODS BILL

Message from Governor

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (11.53 am): I present a message from His Excellency the Governor.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): The message from His Excellency recommends the Therapeutic Goods Bill. The contents of the message will be incorporated in the *Record of Proceedings*. I table the message for the information of members.

MESSAGE

THERAPEUTIC GOODS BILL 2019

Constitution of Queensland 2001, section 68

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


A Bill for an Act to apply the Therapeutic Goods Act 1989 (Cwlth) and related Commonwealth laws in Queensland

GOVERNOR

Date: 14 May 2019

Tabled paper: Message, dated 14 May 2019, from His Excellency the Governor recommending the Therapeutic Goods Bill 2019 [\[742\]](#).

Introduction

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (11.54 am): I present a bill for an act to apply the Therapeutic Goods Act 1989 (Cwlth) and related Commonwealth laws in Queensland. I table the bill and explanatory notes. I nominate the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Therapeutic Goods Bill 2019 [\[743\]](#).

Tabled paper: Therapeutic Goods Bill 2019, explanatory notes [\[744\]](#).

Queensland shares responsibility for the regulation of medicines, poisons and therapeutic goods with the Commonwealth government. The Commonwealth Therapeutic Goods Act regulates the majority of manufacturers of medicines for human use. That act places standardised controls on the manufacture, import, export, supply and use of safe and effective therapeutic goods in Australia. The Commonwealth Therapeutic Goods Act applies to all Queensland corporations, and to Queensland entities of any structure, including partnerships, trusts or sole traders, that trade interstate or overseas.

Due to constitutional limitations, the Commonwealth act does not apply to manufacturers that do not trade as corporations and that also are not engaged in trade outside Queensland. It is important that all commercially manufactured therapeutic goods manufactured in Queensland are subject to the same regulatory requirements. Anything less risks potential safety issues for those purchasing therapeutic goods, such as herbal medicines and vitamin supplements, from sole traders that are not regulated under the Therapeutic Goods Act.

To ensure that all commercially manufactured therapeutic goods are manufactured to the same high standard, the bill adopts the Therapeutic Goods Act as a law of Queensland. This will provide equitable application of therapeutic goods regulation, and better align Queensland with other jurisdictions and international requirements for the manufacture of therapeutic goods. It will provide competitive fairness in the marketplace and ensure the safety of products manufactured and sold within Queensland.

Adopting the Therapeutic Goods Act in Queensland will benefit Queensland based manufacturers already regulated under the Commonwealth act. It will reduce regulatory duplication by removing the need for separate manufacturing, advertising, labelling and packaging requirements in

the Queensland regulatory framework for medicines and poisons. The bill supports a COAG commitment to adopt a nationally consistent approach to the management of medicines, poisons and therapeutic goods, bringing Queensland into line with other jurisdictions.

The bill includes provisions that allow a regulation to modify the application of the Therapeutic Goods Act. I table a draft Therapeutic Goods Regulation 2019 and explanatory notes.

Tabled paper: Draft Therapeutic Goods Regulation 2019 [745].

Tabled paper: Draft Therapeutic Goods Regulation 2019, explanatory notes [746].

The draft regulation modifies the application of the Commonwealth act to ensure it does not apply to the Central Pharmacy Manufacturing Unit, a commercialised business unit within Queensland Health.

Should the bill be passed, the bill will commence by proclamation. The regulation will commence at the same time. The Central Pharmacy provides an essential service to Queensland by manufacturing bespoke medicines that are not commercially available, often because the medicines are not commercially viable for private industry to produce. Central Pharmacy primarily manufactures medicines for complex and rare conditions. This includes vision-saving eye drops for severe fungal infections; specialised dosage forms for children; and solutions for bathing burns victims. These medicines are provided for patients in hospital and health services, dental clinics and Queensland Ambulance Service sites.

The Therapeutic Goods Bill binds all persons, including the state. If the requirements of the Commonwealth Therapeutic Goods Act applied to the state, Central Pharmacy may be required to obtain manufacturing licences and would be required to register some therapeutic goods on the Australian Register of Therapeutic Goods. The cost, technical requirements and administrative processes associated with this are significant, and not obtaining relevant approvals may expose Queensland Health staff to the risk of criminal or civil penalties.

If Central Pharmacy is not exempted from the Commonwealth act, it would more than likely have to cease manufacturing certain medicines, with adverse outcomes for patients in health services across Queensland. To ensure that Central Pharmacy can continue its functions, the bill will be modified by regulation so that it does not apply to departmental employees involved in the manufacture, supply or use of unregistered therapeutic goods or to other individuals supplying or using unregistered therapeutic goods manufactured by a departmental employee. This exemption will ensure patients continue to have access to these life-saving and emergency medicines and will not impact on the safety and quality of the products. Central Pharmacy will be required to hold a manufacturing licence under the medicines and poisons framework and to adhere to the relevant code of good manufacturing practice.

The Palaszczuk government is committed to ensuring the safety and effectiveness of therapeutic goods manufactured in Queensland. This bill will enhance national consistency and ensure appropriate safeguards are in place to protect the health and safety of the community. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. SJ MILES (Murrumba—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (11.58 am): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.


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

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

NATURAL RESOURCES AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 26 February (see p. 341).

Second Reading

 **Hon. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy) (11.59 am): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I thank the State Development, Natural Resources and Agricultural Industry Development Committee for its thorough consideration of the Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. I welcome the committee's recommendation that the bill be passed. I would like to thank the 12 submitters who took time to make a submission, were generally supportive of the proposed amendments and acknowledged the consultation undertaken in their development.

This bill delivers on several government commitments and ensures regulations within my portfolio remain effective and responsive to the needs of industry and the community. The bill will ensure CleanCo Queensland Ltd, a publicly owned clean energy generator, is able to compete in the national energy market. It will provide for an efficient process to transmit leases in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities where lessees have died or die without a will. It ensures the timely and fair resolution of disputes involving Land Act lessees and sublessees by introducing an improved process.

The bill also supports resource exploration by providing flexibility to respond to on-ground findings and adequate time to make informed investment decisions while providing greater certainty for surrounding communities. Lastly, the bill strengthens the compliance and enforcement provisions for water users to increase confidence that Queensland is sustainably managing its water resources.

I now turn to the specifics. This bill makes changes to the Mineral Resources Act 1989 and the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004 that will support exploration in this state. Queensland is a world-class resources region, and reforms such as these will ensure we are known as a destination of choice for investment.

The amendments proposed will result in administrative savings to industry. They will allow explorers to focus on on-ground activities and on building relationships with landholders and the communities in which they operate. These changes are important for the state's exploration industry, which drives the discovery of new mineral and energy resources. This includes the discovery and development of new-economy minerals, which are becoming increasingly important for future technologies.

The bill will provide certainty for the coal and mineral exploration sector, as well as for communities and landholders, by introducing capped terms of 15 years for exploration permits. The bill introduces outcomes based work programs for all exploration authority types. Outcomes based work programs will allow an explorer to state the proposed exploration outcomes and the strategies they will employ to achieve these outcomes. Outcomes based programs are less prescriptive than activities based programs and give explorers flexibility to adjust their activities based on the evaluation of their findings.

Relinquishment requirements for explorers are being amended. This will give permit holders more time to explore and evaluate their findings before deciding what part of an exploration authority to relinquish. The bill clarifies that exploration authority holders can relinquish land from a group of exploration authorities that are worked together as a project. This allows the holder to relinquish land from within a less prospective exploration authority and work up an area of greater potential.

The department worked with the exploration sector to ensure these changes would be effective and the transition would be equitable. During the committee process it was identified that some scenarios would not be covered by the proposed relinquishment provisions in the new framework. I will be moving amendments during consideration in detail to ensure relinquishment arrangements apply fairly across all affected exploration permits.

In recognition of the potential impact of exceptional events on the industry, like natural disasters, the bill establishes a ministerial power to provide relief to the exploration authorities affected. This will provide discretion to impose, vary or remove conditions on exploration authorities. The relief offered may include flexibility for when land is relinquished and how much is relinquished. This power is designed to alleviate the pressures and impacts of the event on the industry. It is not intended to be used to impose more stringent conditions or used as an ad hoc compliance tool.

Together, these amendments will deliver on the government's election commitment to improve the state's resources tenure management system. The changes will support the exploration sector, driving the discovery of new mineral and energy resources.

The bill makes a number of other amendments to the suite of mineral and energy legislation to clarify and improve operational efficiencies. A number of amendments to the Water Act 2000 will deliver on the Queensland government's response to the 2018 independent audit of Queensland non-urban water measurement and compliance and will deliver on commitments to the Murray-Darling Basin Compliance Compact, improving non-urban water management and compliance across the state.

The right to take water carries particular obligations that attach to water taken within an entitlement. By strengthening the compliance and enforcement provisions, the bill makes it clearer for water users what is required to ensure compliance with entitlements. These changes will help government, industry and communities achieve more transparent, sustainable and fairer rural water management outcomes for Queensland.

The bill clarifies that entitlement holders who share a meter or share a water entitlement are jointly responsible for ensuring that the water take is lawful and can be verified. This level of clarity is necessary for effective compliance. This provision ensures entitlement holders who are doing the right things are not disadvantaged by someone doing the wrong thing in situations where entitlement holders share a meter. The amendments are supported by ongoing industry engagement to raise awareness and ensure an entitlement holder's continued compliance where immediate repairs may not be possible.

The bill modernises the governance arrangements for category 2 water boards. To ensure directors have appropriate skills and experience, I am introducing changes to the selection and appointment process for a director of category 2 water authority boards. These changes promote gender parity on water authority boards, demonstrating this government's support for female board members on Queensland statutory bodies by 2020.

Building on the great work of my colleague the Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning, this bill amends the South-East Queensland Water (Distribution and Retail Restructuring) Act 2009 to validate infrastructure charges notices issued by distributor-retailers. This will provide consistency with the local government infrastructure charging framework, which was recently amended by the Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2019.

A number of amendments to other water related legislation will provide operational efficiencies and reduce the regulatory burden for Queensland's Bulk Water Supply Authority and water service providers.

The Land Act amendments focus on improving the administration and management of Queensland's state land assets. This improved dispute resolution framework for subleases over state land will allow disputing parties to resolve differences through mediation, binding arbitration or the existing avenue of adjudication through the Queensland Land Court. In developing this improved framework, extensive consultation has occurred with the Queensland Law Society. I would like to thank it for working so collaboratively with the department. This collaboration has seen further refinements made to the framework which I will discuss further when outlining the amendments to be moved during consideration in detail. The framework will ensure disputes are resolved in a timely fashion.

As a responsible land manager, the Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy undertakes a range of management and compliance activities on state land. It is not always possible to manage this land where access is difficult, either because there is no dedicated access or because the access is unsafe or impractical to use. A number of sites have been identified where access is problematic. While the preference is to obtain the consent of the adjoining landholder to gain access via their property, there are situations where consent has not been able to be negotiated. Where consent cannot be obtained and there is no other safe point of access, authorised persons will be able to traverse land that is adjacent to state land to undertake compliance and maintenance activities.

The bill seeks to balance the rights and interests of affected land owners by ensuring a number of safeguards are in place. To access the adjoining land, the authorised person must provide advance notice of at least 10 days to the landholder before entering the adjacent land. The notice must state the purpose for which access is to be made and the period when access would be required. These arrangements are not intended to be used to create a permanent access thoroughfare through an adjoining property.

A number of amendments to the Land Act will improve its operation and ensure state land is appropriately managed and allocated. These include clarifying that the prescribed terms framework only applies to interests created under the Land Act; ensuring that government commitments and undertakings are considered when assessing the most appropriate tenure and use of state land; transferring a number of administrative decision-making responsibilities from the minister to the chief executive administering the Land Act; repealing the fees that apply to the surrender of tenures under the Land Act; and simplifying the process for closing and reopening roads and clarifying the notification requirements for road closures.

CleanCo Queensland was established as part of our Powering Queensland Plan to deliver on the government's objectives for a clean energy future, affordable energy prices and growing investment and jobs. The bill aligns CleanCo with Queensland's other government owned energy generators, CS Energy and Stanwell, and ensures that they operate under the same regulatory framework. Importantly, the bill ensures CleanCo's employees will have the same legislative protections that apply to employees of the other state electricity entities.

The bill also amends the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Land Holding Act 2013 as part of this government's ongoing commitment under the Reparations Taskforce report *Reconciling past injustice* to resolve leases under the land holding act. The bill provides for a more efficient process for the transmission of leases under the act where the original lessee has died or dies without a will. The current process for transmission of these leases is complex and time consuming and can be expensive for the beneficiaries of these estates. The quicker lease issues can be resolved the sooner home ownership on that land can be resolved. This is why the bill is extending the review period for the land holding act from five years to 10 years.

We listened to the feedback that was telling us clearly that these communities wanted us to keep focusing on delivering home ownership. The program of work being carried out to resolve lease and home ownership issues will continue in these communities uninterrupted by a review. The proposed changes are supported by trustees of these Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities where leases have been granted under the land holding act. In addition to these amendments, the bill makes a number of administrative and technical amendments to other land legislation administered by the department.

The bill amends the Surveyors Act 2003 and the Surveyors Regulation 2014 to clarify delegation powers and improve the operation of the act. These amendments will allow the Surveyors Board of Queensland to appoint qualified and experienced experts and investigators to ensure the high standard of surveying practices is maintained. Minor amendments to the Land Title Act 1994 will improve the operation of the act and clarify and align land titling processes. In response to industry feedback, amendments will enable statutory easements to be used in a wider range of high-density developments.

Amendments to the Foreign Ownership of Land Register Act 1988 will remove the need to table an annual report to parliament of foreign ownership of land in Queensland. This amendment will remove potential ambiguity and duplication with the federal register of foreign ownership. The amendment only removes the obligation to publish and table a report. The Registrar of Titles will continue to collect this data and be able to produce reports as and if required. Minor amendments are also made to the Land Valuation Act 2010 and the Valuers Registration Act 1992 to improve their operational efficiency.

I will now turn to amendments to be moved during consideration in detail. In addition to the amendment I referred to earlier—relinquishment provisions under the resources acts—I also propose other minor amendments to the resources acts to clarify the power to condition a new authority to prospect on grant and to correct a drafting oversight in relation to the definition of an exploration project under the petroleum and gas act. I propose another minor amendment to clause 40, which relates to giving public notice of a proposed closure of part of a road, to correct a drafting oversight. The amendment is required to ensure that all intended registered owners and lessees of the relevant areas of affected land be given a public notice as a matter of course.

I will now discuss more fully the refinements that I propose be made to the improved dispute resolution framework for subleases over state land. As I mentioned earlier in my speech, these refinements have resulted from further consultation that my department has undertaken with the Queensland Law Society. These changes are based on real-life examples provided by the Queensland Law Society. I propose to move a further amendment to enable the parties engaged in arbitration to agree to an extension of time beyond the nine months to reach a resolution. This would apply, for example, if an expert's report is delayed or disclosure has not been provided or completed in a timely manner. I also propose an amendment to allow the arbitrator's decision to be reviewed by the courts if it is shown that a party to the arbitration was suffering some form of unconscionable disadvantage. Examples of such circumstances include a party suffering from cognition decline or being


disadvantaged as in the case of a person with poor English language skills or other vulnerability. Review by the courts will also be available if it later becomes apparent that the arbitrator had a conflict of interest or demonstrated bias that impacted on the arbitration process.

Amendments to the Vegetation Management Act 2000, the Planning Act 2016 and the Planning Regulation 2017 are proposed to clarify what is considered to be 'infrastructure' under the vegetation management framework. Since 2000, property structures such as houses and sheds have been considered 'infrastructure' for the purpose of appropriately clearing firebreaks despite not being explicitly identified under that definition. This has allowed landholders, farmers and companies to clear firebreaks and dangerous vegetation to protect their homes and businesses without having to get a development approval. Recent judicial precedents have narrowed the definition of 'infrastructure' under the planning framework, raising some concern and ambiguity for the vegetation management framework.

These changes will provide certainty for landholders to continue to appropriately clear firebreaks around property structures such as houses and sheds and provide reassurance that past clearing for firebreaks as essential management to protect houses and other buildings is and always has been lawful. The changes to the definition of 'infrastructure' will also ensure that development applications to clear vegetation for houses and other structures can continue to be made and assessed. Let me be absolutely clear that these changes are in no way related to last year's amendments to our vegetation management laws. This is a necessary change required to clarify the interpretation of the definition of 'infrastructure' as it has been applied by successive governments since 2000. The change is required to ensure that it is business as usual for appropriate clearing of vegetation for firebreaks.

A small number of consequential amendments arising from the passage of the Land, Explosives and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2019 and the Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2019 are also required. I now table the explanatory notes to the amendments that will be moved during the consideration in detail stage. I commend the bill to the House.

Tabled paper: Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019, explanatory notes to amendments to be moved during consideration in detail by the Hon. Dr Anthony Lynham [751].

 **Mr LAST** (Burdekin—LNP) (12.16 pm): I rise to speak on the Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. From the outset I want to highlight that this bill is a large omnibus bill that, with the addition of the amendments tabled by the minister today, sprawls across some 252 pages and amends 32 separate acts and a regulation. It is a bill that deals with many important issues including Indigenous and general land access, gas production tenure management, foreign landownership registers, the Surveyors Act, the establishment of CleanCo, category 2 water governance arrangements, mediation for disputes about terms of particular subleases, relinquishment requirements for existing exploration permits, and validation of particular development approvals. There are many sensible and constructive reforms within this bill, but there are also measures that go too far. The LNP finds it frustrating that Labor continues to lump good reform amongst actions of government overreach that we cannot support.

The parliamentary committee was also informed by stakeholders about their concerns with the size and scale of the bill by highlighting their frustration in not having enough time to properly analyse all of the changes in the bill sprawled across its 252 pages. The Queensland Law Society outlined its frustration at the size of this bill by saying that it 'hoped it had not missed anything' after conveying the difficulty it had in properly analysing all of the changes within the short time frame in order to meet the submission date. The Queensland Resources Council had the following to say about the size of the bill—

Even for an omnibus Bill, this legislation is extraordinarily broad in scope, amending according to the references in the Minister's Explanatory speech, a staggering 29 different Acts. The breadth and complexity of this bill makes it very difficult for any stakeholder to be confident they have understood all the ramifications of these amendments in the 15 business days between the Bill being tabled and submissions falling due for the Committee.

Despite concerns about the size and particular issues within the bill in relation to the overreach of government power, the committee failed to offer up a single substantive recommendation other than to pass the bill. I commend the LNP committee members—the member for Condamine, the member for Buderim and the member for Bundaberg—for their statement of reservation that highlights their frustration with this rubber-stamp process that we have all unfortunately become accustomed to.

Unfortunately, the process that this bill has been through feels eerily familiar. It feels like the vegetation management bill process all over again. Despite sensible and pragmatic issues being raised with the Labor government's first draft, there appears to be no amendment or changes under consideration, with the exception of the amendments just mentioned by the minister. This is just another

example of Labor introducing laws into this place without the proper degree of scrutiny. Members on that side of the House should understand that, in order to pass legislation through this place, there needs to be an appropriate level of scrutiny, there needs to be the appropriate time given, there needs to be the appropriate consultation across Queensland.

Given the size of this bill, I will do my best in the time allotted to go through the various changes in the bill and offer the LNP's position on them. The LNP supports the bill's amendments to the Aboriginal Land Act 1991 and the Torres Strait Islander Land Act 1991, which reduce the government's legislative burden by replacing a subordinate legislation process with a ministerial declaration process. These amendments will enable the minister administering the acts to make a declaration about land available for grant as inalienable freehold, the reservation of forest products and quarrying materials to the state on those lands and the management of certain lands that have been granted. The amendments to the Aboriginal Land Act and Torres Strait Islander Land Act clarify the interpretation and application of certain provisions of these acts and provide certainty to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people throughout Queensland.

The LNP supports the changes to the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Land Holding Act 2013, which provides a framework to resolve outstanding lease entitlements and issues affecting granted leases. The amendment to the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Land Holding Act 2013 to allow for a process to transmit granted leases where the lessee dies intestate and the lessee's estate is not being administered will assist the more than 130 leases that are currently held in the names of deceased lessees who have died intestate and whose estates are not being administered.

The LNP opposes the Labor government's move to amend the Foreign Ownership of Land Register Act 1988. These changes, which remove the requirement to produce an annual report into foreign landownership in Queensland, are not in the interests of Queenslanders. The minister and the department have used the fact that the Commonwealth is producing a similar and national report on foreign landownership as a justification for Queensland ceasing its reporting. The LNP agrees with AgForce, which, in its submission and at the committee hearing, outlined that it does not support these changes. It sees any lessening in the reporting of foreign landownership in Queensland and nationally as a step in the wrong direction. Any weakening of reported foreign landownership of agricultural land in Queensland cannot be accepted, especially given that the Commonwealth government could change its reporting regime at any time. By removing this section, Labor is removing a key source of data and transparency that Queenslanders deserve to have from their government.

Queenslanders deserve to know who, how much and what types of land are owned by foreigners. It is a contentious issue. This data and the information in it are essential ingredients that are needed when discussion and scrutiny around foreign landownership arises. The LNP will always oppose moves to reduce transparency on foreign landownership in Queensland. The LNP will oppose changes to part 4 of the bill—clauses 36 and 37—that remove section 16 of the Foreign Ownership of Land Register Act 1988.

The bill seeks to amend the Land Act 1994 to ensure the clear and effective application of the act, improve administrative efficiency and reduce the regulatory burden across a number of policy issues. Although the majority of these reforms and amendments carry the LNP's support, one such change will be opposed by the LNP. The changes to the Land Act 1994 that allow an authorised person without consent or warrant to enter freehold land if they need to access adjacent state land will be opposed by the LNP.

In its submission, AgForce rejected the need and legitimacy to extend the state's right to cross freehold land in order to access state controlled land. It raised concerns that the new power of entry represents a reduction in property rights and a potential biosecurity issue. AgForce also noted in its submission that the amendments do not provide any arrangements for compensation to be paid to the landholder and suggested that the bill should consider a budget allocation for either surveying easements on affected land or paying adjoining neighbours for land access. It stated that the bill breaches fundamental legislative principles by providing the government with powers to authorise access with insufficient regard to the rights and liberties of landholders. In its submission AgForce went on to state—

This Bill is evidence of further socialization and diminution of property rights with no compensation back to the landholder.

...

An incident threat is that landholders who allow access to authorized Government staff are at risk of having their properties included in databases triggering legal implications and possible compliance costs. The issue of trust between landholders and staff or authorized persons by Queensland Government, has longer term ramifications on effective and sustainable management of land. Supplying the chief executive with increased powers to access freehold and leasehold land without compensation, further erodes this trust.

The LNP agrees with AgForce and does not believe that the reasons outlined in the bill for the amendment are legitimate reasons for an authorised person to enter private freehold land without consent or a permit. The fact that the committee refused to consider any recommendations to address this government power overreach is concerning and, once again, shows the pattern of the government's arrogance and contempt for our farmers and landholders across Queensland. The LNP will oppose clause 45, which introduces a new section 431ZD to the act, which grants this power to access freehold land without a permit.

The LNP supports the bill's amendments to the Surveyors Act 2003, which establishes the Surveyors Board of Queensland to register surveyors in Queensland and establish professional standards for the surveying profession. These amendments address the administrative and disciplinary issues that have hindered the effective operation of the Surveyors Board. I note that the following issues will also be resolved by amendments in this bill: the insufficient expertise and capacity of the Surveyors Board to deal with registration and compliance of mining surveyors; the unclear delegation powers for the Surveyors Board leading to a dealing with minor administrative functions such as approving forms; the inability to appoint an investigator with expertise other than surveying qualifications, hindering the Surveyors Board in seeking advice about compliance with parts of the professional surveyor standards, for example, the conduct of a surveying business; and the cost of seeking information from registers and rolls held by the administering agency, which can be a hindrance to the Surveyors Board assessing competence, conducting investigations and carrying out compliance monitoring following disciplinary action. The LNP hopes that these amendments will assist the Surveyors Board in its capacity in overseeing its sector.

The bill makes numerous changes to the way in which resource exploration and resource licenses are managed and processed. The LNP supports a number of these amendments, including measures to improve the performance of the resources tenure management system supporting the resource exploration sector by creating greater flexibility, reducing the administrative burden while producing more time for exploration prior to the relinquishment of land. Under the current framework, unlimited renewal of exploration permits, along with the ability to vary relinquishment requirements, has resulted in some exploration areas being held for too long, delaying production and the associated benefits to the state. The cap introduced in this bill limits the total life of an exploration permit to 15 years, with a three-year extension in exceptional events. Currently, the time between relinquishment intervals is considered to be too short, resulting in proponents routinely applying to vary their relinquishment obligations. Relinquishment requirements have been streamlined to increase the time before the first relinquishment due date and reduce the total area required to be relinquished before the expiry of the exploration authority. I note the amendments brought forward today by the minister regarding this particular amendment.

These reforms will, hopefully, address the issue of some large resource companies land banking, which ties up large tracts of land across Queensland and stymies development. This process needs to be managed in a manner that allows for the systematic development of our resources, which ultimately provides jobs and economic prosperity for our state.

The LNP will be opposing the amendments to the Mineral Resources Act 1989 that provide increased ministerial powers allowing a minister to cancel, vary or insert conditions for an exploration permit in an exceptional event. Clause 260 inserts a new section 141A. This section allows the minister to oppose, vary or remove a condition of an exploration permit at any time without application or seeking the views from the permit holder if an exceptional event has occurred. Exceptional events are natural disasters or financial crises which negatively affect the resources industry.

The LNP has serious concerns that the power of a minister to terminate or change exploration licences is open to exploitation. The Queensland Resources Council raised serious concerns with the extension of this ministerial power as it has opened the possibility of considerable risk to investments that can be ended on the stroke of a minister's pen. The Queensland Law Society also raised concerns with the minister being given the power to unilaterally oppose, vary or remove a condition in an exploration permit without application by the holder where the minister considers the conditions must be amended because of an exceptional event affecting the permit. The Queensland Law Society outlined its concerns that a licence holder would not be given the right to be heard in respect of the exceptional event or the proposed change and that it does not afford the holder a formal right of appeal in respect of the minister's decision. Both the Queensland Resources Council and the Queensland Law Society have concerns with the broad definition of 'exceptional event' within the bill and believe it is too open to exploitation.


The LNP has grave concerns that this power is open to abuse and that the cancellation of exploration licences is a possibility. Resource businesses deserve more certainty than to be held captive to the ebbs and flows of political wills. We have already seen how politics can interfere with the approval of mining projects in Queensland with the disgraceful interference in the Carmichael project by this Palaszczuk Labor government. The LNP will oppose clause 260 that creates a new section, 141A, in the act.

In relation to distributor-retailer infrastructure charges notices, the LNP supports the amendments to the South-East Queensland Water (Distribution and Retail Restructuring) Act 2009 that validates infrastructure charges notices issued by distributor-retailers that contain minor procedural irregularities. Hopefully this will ensure consistency with the local government infrastructure charging framework under the Planning Act 2016.

In relation to water authority boards, the LNP notes the changes to the category 2 water authority boards requiring the boards to comply with the Queensland government's Women on Boards initiative to establish a gender equity target of 50 per cent representation of women on the boards of Queensland government bodies by 2020. Both the Glamorgan Vale and Roadvale water boards in their submissions expressed their dissatisfaction with the move to change appointments to category 2 water boards, in particular the requirement for fifty-fifty gender representation on their boards. Both groups outlined their opposition to the new election process and appointments criteria primarily due to the difficulty in finding suitable candidates and the potential costs incurred while conducting such a search for candidates. These local water boards see the changes to their board appointments as a Brisbane takeover. The LNP will watch with interest how these changes will play out on our category 2 water boards going forward. The LNP will always support a model in which our category 2 water boards can operate effectively and properly.

The bill makes CleanCo related amendments to the Right to Information Act 2009 to protect CleanCo's competitive interests within the NEM and aligns with existing protections in place for CS Energy and Stanwell. The related amendments made by the bill to the Electricity Act 1994 will enable a regulation to be made to designate CleanCo as a state electricity entity. This allows CleanCo to be subject to government directions under the Electricity Act 1994 as is currently the case for CS Energy and Stanwell. The amendments provide legislative protection for the entitlements of employees who transfer from CS Energy or Stanwell to CleanCo. However, this seems to be window dressing when the ACCC, the Queensland Competition Authority and the Electrical Trades Union have all said that Labor's CleanCo will not work and it will not lower prices. How inconvenient that the ETU still call out its own Labor government for this white elephant of an idea. The Labor government still has not answered why it is setting up its own company to pursue renewable generation opportunities in direct competition to private projects it is already underwriting. It seems that these reforms are just the latest chapter in the Labor government's farcical crusade to establish CleanCo even though it has been roundly condemned and clearly will not work.

As I have alluded to during my contribution, the LNP will be opposing a number of reforms in this large bill. The LNP will be opposing the removal of the foreign landownership report, we will be opposing the moves to allow bureaucrats the rights to, without consent or warrant, enter freehold land if they need to access adjacent state land and we will be opposing increased ministerial powers to allow a minister to cancel, vary or insert conditions for an exploration permit in an exceptional event. The Palaszczuk government likes to portray itself as open and accountable. Large omnibus bills such as this portray exactly the opposite and fail the good governance test. The LNP want it on record that this Labor government is failing the transparent, open and accountable government promise it made to Queenslanders at the last election.

 **Mr WHITING** (Bancroft—ALP) (12.35 pm): I rise to speak in favour of the Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. Contrary to what we have heard, this is a great example of legislation that is open and accountable. This bill does a lot of good work in clarifying and simplifying provisions and creating new ones to keep these important acts updated. As we have heard, this bill will amend many acts—30, in fact. It is interesting that the government is being criticised for that. Acts need to be updated so that people in businesses are not burdened with outdated and unnecessary regulations and laws. It is not government overreach, it is timely and appropriate action. It is being effective. I believe we have given this bill appropriate scrutiny. I will discuss just a few parts of this bill. My colleagues the members for Ipswich West and Mount Ommaney will focus on other aspects.

Addressing the issue of CleanCo, I feel strongly about the creation of CleanCo. It is one of the most important developments that we have seen in the renewable energy sector. The renewable energy sector in Queensland is booming. This economic sector went from nothing under the previous LNP to

today being an integral part of Queensland's regional economy. The federal government is not doing any leading in relation to energy policy. That has been highlighted in the federal election campaign. In Queensland it is the business sector that is leading the way on energy policy. Businesses all over Queensland are investing in renewable energy plans.

In the past two years 18 large-scale renewable energy projects have commenced operations in Queensland, bringing more than 1,700 megawatts into the grid. There are another 14 large-scale projects worth around \$2.8 billion that are currently under construction in regional Queensland. Our state is leading the push in the renewable energy sector. We have adopted a 50 per cent target by 2030. We also have the Powering Queensland Plan, a \$2 billion integrated energy plan for our state. As part of that plan we have set a target of one million rooftop solar panels, or 3,000 megawatts of solar photovoltaics, in Queensland by 2020. We are more than halfway there.

We know that rooftop solar power is now the biggest generator in this state. But we are missing an obvious component in the renewable energy sector: state owned low or no emissions power generation assets. We know the advantages of having state owned power generation assets. We can take action to keep energy prices low. We can only do that if we own those entities. It is because we own our current power generation assets in Queensland that power prices have continued to remain stable or fall for four consecutive quarters.

There has been a 1.3 per cent decrease for residents in regional Queensland and we are now delivering two annual rebates of \$50 for each customer. It is clear that we need strong state owned assets guided by strong directives. These parts of this bill really help that.

We are amending the RTI Act to designate CleanCo as a state electricity entity, which means that CleanCo will be subject to government direction. The entitlements of employees transferring from other organisations will be protected. I ask the LNP: how could you oppose or question employees retaining their entitlements? It is a fundamental part of what we need to do.

The bill will amend the Land Act 1994 to allow departmental officers to traverse land where necessary. If something is happening on unallocated state land such as illegal waste dumping or people illegally taking soil or sand, officers need to take enforcement action. Some unallocated state land can only be accessed by sea or air, or by going through other lots. In the committee hearings we asked how many lots of land this would involve. We heard that throughout the state there are 54 lots of unallocated state land with problematic access. The LNP has a problem with this clause because of 54 out of 17,000 lots of unallocated state land across Queensland. We learnt that in most cases there is no problem with traversing that land and people cooperate with the officers, although occasionally consent has not been given. Through the hearings we learned that Queensland officers will always try to get consent. Under the bill, they will give advance notice before traversing the land and there will be a make-good arrangement if anything happens.

In the hearings it was raised—and we have heard a bit about this today—that some landholders fear that the provision will allow the Queensland Herbarium to come onto their land and identify threatened species. That is a completely invalid fear. In the hearings I asked AgForce to identify any instance of something similar happening, but they could not give one example. No-one could specify how this could be a bio-security risk. No-one could give us an example of that happening.

I say to members in the House that we have delivered a fair and balanced vegetation management regime. It is a long-term and stable regime that has been around since the last century. To say that one amendment to the Land Act is designed to be a part of the vegetation management system or is designed to diminish property rights is simply fallacious. It is completely wrong.


I touch on the improved dispute resolution procedures. This is a large problem that we are resolving today and I am quite proud of this. Currently there are 24,000 subleases of state land in Queensland, that is, land that is leased from the organisation or person that leases the land from the state. If a sublessee has a problem with the head lease, they have to take it to the Land Court. That is their only option. Currently, there is no dispute resolution procedure. We are providing another avenue for people to resolve their problems, which is through mediation that can be nonbinding or there can be binding commercial arbitration. The Law Society has agreed to be the prescribed dispute resolution entity for this.

This amendment may seem minor but I ask members to consider this: at Tangalooma, \$1 million homes are built on subleases. There has been an intense dispute between the home owners and the head lease owner over the annual fees charged by the head lease owner for the likes of roads, electricity and waste disposal. One home owner is on the record as saying that he has an annual fee of \$41,000

for his sublease. To fight that he would have to go to court. There must be a better way to resolve such issues besides launching court action. Creating a mediation service for those 24,000 sublease holders—people and organisations—is the right and just thing to do.

I finish by touching on the issue of foreign ownership of land. The bill proposes to omit the need for us to prepare an annual report on foreign owned land and table it in parliament. It is unnecessary to do that because the Commonwealth government now publishes an annual report on foreign ownership. We still have the information. The Registrar of Titles will continue to collect foreign ownership data. Any member of the public can pay a fee and search that register and, as we heard, the minister still has the ability to produce a report if the need arises.

I have some unease about the LNP's decision to oppose this clause. I finish on this point: in a time of heightened political tension, it is always easy for the unscrupulous or politically lazy to whip up fears of foreign ownership. In this case I am referring to people outside of this House. The political outriders we see at this time are the least likely to have read the reports that we have produced over the years. They would rather spend millions of dollars in the media on fearmongering than spend a smaller amount to research and analyse the data that we have already collected. I do not fear foreign ownership and incursions in this country. I do fear the division and hatred about so-called foreigners that is whipped up by political opportunists at this time, merely to get political or financial advantage. I believe that is the truer threat to our country. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Mr WEIR** (Condamine—LNP) (12.45 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019 as deputy chair of the State Development, Natural Resources and Agricultural Industry Development Committee. This bill was introduced to the Queensland parliament on 26 February 2019. This omnibus bill seeks to amend 29 separate acts. It totals 234 pages and deals with several issues, including the foreign ownership of land register, land legislation amendments, gas production tenure management, resource authorities, other miscellaneous amendments to the resources act and water compliance and enforcement. Such a large omnibus bill made it difficult for both the committee and the research staff to adequately dissect each and every amendment in the reporting time available. I commend Jacqui Dewar and the research staff for the work they did on this bill. It is a massive piece of legislation.

During a committee hearing, Andrew Barger from the Queensland Resources Council stated—

In introducing it, Anthony Lynham must have almost tossed up whether it was easier to list the bills that it did not amend. My tally marks on the introductory speech got to 29, which is probably up there as a personal best in terms of number of bills amended.

Later he said—

... in an ideal world you would not be trying to write a definitive submission on this bill in 15 business days.

In response to a question about the size of this omnibus bill, the Queensland Law Society stated—

The most difficult position that we have in assisting the parliament in its important business is hoping that we have not missed anything.

Statements such as these did not fill non-government members with confidence that all unintended consequences of the bill were investigated to their full extent. This is just another example of Labor ramming through a law with limited opportunity for proper scrutiny.

The bill removes a requirement to create and table an annual report on the foreign ownership of land under the foreign ownership of land register 1988. Annually the Commonwealth government publishes a report on the foreign ownership of agricultural land. AgForce sees this change as weakening the reporting on foreign ownership of agricultural land in Queensland and does not support the change. It is concerned that the Commonwealth government may change the reporting regime in the future. By removing this section, Labor is taking away a key source of data and transparency that Queensland deserves when it comes to landownership. During the committee process, we heard that there was a vast difference between the Commonwealth register and the state register. The state register goes into much more detail of foreign ownership, localities and type of ownership. The big fear is that if the Commonwealth changes their legislation a lot of that data would be lost. The LNP will oppose moves to reduce transparency on foreign landownership in Queensland. The committee heard that the state register has more localised detail of foreign ownership, as I just stated.

While the bill amends the Land Act 1994 to ensure the clear and effective application of the act, improved administrative efficiency and reduce regulatory burden, there was one area that raised some quite serious concerns. The bill introduces a new power of entry for authorised persons to traverse adjacent freehold, leasehold or trust land to access state land to carry out activities where entry cannot be negotiated in the first instance and there is no reasonably practical route for entering that state land.

AgForce opposed these changes to the act rejecting the need and legitimacy for extending the state's right to access freehold land to access state controlled land and believe that insufficient regard is given to the rights and liberties of landowners. The Queensland Law Society asked that the compensation process for damages potentially suffered from this access be properly implemented.

This bill is evidence of the further socialisation and shrinking of property rights with no compensation to the landowners. The bill breaches fundamental legislative principles by providing the government with powers to authorise access with insufficient regard to the rights and liberties of landowners. The LNP do not believe this is a legitimate reason to be able to enter private freehold land without consent or a permit. Under questioning at the public hearing, the department could not produce any instance where access to state land had been refused by any landowner, raising the question of why this amendment is necessary.

Concerns have also been raised with the judicial review process. Clause 260 inserts new section 141A. This section allows the minister to impose, vary or remove a condition of an exploration permit at any time without application or seeking the views from the permit holder if an exceptional event has occurred. Exceptional events are natural disasters or financial crises which negatively affect the resources industry.

QRC has raised serious concerns with granting this ministerial power as it opens up considerable risk to investments that can be ended at the stroke of the minister's pen. The Queensland Law Society has concerns that the holder is 'not given the right to be heard in respect of the exceptional event or the proposed change and does not afford the holder a formal right of appeal in respect to the minister's decision'. Both the Queensland Resources Council and the Queensland Law Society have concerns with the broad definition of 'exceptional event' within the bill. It is too open for exploitation.

Resource businesses deserve more certainty than to be held captive to the ebbs and flows of a political will. There were a number of times during the public hearing in Brisbane where QRC stated that consultation was ongoing, indicating the committee was being asked to pass a bill that was incomplete. This is typical of the Labor government with large omnibus bills being introduced into the parliament, making multiple amendments to multiple acts with an unrealistic reporting deadline for the amount of information in the bill. QRC stated—


Even for an omnibus Bill, this legislation is extraordinarily broad in scope, amending according to the references in the Minister's Explanatory speech, a staggering 29 different Acts. The breadth and complexity of this Bill makes it very difficult for any stakeholder to be confident they have understood all the ramifications of these amendments in the 15 business days between the Bill being tabled and submissions falling due for the Committee.

The bill also amends the Water Act: to clarify that all persons who take water through a common meter are equally responsible and liable for ensuring that water taken through that meter meets their water entitlement, subject to a reasonable excuse exemption; to improve the effectiveness of compliance notices by increasing the penalty to act as a stronger deterrent for noncompliance; and to clarify the application of offence provisions relating to taking water in excess of a volume or rate of take stated in the entitlement. This was supported by QFF and AgForce. As we all know, water is vital to the agricultural sector. The increased monitoring and metering of water we fully support.

I have a situation with a local aquifer in the seat of Condamine where it is not metered on a volumetric basis. The extraction is over a certain number of hours per week. My discussions with the department indicate that they are investigating that and they are moving towards having that aquifer fully metered, hopefully by the end of this year. I welcome that move and we support these amendments. Many of the amendments were supported by submitters. However, insufficient time was given to properly scrutinise the enormous amount of information in this bill.

I will finish by addressing the amendment the minister has introduced regarding the Vegetation Management Act. I thank the department for the briefing this morning. I understand this amendment is in response to what could be pending legal action. The amendment is to clarify the relevant purposes. These include development for buildings and other structures. That could be barns, a piggery or a firebreak. Thank you very much for that briefing. We will be supporting that amendment.

This bill was way too big. I would suggest to the minister that if he is in the mood to bring in another omnibus bill that he makes it about half this size or less.

 **Mr MADDEN** (Ipswich West—ALP) (12.55 pm): On 26 February 2019 the Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019 was introduced into the Queensland parliament by the Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy. It is an omnibus bill that makes amendments to various pieces of Queensland legislation. The bill was referred to the State Development, Natural Resources and Agricultural Industry Development Committee for detailed consideration. I would like to thank my

fellow committee members—the chair, the member for Bancroft; the deputy chair, the member for Condamine; the member for Mount Ommaney; the member for Bundaberg; the member for Buderim—as well as the committee secretariat, led by Jacqui Dewar, the submitters and Hansard.

I would also like to thank the Queensland Resources Council, AgForce and the Queensland Law Society who all attended and made submissions at the public hearing held on 25 March 2019. In the written submission made by the Queensland Law Society dated 20 March 2019, President Bill Potts said that the Queensland Law Society was consulted during the development of some aspects of the bill and would like to thank the government for the opportunity for consultation during that early stage of the legislative process. As the bill is amending a number of acts, it was considered by the society's Alternative Dispute Resolution Committee, the Mining and Resources Law Committee, the Reconciliation and First Nations Advancement Committee, the Property and Development Law Committee and the Revenue Law Committee.

With regard to Aboriginal Land Act 1991 and the Torres Strait Islander Land Act 1991, the Queensland Law Society submission stated—

The proposed amendments appear appropriate to the extent that reducing the burden of administrative processes will assist traditional owners negotiating with the State for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander freehold grants under these Acts.

The public register of ministerial declarations would be welcomed. It is important to ensure appropriate transparency when a subordinate legislation process is replaced with a ministerial declaration process.

The committee's report was tabled in April 2019. As the minister stated in his explanatory speech on 26 February 2019—

The Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019 delivers on several government commitments and ensures a number of key regulatory frameworks within the Natural Resources, Mines and Energy portfolio remain effective and responsive. As part of our Powering Queensland Plan, the government established CleanCo on 17 December 2018 as a publicly owned clean energy generator. CleanCo delivers on the government's objectives for a clean energy future, affordable energy electricity prices, and growing investment and jobs.

With regard to what some commentators describe as the water wars, the minister stated—

The bill strengthens the compliance and enforcement provisions under the Water Act 2000 to deliver on Queensland's commitments under the Murray-Darling Basin Compliance Compact and the government's response to the independent audit of Queensland's non-urban water measurement and compliance. These changes will help ensure that water users are taking water in accordance with their entitlements, increasing confidence that Queensland is sustainably managing its water resources. This supports a program of work to deliver more transparent, sustainable and equitable rural water management in the Queensland Murray-Darling Basin region and across the state.


In summary, the bill: amends the Aboriginal Land Act 1991 and the Torres Strait Islander Land Act 1991 to reduce the regulatory burden and clarify the interpretation and application of these acts; amends the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Land Holding Act 2013 to provide a more efficient process for the transmission of leases where the original lessee dies intestate—that is, without a will—and extends the statutory review period of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Land Holding Act 2013 from five years to 10 years; and removes the requirement to create and table an annual report on foreign ownership under the Foreign Ownership of Land Register Act 1998.

Debate, on motion of Mr Madden, adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 pm to 2.00 pm.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Youth Detention

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.00 pm): Last night's revelations about children being kept in watch houses made me sick to my stomach—kids being locked up for up to 40 days in our watch houses; children trying to hang themselves in police stations; a girl being locked in the same room as two alleged sexual predators. We are talking about children as young as 10 and some with a mental age of around six. We are talking about primary school aged kids traumatised by the system—a system that the Palaszczuk Labor government has inflicted on them. I say to the Premier today: get these kids out of the watch houses.

Today the Premier has failed the test of leadership. The Premier should have come into this House and explained to Queenslanders why the justice system is a national embarrassment. In the Premier's ministerial statement what did the Premier say about the children who have been locked up 24/7 with the lights on for up to 40 days? The Premier was deathly silent. The Premier has failed the test of leadership.

We know that the system is failing these children. These children should not be in watch houses. It is a system that is brutalising children and pushing our police to breaking point. Everyone responsible for this shocking state of affairs should hang their heads in shame, and those people are not hard to find. This is not a whodunnit. We know exactly who to blame, and that is the Palaszczuk Labor government—the Premier, her police minister and her youth minister. They have all created this crisis. This is all down to them, and they cannot say they were not warned.

The LNP told the Palaszczuk government not to remove 17-year-olds from adult prisons without a plan, but the Palaszczuk Labor government did not listen—they never do. They did not listen to the Public Guardian when she wrote to the director-general of the Department of Justice and Attorney-General. They did not listen when she wrote to the director-general of the Premier's own department. The question that needs answering is: what action did the Premier take after being notified of these warnings? The Public Guardian wrote that she could not sleep at night because of what is happening in our watch houses. It seems that those involved, the Palaszczuk Labor government and the ministers, were simply not worried. Labor lit the fuse for this crisis. They have stood back and they have ignored the warnings.

Just a week ago the police minister said that 10-year-olds were not being held in watch houses. If the police minister does not know what is going on in our watch houses then how on earth will this mess ever be fixed? The youth minister is simply no better. The youth minister seemed shell-shocked on last night's show. For anyone who watched it, it was a national embarrassment. The Palaszczuk Labor government is a national embarrassment and no more so than the Minister for Youth. 'I wasn't told about this,' she said. Then she again said, 'No, I wasn't told about that.' This is a youth minister who has no plan to fix the crisis and no guarantees about when it will be fixed. It is clear that they do not even have a clue about what has happened. I will explain it to them. It is not that complicated. Our police stations were not built to hold children for four days, let alone 40 days. Our police officers are not trained to be childminders or counsellors for up to 40 days.

The LNP warned the Premier not to remove 17-year-olds from adult prisons without a plan. The hardworking police in this great state have been warning the government about this crisis in the making. Whose crisis is it? It is a crisis of the Palaszczuk Labor government. The detention of 17-year-old offenders in our prisons was far more humane than Labor's heartless regime. They were held separately from adult prisoners. They were guarded. They were supervised. Very importantly, they were educated by properly trained staff. They were certainly safer than where they are being held right now. This incompetent, arrogant and negligent government has made a dreadful decision. It is time that the Premier stood up, showed some leadership and took responsibility for this failed decision.

We know that this government has only been interested in passing a Human Rights Bill. I think it was the youth minister last night on the *Four Corners* program who said, 'What bill? We don't have that yet. The starting date is not until the first of next year.'

Mr Minnikin: Charter boat? What charter boat?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Charter boat? Isn't the youth minister lucky that the bill is not retrospective? Instead of worrying about the children who are being held in light filled rooms for 24 hours a day, seven days a week, they are more worried about passing a bill that the government's own policies would not even pass. It is a national shame.

Our youth crime crisis is not just confined to police watch houses; it is on our streets, too. I tabled my second petition today and there is another petition that will be tabled tomorrow in relation to juvenile crime and the growing tide of youth crime in my local community in and around the South Burnett. The residents there want a curfew of 10 pm for their township. They want more police in the community at night and on the weekends, and our local police want more support. From the Brisbane watch houses to the streets of Murgon, the Palaszczuk Labor government is presiding over a crime and detention crisis. I urge the Palaszczuk Labor government not to ignore this warning like it has ignored so many other warnings.

On the issue of human rights there is nothing more precious than the right to freedom of speech, to be able to talk to our politicians. In Queensland we now know that you have to be careful which politician you speak to. Do not dare say a word to any Labor leaders. If you do, you will be locked out of your desk and your desk will be cleared out before you know anything about it.

Today in this chamber we heard Minister Bailey actually say that the Gladstone Port suspended a contract with the company. Who ordered that suspension? Was it Minister Bailey or was it the other shareholding minister, the Deputy Premier? Maybe it was the Treasurer of this state, the member for South Brisbane, who picked up the phone and said, 'Yes, Bill. Yes, Bill. You've spoken out. I know we

organised that man to talk to you and he said something about tax.' The Labor Party loves to tax Queenslanders, yet this hardworking Queenslander stood up for the other workers in Queensland and what happened to him?

Mr Mander: Gone!

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Gone. He got sacked. The hardworking company that had a contract with Gladstone Port got suspended. Which shareholding minister is responsible? Is it the one who took the fall this morning, Minister Bailey, or is it the Treasurer of Queensland? Those are the answers that the people of Queensland would like to know.

Opposition member interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Or maybe it was the Premier, but we know she does not like to make decisions.


(Time expired)

Mr Watts interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Member for Toowoomba North, I do not believe that to be parliamentary language. I ask you to withdraw.

Mr WATTS: I withdraw.

Federal Election, Campaign

 **Mr PEGG** (Stretton—ALP) (2.11 pm): It is very interesting to follow the member for Nanango and her contribution about the federal election campaign. I noticed that the member for Nanango talked quite a bit about Bill Shorten, but I did not hear her mention Scott Morrison once. I did not hear her mention the Prime Minister once. We also heard the member for Nanango talking about standing up and showing leadership. I think it is about time the member for Nanango stood up and showed some leadership and stood up to the Prime Minister. We are only days out from the federal election and this could have been one of her last opportunities. Instead, she decided to talk all about Bill Shorten.

We heard the member for Nanango mention Bill Shorten but she did not mention Scott Morrison once. She did not mention the Prime Minister once. That got me thinking. Is there an issue between the member for Nanango and the Prime Minister? I was at the federal election campaign launch for Labor just a couple of weeks ago, and the Premier was centre stage at that Labor campaign launch. My question is this: in this federal election campaign where is—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order! Pause the clock. Members to my left, I am having difficulties hearing the member on his feet. The Leader of the Opposition was listened to in silence. I am asking for the same respect to be shown to this speaker.

Mr PEGG: My question is: where is the member for Nanango in relation to the Prime Minister? This is where it gets really interesting. Google does not have the answers to everything, but on this particular occasion I did a Google search of 'Scott Morrison and Deb Frecklington' and guess what the No. 1 trending story was from that? It was a story from the *Courier-Mail*.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Stretton, are you going to table that?

Mr PEGG: I am going to table that.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. Please do not wave it around as a prop.

Mr PEGG: I will table this story from the *Courier-Mail*. As I said, if you google 'Scott Morrison and Deb Frecklington' this is the No. 1 search result: 'It's war between Deb Frecklington and Scott Morrison and Campbell Newman.' I table that.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Courier-Mail*, dated 11 December 2018, titled 'Peter Gleeson: It's war between Deb Frecklington and Scott Morrison and Campbell Newman' [\[752\]](#).

That is the No. 1 search result on Google from that newspaper of record that those opposite like to quote from all the time—the *Courier-Mail*. Google does not always explain everything, but it speaks volumes on this occasion with that No. 1 trending search result. It was very, very enlightening.

It probably explains a lot about the contribution from the member for Nanango—not only her speech today but her actions throughout this federal election campaign and indeed throughout the entirety of the Scott Morrison government. She refuses to stand up for Queensland. She refuses to stand up to the Prime Minister. In fact, it appears that the Prime Minister refuses to—

Mr Hunt interjected.

Mr Mickelberg interjected.


Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Pause the clock. Member for Nicklin, member for Buderim, I have already just warned members on my left and you continue to interject. You are now both warned under the standing orders.

Mr PEGG: We have a situation now where we have a crisis of leadership in the LNP. The Prime Minister does not want to stand beside the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition does not want to be beside the Prime Minister. The feeling is clearly mutual. I want to put on the record that I do not often agree with the Prime Minister on many things, and I probably agree with the member for Nanango on even fewer things, but I can understand completely why the member for Nanango does not want to be seen with the Prime Minister and I can definitely understand why the Prime Minister does not want to be seen with the member for Nanango.

This is not the only time where we have had a crisis of leadership in the LNP. The LNP turn over leadership all the time. At the last state election, we had a situation where Tim Nicholls, the member for Clayfield, was the leader and Malcolm Turnbull was the Prime Minister. We all know that the member for Clayfield did not want Malcolm Turnbull anywhere near him during that state election campaign. How did those in the LNP respond? They wanted the member for Clayfield nowhere near them during the campaign. In fact they removed photos of the member for Clayfield from their how-to-vote cards.

In conclusion, I know that the Prime Minister has some fans here amongst those opposite, despite what the member for Nanango says. I ask those opposite who they really support. Do they support Prime Minister Morrison? Do they support the member for Nanango? They clearly do not support each other. There is a crisis in the LNP leadership. There are cuts. There is chaos. Everyone has to take a stand. Get on the record and take a stand.

Crime

 **Mr MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (2.16 pm): May well the member for Stretton follow his obsession with the opposition leader by googling 'Deb Frecklington and Scott Morrison', but what happens when you google 'crime and Sunnybank and Stretton'? What happens when you do that? The answer comes up: 1,500 people went in a protest march because they are fed up to their back teeth with the crime problems in the Sunnybank-Stretton area. That is 1,500 people who are sick of home invasions and sick of gunshots being fired at innocent people as they take out their rubbish. That is what is happening in this state at the moment. There is an escalating crime problem. I cannot recall when 1,500 people in the suburbs of Brisbane marched about any issue at all and here they marched in the backyard of the member for Stretton. The member for Stretton got up and addressed them.

An opposition member: What did he say?

Mr MANDER: Yes, what did he say? He got up and said that the crime rate is actually going down and there is no problem. How well did that go over?

Mr PEGG: I rise to a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. The member for Everton is misleading the House. He was not even there.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order!

Mr Krause interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Scenic Rim, I do not need your assistance. You will be warned next time. Member for Stretton, if you have any concerns with that, the process is to write to the Speaker.

Mr MANDER: Eyewitness accounts from members on this side of the House who were at that rally told me how the member for Stretton was received by his beloved electorate. They booed him when he got up and made the outrageous claim, 'There's nothing to see here.'

How well does the member for Stretton know his electorate and its problems? That seat was a safe Labor seat. We are going to come after the member for Stretton because we reckon we have an issue there and we will include the future member for Toohey, the now member for South Brisbane, in that as well after she makes a transfer.

We have an escalating crime rate in this state and there is no greater example of that than in the southern parts of Brisbane, in Sunnybank and Stretton, and the people have had enough of it. They have had enough of weak laws. They have had enough of police not being resourced properly. They have had enough of the revolving door of the juvenile justice system. They came out in numbers and spoke the other week and they will continue to speak until they get some sort of action.

It is only this side of the House that is serious about addressing crime. What we are seeing at the moment is failure after failure after failure not just in crime but in every aspect of government. We have had hospital fail, we have had rail fail, we have had jail fail and now we have watch house fail.

It was not until this morning when we were discussing the appalling images we saw last night that I understood why young kids were going around with blankets over their heads in those watch houses. The reason is, as the opposition leader has already mentioned, they are under the lights for 24 hours a day, seven days a week and some of them for 40 days. That is simply inhumane.

Dr Rowan: Torture.

Mr MANDER: That is torture; I take that interjection from the member for Moggill. These people opposite are the people who have been screaming about getting kids out of our detention centres, which we did on this side of the parliament, but they have said nothing about this. In answering the question, 'How long will it take to get these kids out?', the youth justice minister said, 'I don't know. Hopefully at the end of next year.' They have no solution. A mining camp can be set up in four days. Let's set up temporary accommodation inside the walls of the youth detention centres and get these kids out of the watch houses. It is simply inhumane. Anything would be better than what they are experiencing at the moment.

These kids have done things wrong and they deserve to be punished, but they do not deserve to be treated like caged animals, which is exactly what is happening at the moment, and there is total silence from that side of the House. For the Premier and the Deputy Premier to come in here today and in ministerial statements talk about the Magic Round rather than about the kids that are being held in captivity inhumanely is a shame.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Capalaba, member for Everton, this morning Mr Speaker made it really clear that you do not turn your back to the chair. This is just a reminder for you and any other speakers: please do not turn your back to the chair.

Federal Election, Electoral Donations



Mr BROWN (Capalaba—ALP) (2.22 pm): It is fitting to follow the member for Everton and talk about crime and political donations from developers because I hear a developer actually funded that rally out in Stretton—and a prominent LNP member. People hate cheats. People hate others who break the laws or break the rules to gain advantage, whether it is on the sporting field or in the political arena. That is why it is disappointing to see the federal LNP member for Bowman, Andrew Laming, resorting to developer donations to try to win his seat of Bowman.

I want to first congratulate the Attorney-General on a fantastic victory in the High Court. We know those opposite fought hard to stop the developer donation ban. They took it from inside this place to outside and all the way to the High Court. I congratulate the Attorney-General on the case of Spence v State of Queensland in not only upholding our laws but going a step further to ensure that the laws brought in by the federal LNP to bypass our donation laws, ensuring their federal candidates were not captured, were chucked out. It was also pleasing to see Gary Spence was awarded costs against him. It is absolutely ironic to see that the first known investigation by the Electoral Commission of Queensland is into Andrew Laming because we know that Gary Spence helped Andrew Laming a great deal in his preselection: sacking and kicking three predominant LNP members out of Bowman so they could help him get his preselection up. I see that Gary Spence did not go to those lengths for Jane Prentice; he only did it for Andrew Laming. 'You're on your own, Jane Prentice, but Andrew Laming, I'll kick out your opposition for you.'

This billboard stinks. Here we have a private billboard located in none other than the same street that Andrew Laming lived on up until a couple of days ago. I table this for the benefit of the House.

Tabled paper: Bundle of photographs depicting political advertising for the Federal member for Bowman, Mr Andrew Laming MP [\[753\]](#).

We see the billboard has changed for the federal election. They are owned by Harridan, a developer still advertising a development on the same street. I made some inquiries into this private billboard. A private billboard has to be registered with Redland City Council. When the skin or the material use of that billboard is changed, that also has to be registered with Redland City Council. Do honourable members think Andrew Laming or the developer did that when it came time to change the skin for the federal election? No. There was no paperwork and no fees were paid. However, it gets even worse.

When the media started to inquire about this billboard, Mr Laming said that a commercial contract 'is in place as required under the legislation, meaning the billboard is not a donation'. That is great. That is fantastic. The *News* then asked Mr Laming for a copy of the contract but he declined. 'I don't have to


provide anything,' Mr Laming said. Mr Laming said that the commercial billboard site fee was \$2,000 per lunar month. He said the contract was commercial-in-confidence. On one hand he is saying, 'This is how much it cost,' and on the other hand he is saying, 'It is commercial-in-confidence.' This absolutely stinks to high hell. We have a private developer billboard on the same street that Andrew Laming lived on that has changed to a billboard. There is no paperwork, no contract in place. He is not even willing to show a simple contract to clear this all up.

The media also contacted Harridan, who declined to comment. We know that Harridan is a big donor to the LNP. I table for the benefit of the House their donations.

Tabled paper: Extract from the Electoral Commission of Queensland report, dated 13 May 2019, regarding disclosed gifts to the Liberal National Party [754].

We see there was \$5,000 in 2017, \$2,000 in 2017, another \$3,300 in 2016 and \$2,000 in 2016. I table that for the benefit of the House. This stinks to high hell. I urge Andrew Laming and Harridan to cooperate with the ECQ. People do not have to take illegal developer donations to win this election. Let's have an even playing field and ensure that we do things by the law and not illegally.

Law and Order

 **Mr WATTS** (Toowoomba North—LNP) (2.27 pm): I want to make something very clear to this House. The police budget is down and crime is up. Those are the facts here in Queensland under the leadership of this minister. I also want to make it clear because the minister said something in this House earlier today about our support for the police. Nobody supports the police more than the LNP. Whether it is through strong legislation, through giving them the resources they need or giving them the financial capacity they need to do the job, we will always support the police. I want to have that firmly on the record.

There are a couple of other things that need to be put firmly on the record. I will now address the South Brisbane crime forum—'stop crime', 'enough is enough'. I was invited to attend this along with some Labor members, the member for Moggill and some other people to address a serious concern. This petition which, I will table today, shows clearly that that community have absolutely had a gutful of this weak Labor government.

Tabled paper: Nonconforming petition regarding crime [755].

We know they are soft on crime—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Unparliamentary—

Mr WATTS: I withdraw that comment, Mr Deputy Speaker. We know they are soft on crime. The people of Sunnybank know they are soft on crime and today they put their names on a piece of paper asking for support for their community to be made safer. There are a couple of other things that I need to put on the record as well. I have correspondence from me requesting to meet with the assistant commissioners of police. I want to put it on the record today because it took six months to get an answer out of the minister's office as to whether or not I would be allowed to meet with them. Along with that I have communication regarding my request in November last year to visit the Brisbane watch house because I was hearing grave concerns about the safety of children in that watch house at that time.

I was blocked and not allowed to visit the watch house. I table that correspondence.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 17 October 2018, from the Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services, Hon. Mark Ryan, to the member for Toowoomba North, Mr Trevor Watts MP, in response to Mr Watts's request to meet with all Queensland Police assistant commissioners [756].

Tabled paper: Emails, dated 20 and 23 November 2018, between the Toowoomba North electorate officer, Ms Elysia Ruttley, and Chief of Staff, Commissioner's Office, Queensland Police Service, Superintendent Mark Wheeler, regarding a request for the member for Toowoomba North, Mr Trevor Watts MP, to visit the Brisbane watch house [757].

I also asked to go on a ride along in Townsville and Cairns so that I could understand what was happening on the streets in those places, but I was blocked from attending. I sent that correspondence in October last year. I table that correspondence.

Tabled paper: Emails, dated 24 October and 1 November 2018, between the Toowoomba North electorate officer, Ms Elysia Ruttley, and the Office of the Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services regarding a request for the member for Toowoomba North, Mr Trevor Watts MP, to do a ride along with the Queensland Police Service Townsville Rapid Action Patrol Group [758].


Tabled paper: Emails, dated 5 and 6 March 2019, between the Toowoomba North Electorate Office and Ministerial Liaison Officer, Queensland Police Service, Office of the Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services, Inspector Peter Stacey, regarding a request for the member for Toowoomba North, Mr Trevor Watts MP, to visit the Cairns and Townsville watch houses [759].

I have other correspondence that shows that I have tried to access information from the Police Service. My job as the shadow minister is to hold this government to account. I believe that the reason I have not been allowed to see or meet any of these people, visit the watch house or go on a ride along is that the minister is ashamed, embarrassed and, as we all know from what we see in today's media, incompetent. The minister is weak. He lost at the cabinet table and had his budget slashed. Not only did they underspend by \$36 million one year; the budget was slashed by \$44 million the other year. Who is paying the price? The people of Sunnybank know who is paying the price. That is why they are marching on the streets. The people of Cairns and Townsville know who is paying the price. Everybody in Queensland knows that Labor is soft on crime and cannot manage it.

There are a couple of other things going on. I would love to speak further about the watch houses but others have covered that. What happened at Palen Creek is an embarrassment to the government that needs to be seriously investigated. Who paid for this and where did the money come from? That is something that absolutely needs to be looked at. We know that this government is suffering a crime and detention crisis, because its soft-on-crime approach has landed its members exactly where they are today—embarrassed, with their heads down, unable to comprehend what they are doing to the community of Queensland and its children. Can you imagine the circumstances these children are being kept in? I tried to ensure that this minister spoke to people so that this would be looked after.

The buck must stop with this minister. The minister is responsible for the budget, for the outcomes and for what has happened in his departments. What has happened in his departments is embarrassing. I challenge the minister to come and visit, to allow me to go. Let us together look at the watch houses. Let us go together on a ride along in Cairns and Townsville. Then let us work out how we can solve these problems rather than just bury our heads in the sand and pretend they do not exist, because the people of Queensland know they exist. That is why they are marching on the streets, signing petitions and demanding some action from this government. What they see is zero action. It is time for the minister to stand up and be counted. He should come with me on these visits or resign.

Townsville, Youth Crime

 **Mr HARPER** (Thuringowa—ALP) (2.33 pm): I rise to inform the House about our ongoing efforts in Townsville to reduce youth crime related issues. I did a ride along on the half-baked RAP delivered by the LNP when it was in government. I lobbied and received 20 additional police officers to fully staff that patrol. There is more going on in Townsville.

As reported in the second tranche of the Youth Justice Strategy recently announced by Minister Farmer, the recent evaluation of the Townsville Community Youth Response showed decreasing reoffending rates. Are members on the other side listening? I will explain how. This is because of our investment in a suite of programs, including the Transition 2 Success program. Some 67 per cent of participants in that program did not reoffend within 12 months of completion. This is in complete contrast to the LNP's failed youth boot camps, which had recidivism rates of 70 per cent. Other programs include Project Booyah, Yinda cultural mentoring, Clontarf, Stars Foundation, Flexi School, Pathways College and other youth justice strategies. Youth restorative conferencing alone resulted in 77 per cent of participants not reoffending and 98 per cent of victims being satisfied with the outcome. In its time, the LNP cut that program.

All of the stakeholders in these programs are working with the Townsville Stronger Communities Action Group, resulting in decreasing offending rates overall. This is positive news for Townsville. In fact, recent evaluation of the community youth response model in our city showed a 25 per cent decrease in rates of reoffending for high-risk young offenders, because they can access various intensive case management services. Since the community youth response started in February 2017, the overall number of youth offences for 10- to 16-year-olds in Townsville also reduced. Prior to this recent evaluation, the annual independent crime statistics showed a promising decrease in property offences and the number of stolen motor vehicles, both around the 18 per cent mark. I commend and congratulate both our police for their work and the local community.

As we keep saying to young people, if you break the law you will be held accountable. We strongly encourage parents of those youth to step up and take responsibility for their children but, when they get into strife, we will give them all the assistance we can by engaging them in these programs and breaking the cycle of crime. We know that this challenging issue has been around for years. The LNP completely failed to address the causes of crime. We are about tackling the causes of crime. I applaud the Palaszczuk government for addressing and tackling the causes upstream. That is in stark contrast to the efforts of LNP members who sacked child safety officers. They do not tackle the causes of crime. When we do, we stop people offending in the first place.


What about the LNP's false promise of a police helicopter in Townsville? After working on that platform for 15 years, I know that it does respond as a multitasking platform to QAS, Queensland Health, QFES and QPS requests for service. Guess how many times it called for police assistance in the last year? Of course, there is silence from the other side. It was 12 times. That equates to once a month. The bulk of those requests were for water police searches.

The member for Nanango says, 'We will deliver a police helicopter.' What for? It will go up in the air one or two times a year. Is the member serious? This is a thought bubble. The member is completely deluded. Polair might work in South-East Queensland, where there are three million people, but in Townsville I would rather see boots on the ground. That is why we are delivering police and why I am opening a new police facility in the Upper Ross. Reoffending rates are decreasing because of all of the programs. We have the extra police. We also have a commitment of 53 additional police and I know that, through the work of the police minister, we will deliver it. You have learned nothing. You do not tackle the causes of crime—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Through the chair.

Mr HARPER: Sorry, Mr Deputy Speaker. I am going off again. The members for Redlands and Gaven are coming up to look at the Stronger Communities Action Group as they are considering replicating that model in others areas of the state. I commend the work of the Stronger Communities Action Group.

Climate

 **Mr BERKMAN** (Maiwar—Grn) (2.38 pm): Last week the world's leading scientists again delivered news that should have sent shockwaves through communities across the globe, nationally and here in Queensland. Again, I am on my feet in this place to lament not only the shocking news but also the complete reprehensible silence of our political leaders.

Eight days ago a UN report laid bare the catastrophic, unprecedented human induced global extinction crisis unfolding before our eyes. It estimated that one million plant and animal species are at risk of being lost forever. It confirmed what scientists already knew: biodiversity and ecosystems globally are literally collapsing under the strain of the greed of those in charge and our apathy towards the climate crisis.

In less than a month, my partner and I will welcome a new baby into the world. In amongst the joy this tiny person is already bringing to our family, I despair at this kind of ominous news and the future we are bringing them into. This is not simply about the loss of some natural places or wildlife that I would like my kids and grandkids to be able to enjoy together. It is not even just about the loss of creatures or places in unprecedented numbers. Leading global experts are pointing to the rapid and accelerating deterioration of, in their words, the very foundations of our economies, livelihoods, food security, health and quality of life worldwide.

Climate experts have been screaming similar messages at us for decades now. They are saying that this could turn out really nasty. In fact, it has already begun. The traditional custodians of this ancient continent see it already. Our Pacific neighbours are sinking, ecosystems are collapsing and people are dying.

The economic system we have is quite literally destroying planetary life supports. This crisis should be everywhere—on the news, on the streets and most certainly in our parliament. What is the government's response? It is deafening silence, yet again.

The experts have called for transformative change—fundamental, system-wide reorganisation across technological, economic and social factors—but instead we see piecemeal, half-baked proposals that fail to properly acknowledge, let alone address, the gravity of the reality of the situation. Even worse, it is new coalmines, new fracking and new developments that will clear habitat and devastate what little refuge our wildlife has left. It is outrageous and devastating. Honestly, sometimes I wonder what is the point of us meeting in this place if we are not doing something about it.

I, like most people, cannot stand watching the major parties squabbling with each other, wasting so much time while our earth disintegrates, treating science as though it is a partisan issue—all the while failing to plan for the future, failing to do anything with vision. The big parties will not touch the greedy coal billionaires or stop those big corporations wrecking our common home because the big


parties do not rock the boat with their powerful friends. The sheer panic, anger and frustration can be overwhelming. I know that there are so many out there in this country and across the world who feel the same way. At this point, anyone could easily lose hope or just give up caring all together.

In less than a week Australia will go to the polls. This election really does matter, perhaps more than any other in this country's history. The young people striking from school are calling this election a referendum on their futures, and they are absolutely right. This weekend is a chance to communicate that rage and despair to our current federal government and politicians across the spectrum. It is the make-or-break point for the Adani coalmine and those that will follow in the Galilee Basin.

Here in Queensland, voters will choose between re-electing Larissa Waters to the Senate and handing a six-year term to a lazy, self-interested coal billionaire, a cowardly fascist or an unhinged conspiracy theorist climate denier. Here in Queensland we could elect up to three Greens MPs to the lower house to hold the balance of power and ensure that our planetary life support systems are the absolute priority for a new government, building a better and fairer society in the process.

This election could be the point we all look back on in a decade or two and think, 'That's when Australia turned the ship around. That's when we saw real leadership on climate.' In fact, it must be that point. We cannot wait any longer. In decades and centuries to come, when our kids and grandkids are dealing with the mess we have left them, they will simply not be interested in our excuses.

Capricornia Electorate, ALP Candidate

 **Mrs LAUGA** (Keppel—ALP) (2.42 pm): The member for Maiwar talks about turning the ship around at this election. I can tell you that it is not the Greens that will turn the ship around at this election! I rise today to speak about how important this election is for Queensland and Australia. Scott Morrison and the LNP have cut schools, hospitals, TAFE and pensions, all to pay for their \$80 billion handout for banks and multinationals.

There is a lot at stake this Saturday, especially in Capricornia. When it comes to what matters to middle-class and working Australians, Scott Morrison and the LNP are only for the top end of town. As treasurer, Scott Morrison spent three years trying to give the banks a \$17 billion tax cut. Scott Morrison and Michelle Landry, the member for Capricornia, have cut \$14 billion from schools. This means that Queensland schools will be over \$2 billion worse off under the LNP. Cutting funding from public schools means more pressure on class sizes and less individual attention for students.

You cannot have a plan for economic growth without a plan to invest in schools and education. Scott Morrison, Michelle Landry and the LNP have cut \$3 billion from TAFE, skills and apprenticeships. Under the LNP Australia has lost almost 150,000 apprenticeships and traineeships nationwide. If you are serious about jobs, you do not cut funding from TAFE. Scott Morrison and the LNP tried to give an \$80 billion taxpayer funded handout to multinationals and big business. He cut \$360 million from Queensland hospitals, including \$11 million from Central Queensland hospitals.

Scott Morrison, Michelle Landry and the LNP supported cuts to penalty rates. In fact, Michelle Landry sat in parliament and voted eight times to cut penalty rates. In Capricornia that equates to 10,670 retail and hospitality workers who have had their Sunday penalty rates cut. Their take-home pay has been cut by up to \$3,200 this year. We need a wage rise for working Australians, not tax handouts for big banks and multinationals. Michelle Landry and the LNP voted to raise the pension age to 70 and to cut the pension.

There is a lot at stake at this election for the people of Capricornia. That is why on election day this Saturday I am backing Russell Robertson, Labor's candidate for Capricornia. Russell Robertson, or 'Robbo' as he is affectionately known, is a third-generation miner and father of three. Russell was born in Clermont and grew up in Moranbah, where he attended the same local school that his children went to. He has dedicated time as chairman of the Moranbah community scholarship board, which supports and funds local kids to attend university. For the past 17 years Russell has worked at the nearby Goonyella mine, where he operates heavy mining vehicles.

I have known Russell for a little while now and I know that he will not sit back and watch the LNP destroy the secure jobs our workers and their families need in Central Queensland. He has the guts and the fight in him to stand up for our region.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Member for Keppel, that is unparliamentary language. I ask you to withdraw.

Mrs LAUGA: He has the fight and the determination—


Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. I still need you to withdraw, though.

Mrs LAUGA: I withdraw. Creating good, secure, local jobs in Central Queensland is Russell Robertson's top priority. While Michelle Landry supports Scott Morrison and the LNP's cuts to our region, Russell will fight for the funding our region needs for our schools and hospitals. Russell Robertson is on our side. He understands that every worker should get the same pay for the same job, and he will fight for more funding for our schools and hospitals.

Michelle Landry and the LNP have cut \$11 million from our Central Queensland hospitals, destroyed permanent jobs and cut penalty rates from our workers and families. Michelle Landry wants to back the big end of town instead of putting an end to dodgy labour hire practices. Russell will fight for more funding for our schools and hospitals and will stand up for workers and their families so they can have a good, secure job.

There is much at stake at this election for the people of Capricornia. This weekend I am encouraging everyone to vote Labor so as to restore penalty rates, fix our schools and hospitals, ease pressure on family budgets by ending the Medicare freeze and give tax breaks to workers and not the top end of town. We need a local member who will stand up for workers, not someone who is too busy getting selfies with mine bosses. We need a local member who will reverse cuts to penalty rates and crack down on abuse of labour hire and 457 visas. We need Russell Robertson standing up for us in Capricornia—working to build a strong economy that works for us all. He will make the top end of town pay their fair share so that we can build new infrastructure and give workers a fair go. We need to end the cuts and chaos that the Canberra LNP government has dished up to us, and Russell Robertson is the only person on the ballot paper in Capricornia who will do so.

Youth Detention

 **Mr BENNETT** (Burnett—LNP) (2.47 pm): It gives me no pleasure to speak about a sad new chapter in the Palaszczuk government's complete and utter failure to manage Queensland's child safety and youth justice systems. I speak, of course, of what those on the other side of the House do not want to talk about—that is, the *ABC Four Corners* report on Monday that detailed the utterly horrific experience of children in Queensland police watch houses.

Children as young as 10 have been held in maximum security watch houses designed for adults only. Members should let that sink in. Words cannot describe how disgraceful that fact is. More than 500 files released on Monday have finally laid bare the traumatic stories of children who have been held for weeks on end, as well as distressing incidents such as cases of self-harm and a young female placed in a pod with two male alleged sex offenders. It has been further revealed that two children, including a mentally impaired 14-year-old boy, were held in a watch house for 33 days or more. As these watch houses are designed for adults to stay in for only eight hours, it is clear that something is fundamentally wrong with holding children in the very same watch houses for more than a day, let alone 33 days or 40 days.

Some 52 files refer to children 14 or under, including a 12-year-old girl who spent nine days at the Brisbane watch house and was made to wear a suicide smock and an 11-year-old boy who spent one night in the Brisbane watch house as well. Again, something is fundamentally wrong. Just this morning the member for Bulimba said that she does not want young people to stay in watch houses. We could not agree more. Unfortunately, it is a bit rich for the Minister for Child Safety, Youth and Women to say that as of 10.30 am yesterday there were 79 children in watch houses across Queensland. As I said before—and it really needs repeating—some of these children are 10 years old.

Minister Di Farmer herself told *Four Corners* that watch houses are not an environment that are good for young people—again, we could not agree more—but what is the government doing? If the minister thinks that is the case, I would propose that she consider taking what might seem to her and the Premier to be a radical step—that is, try removing the kids from watch houses today. Not surprisingly, I am not the first to suggest this idea to the Palaszczuk Labor government. The incredible efforts of the Public Guardian to bring this shameful child safety saga to light are to be praised. I will quote from the Public Guardian, as it is perhaps her words that are best to use when describing this horrific child safety system that confronts us in Queensland—

I have visited the Brisbane watch house, and seen with my own eyes children who are cold, who are hungry, who haven't accessed any real outdoor air for two weeks or more, and who have little or no access to education. Some are being held in these conditions for weeks at a time.


Again, something is fundamentally wrong here. To make things worse, the Public Guardian has already recommended two viable solutions to the Palaszczuk Labor government to correct this child safety shame—recommendations that will make immediate change. One proposed solution is to build temporary immediate accommodation at youth centres. If those opposite want help designing this, I can

guarantee that we could do it in a hurry. Another proposed solution is to transport youth to the watch house each day from the Brisbane Youth Detention Centre where they have access to fresh air, proper health care, appropriate education and, more importantly, psychological support. These solutions may not be perfect, but it should be obvious to anyone that they are far and away better than children being held in watch houses as they are now.

What makes this entire situation worse—and it is hard to believe that this case could be worse—is that the Public Guardian reports that almost none of these children have been convicted of a crime. Rather, they are simply on remand or are homeless, yet they are forced to endure conditions that not even adult criminals are forced to face. Something is deeply and fundamentally wrong here. The Premier and her minister have failed every single child who has been forced to endure time in these watch houses. As terrible as this watch-house debacle is, it is sadly not the only significant failure of the Premier and the Minister for Child Safety when it comes to caring for children—the most vulnerable in our state. The latest quarterly figures from the Department of Child Safety, Youth and Women show that just 44.8 per cent of investigations were completed within the 60-day target. This is down from the already shocking figure from the previous quarter and is way below the 63.6 per cent achieved by the LNP when last in government.

When it comes to child safety, these children are the most vulnerable and they need our help. This Labor government has failed them time and time again. There is nothing more important than protecting our children, but somewhere along the line this incompetent Labor government has clearly forgotten what its role is. The Palaszczuk Labor government's failure to act on child safety has put thousands of children at harm and has seen hundreds subjected to utterly unacceptable conditions by the one authority that they should have trust in to care for them. This government has failed them. Minister Di Farmer is failing to take real action on child safety and Queensland's most vulnerable continue to suffer as a result. I call on the Premier and the minister to right this wrong. Something is deeply and fundamentally wrong here.

Ipswich West Electorate, Shows

 **Mr MADDEN** (Ipswich West—ALP) (2.52 pm): The show season in Ipswich is well underway and I want to give a few words of praise for our wonderful agricultural shows. These shows would not be possible without an army of enthusiastic volunteers and I thank them all for freely giving up their time, skills and energy to organise these shows for our local communities. I am sure there would be many present in this chamber who appreciate that nothing brings out the spirit and sense of community like an agricultural show. Not only are they a chance for families to jump on a sideshow ride, buy a sample bag, see livestock up close or get a bite to eat; each show has something unique about them.

The first show of the year which was held on Friday and Saturday just gone was the Marburg Show. President Ross Buchanan and his hardworking show society committee, including Vice-President Gavin Anderson, Secretary Sue Kunde, Cattle Steward Korrine Nelson, Chief Horticultural Steward Eileen Steinhardt, Steward Miscellaneous Christine Hines, Dance Committee Chairperson Joy Boughen, as well as committee members Robert Krause—father of the member for Scenic Rim—Merv Steinhardt, Elwyn Steinhardt and Barb Froloff put on a great show with glorious weather. A true country show, the first Marburg Show was held in 1887 and my aunt, Wendy Gratton, has recorded the history of the show in her wonderful book *Not Just a Show*. A talented author, Wendy has also co-written a book with Bob Hampson about the history of coalmining in the Marburg area titled *Winning the Coal*. As always, I had a stall at the show with Sarah Grist and Lachie Enshaw helping me out. I was also a proud sponsor of this year's stud cattle section, which had over 150 entries.

The Ipswich Show begins this Friday and the executive committee led by President Rusty Thomas includes Vice-Presidents Darren Zanow, Marcia Cruickshank, Ross Young and Luke Barron. The Treasurer is Michael Lenihan, Assistant Treasurer is Kate Martindale with other executive committee members including Jill Pattinson, John Wiseman and Darryl Williams. The committee will oversee a three-day event with approximately 50,000 people coming through the gates to see what the Ipswich Show has to offer. It is estimated that the contribution of this annual event to the Ipswich economy is an astounding \$13 million. As usual, I have a stall at the show assisted by over 20 volunteers. I will also present some awards at the stud cattle section as a proud sponsor.

Last but not least of the Ipswich area shows is the Rosewood Show, which will be held on 28 and 29 June. Rosewood is the ancestral home of the Maddens, my family having settled there after arriving in Queensland from Ireland in 1863. The Rosewood Agricultural and Horticultural Show Society committee is comprised of President Craig Christensen, Vice-President Paddy Lenihan, Secretary Kate Lenihan and Treasurer Renea Lenihan. Like the other Ipswich shows, the Rosewood Show just gets


better every year and I am honoured to be a patron of the show society. As I did in previous years, I will have a stall at the show and will be sponsoring the amazing schools exhibits. Whether it is schools exhibits, stalls for community groups, poultry and birds, campdrafting or farmers proudly exhibiting their produce and livestock, these shows are all about locals supporting their community, and we cannot forget those volunteers. Whether it be setting up at 5 am, manning the gates and school canteens or stewards judging awards, they all play a valuable role in ensuring the future of the show season in the annual Ipswich calendar. Having watched the grand parade at the Marburg Show seeing the well presented and enthusiastic students from WestMAC, Lockyer, Cleveland, Rochedale and Calvary Christian colleges proudly marching with their schools' livestock, I think the future of our country shows is in good hands.

NATURAL RESOURCES AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading


Resumed from p. 1536, on motion of Dr Lynham—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Mr MADDEN** (Ipswich West—ALP) (2.57 pm), continuing: I will continue with a summary of the bill. The bill amends the Land Act 1994 to improve administrative efficiency and reduce regulatory burden. These amendments provide an effective mechanism to facilitate the resolution of disputes between leaseholders and sublessees, ensure access to inaccessible state land, close roads and transfer certain administrative approvals from the minister to the chief executive. The bill also amends the Land Title Act 1994, corresponding provisions of the Land Act 1994 and the Land Title Regulation 2015 to facilitate operational improvements and streamline and clarify processes. It clarifies administrative arrangements and disciplinary processes to improve the operation of the Surveyors Act 2003, the Surveyors Regulation 2014 and the Surveyors Board of Queensland.

The bill also amends the Mineral Resources Act 1989 and the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004 to implement measures to continue to improve performance of the resources tenure management system and corrects some minor errors. It amends the resources acts to correct errors, clarify the application provisions and improve the administration of the acts. It amends water legislation to improve operational efficiency, strengthen compliance and enforcement provisions; ensures consistency with local government infrastructure charging notices; facilitates balanced gender representation on category 2 water authority boards and modernises the selection and appointment process for directors; reduces regulatory burden; and clarifies the application of a number of provisions applying to category 1 and category 2 authority water boards.

Finally, the bill amends the Right to Information Act 2009 and the Electricity Act 1994 to support the establishment of a new clean energy generation government owned corporation. In closing, I would like to once again thank my fellow committee members, the secretariat, the submitters and, importantly, Hansard. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr MICKELBERG** (Buderim—LNP) (2.59 pm): I rise to speak to the Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019, the latest in a series of unwieldy omnibus bills. This one covers 252 pages and amends 32 acts. This bill deals with several issues, including access to state land, foreign ownership of land, ministerial powers, exploration permits and category 2 water governance arrangements. It covers a lot of territory. It even required further amendment this morning with amendments to the Vegetation Management Act, Planning Act and Planning Regulation 2017.

As a member of the State Development, Natural Resources and Agricultural Industry Development Committee, which was tasked with reviewing this bill, I would like to acknowledge the contributions of my fellow committee members—the members for Bancroft, Condamine, Bundaberg, Ipswich West and Mount Ommaney. I would also like to thank the committee secretariat, led by Dr Jacqui Dewar, who are always professional and diligent in supporting the work of the committee.

This bill is the latest of many that would have benefited from a longer consultation period to provide confidence to the community that there are no unintended implications in relation to the complex provisions that are contained within the bill. The LNP has serious concerns that the stakeholders have not had adequate time to properly analyse the bill owing to its broad and complex nature. This is a view shared by submitters to the bill. The Queensland Resources Council expressed such concerns at the public hearing when it submitted that 'you would not be trying to write a definitive submission on this bill in 15 business days'.

One of the provisions of this bill that caused the most concern to submitters to this bill was the removal of the requirement for the state government to continue to produce its annual foreign landownership report. The removal of this provision is the latest example of this Palaszczuk Labor government eroding the accountability and transparency that all Queenslanders deserve. Queenslanders have a right to know the details of who and what land is owned by foreign individuals and organisations without having to pay a regulated search fee. We have heard those opposite say that the register was duplicated by information collated by the federal government's foreign ownership register, but that is misleading. The federal provisions relate only to agricultural land and water entitlements whereas the existing provisions that are to be removed by this state government are more expansive and detail information on all land owned by foreign interests.

I note that, as at 30 June last year, foreign owned interests in Queensland freehold and leasehold land totalled approximately 11,463,000 hectares, or approximately 6.6 per cent of the state's total land mass. That is a pretty significant proportion of the state. Interestingly, for the financial year ended 30 June 2018, by value, some 64 per cent of foreign land acquisitions in Queensland were made in the Brisbane city local government area. I suspect that the majority, if not all, of the acquisitions made in Brisbane city did not consist of agricultural land and, as a consequence, would not be captured by the federal government's foreign ownership disclosure requirements.

Queenslanders' legitimate concerns about the foreign ownership of land across Queensland are not restricted to agricultural land. Queenslanders have a justified interest in knowing who owns the land in their state. Although I acknowledge that information will still be available through the Titles Registry by application and with payment of a fee, the current presentation of a tabled annual report makes the information accessible for all Queenslanders and allows comparisons year on year along with some degree of trend analysis. Clearly, that is a superior outcome. I ask the government to hear the concerns of the community and retain the current foreign ownership of land register.

Another issue raised during the consideration of this bill were the changes to the Land Act 1994, which allow an authorised person without consent or warrant to enter freehold land if they need to access adjacent state land. This amendment is a further diminution of property rights and it breaches fundamental legislative principles in that it provides the government with powers to authorise access without sufficient regard to the rights and liberties of landholders. Submissions from AgForce, which the committee received, noted that the amendments do not provide for any arrangements for compensation to be paid to landholders where access is required.

Further, amendments to the Mineral Resources Act 1989 allow the minister to impose, vary or remove a condition of an exploration permit at any time without application or seeking the views of the permit holder if an 'exceptional event' has occurred. Exceptional events are natural disasters or financial crises that negatively affect the resources industry. The minister may change a work program condition to suspend or defer all exploration activities for a period owing to a weather event. This new ministerial power is open to exploitation. The Queensland Resources Council has raised serious concerns about granting this ministerial power as it opens up considerable risk to investments that can be ended whenever the minister thought it appropriate. Additionally, the Queensland Law Society also raised concerns that the holder is—

... not given the right to be heard in respect of the exceptional event or the proposed change. Further, the proposal does not afford the holder a formal right of appeal in respect of the Minister's decision.

The broad definition of 'exceptional event' in the bill is far too open to exploitation. That is a view that is shared by both the QRC and the QLC. Far too often we have seen how politics can interfere with the approval of mining projects in Queensland, as evidenced by this government's interference in the development of the Galilee Basin and the Carmichael project. More detailed clarification on what an exceptional event may look like needs to be provided. The fact that the QLS suggested the 'insertion of examples giving a description of what circumstances might constitute an exceptional event will assist to clarify the intended parameters of an exercise of this power' evidences the level of concern that this bill is far too open to exploitation.


This bill also introduces several amendments to the Water Act 2000 to require category 2 water authority boards to comply with the Queensland government's Women on Boards initiative to establish a gender equity target of 50 per cent representation of women on the boards of all Queensland government bodies by 2020. Although all members support initiatives to establish greater diversity on government boards, significant issues exist with respect to government policy that is established as a thought bubble and then pushed on to organisations that do not have the capacity to deliver on the requirements of that policy. The government would be well served to proactively take steps to develop and encourage suitably qualified local female board candidates to nominate for government board

positions. I note that the government is taking such an approach in relation to board positions more broadly but, evidently, it has decided that a blunt legislative approach is more appropriate in relation to category 2 water boards.

Before I finish, I will address the amendments that were moved today by the minister. I note that the amendments relating to vegetation management seek to ensure that the definition of 'infrastructure' captures buildings or other structures built for any purpose. The amendments also retrospectively validate past decisions as they relate to the amended definition. I understand that these amendments and their retrospectivity aspects are a response to a legal challenge or potential legal challenge to the government's vegetation management amendments that were rushed through the parliament last year. Perhaps such issues would not have arisen had the government undertaken a more fulsome consideration and consultation process in relation to the previous amendments to the Vegetation Management Act that were rushed through this House last year.

While I am on my feet, as this bill deals with CleanCo, I would like to correct the record in relation to a comment that I made about CleanCo during the last sitting. In my contribution to the debate on the committee's report on energy I made a comment that suggested that CleanCo would not result in any more renewable generation than currently exists in CS Energy and Stanwell. I accept that the government's proposal for CleanCo has an objective of an additional 1,000 megawatt hours of renewable generation capacity. I had based my comment on testimony from the minister last year. However, I was mistaken and I apologise to the minister for this inadvertent error.

There are many aspects of this bill that make sense and are needed. However, amalgamating a grab bag of issues into another massive omnibus bill does nothing to engender trust in the community. I note that the LNP will be opposing some aspects of the bill and I ask that the government take on board the genuine concerns expressed by submitters to the bill and the community as a whole.

 **Ms PUGH** (Mount Ommaney—ALP) (3.09 pm): I rise as a member of the State Development, Natural Resources and Agricultural Industry Development Committee to address some key aspects of the Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. First, I want to once again place on record my thanks to the secretariat. I never cease to be amazed at the tireless efforts of our secretariat. They really do an outstanding job. Jacqueline Dewar has been at the helm for quite some time. A number of assistants have come through. She does an exemplary job of calling up excellent witnesses to ensure that we get the best possible testimony on all of our different inquiries. It would be absolutely remiss of me not to start by thanking them, as I know each of my fellow committee members have.

Turning to the bill, CleanCo was established on 17 December 2018. It is a publicly owned clean energy generator under the Palaszczuk government's Powering Queensland Plan. This bill further supports the establishment of CleanCo. The changes in this bill will align CleanCo's operating environment with that of Queensland's other government owned energy generators and it will protect its competitive interest in the National Electricity Market. The changes to the Electricity Act will enable CleanCo to be designated as a state electricity entity to ensure that it is subject to government directions and provides legislative protection of employee entitlements. These protections include employees transferred to CleanCo retaining their existing entitlements. New CleanCo staff will share those same rights.

CleanCo will deliver on the government's objectives of a clean energy future, affordable energy prices right across Queensland and growing investment in jobs in this sector. The Palaszczuk government's Powering Queensland Plan actions have been very successful in putting downward pressure on wholesale electricity prices and, therefore, on the household budget. Just a few weeks ago I spoke in the Mount Ommaney community on the success of this plan. It is because the Palaszczuk government owns the electricity generators that it can take action to deliver affordable and reliable electricity while lowering energy sector emissions to the benefit of all Queenslanders.

The Treasurer has previously indicated that CleanCo should reduce wholesale electricity prices on average by around \$7 per megawatt hour, which is expected to translate to an estimated \$70 per annum saving for the average Queensland household. That is great news for households like mine. CleanCo is also a key part of the Palaszczuk government's broader strategy to achieve our goal of 50 per cent renewable energy by 2030. It will provide support for the establishment of 1,000 megawatts of renewables such as solar, wind and hydro by 2025. The government will provide an initial injection of \$250 million for CleanCo to progress the development of new, publicly owned generation assets.


I would also like to touch on the water authority board amendments. As we know, this bill amends the Water Act to modernise governance arrangements of category 2 water authorities and facilitate balanced gender representation on these boards. The key word is 'balanced'. The amendments set out

specific criteria that must be considered during the selection process for suitable candidates for the director of the board. These requirements include having appropriate skills, knowledge and experience and having regard for balanced gender representation. This approach will bring category 2 water authorities in line with other governance models for statutory board processes in Queensland. A merit based approach will allow flexibility in the selection process, as both election and nomination processes can be used to recommend a person for director. The bill removes the ability of a director to continue to hold office until a successor is appointed despite the end of their term. However, while the selection process is underway an acting director may be appointed.

With that process clearly outlined, what a shame it was to hear the member for Burdekin call this policy a Brisbane takeover. Let us be frank, those on the opposite side of the House have a horrific track record on gender equity. It seems that they fundamentally oppose it. To be so dismissive of the need to have gender equity yet again is outdated in our modern workplace. If the members opposite oppose gender quotas that is fine, but do not dress it up as some kind of city versus country issue—they need to own it. The Palaszczuk government is committed to ensuring that we have equal representation of women on government boards. This is a big step in the right direction.

The Land Act 1994 will be amended to provide processes to resolve disputes involving lessees and sublessees on state land. While these are infrequent, disputes do arise from time to time between the sublessor and the sublessee in relation to the terms and conditions of a sublease. This bill establishes an improved dispute resolution framework for disputing parties to resolve their differences, either through mediation or arbitration. Under the framework, parties are encouraged to attempt to resolve their dispute through mediation as a first step. There are also situations where multiple subleases may be connected through a common sublessor, the holder of the primary lease. The new framework is able to respond to these situations whereby multiple disputes about similar sublease issues can be resolved as part of the same dispute resolution process. This is a positive step towards achieving cost-effective outcomes for parties involved in such disputes.

I would also like to place on record my thanks to the Queensland Law Society for its contributions through our committee hearings. Its representatives did a wonderful job in providing evidence around this bill. It is always very much appreciated to have their input. If I can move on to another Land Act amendment, we have seen some real confected hysteria from those opposite on some of these changes. I sat through the committee hearings and I listened to the department representatives, indeed all the witnesses, very closely. Let us clear up a couple of myths that have been perpetuated by those opposite. These powers are intended to be used as a last resort when there is no safe alternative pathway for access. The new powers include numerous safeguards to balance—there is that word again—the rights and interests of landowners with the department's obligation to effectively administer and manage state land. These include adequate prior notice being given for any proposed entry, including the details of its purpose, the duration and any equipment that might need to be taken across the land, authorised officers needing to take all reasonable steps to minimise damage and inconvenience during that entry, including complying with all relevant biosecurity requirements and entry of any residential or associated buildings not being permitted and landowners can enter into a remediation agreement with the department if damage occurs as a result of the entry. Those opposite can come into this chamber and debate the merits of the legislation, but they should at least stick to the facts. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr BATT** (Bundaberg—LNP) (3.17 pm): I rise to speak on the Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. I am a member of the State Development, Natural Resources and Agricultural Industry Development Committee, the committee that considered the bill before the House today. My fellow LNP committee members and I are gravely concerned with the enormity and complexity of this bill, submitting a statement of reservation as part of the final report. Today I will address my concerns regarding the short time our committee was given to review the bill, my reservations regarding the incredible number of separate acts this bill seeks to amend and my resistance to three specific elements of this bill.

The bill sprawled across a huge 234 pages and seeks to make changes to 29 separate legislative acts in Queensland. That was until this morning when we have received from the minister another 16 pages and another three acts. I think the minister must have been going for a new record and was a few short so there are now 32 acts that this bill amends. Not only was the available reporting time inadequate, the range of issues that this bill deals with is unbelievably large. The bill seeks to make changes to Indigenous and general land access, gas production tenure management, foreign landownership registers, the Surveyors Act, the establishment of CleanCo and category 2 water governance arrangements, just to name a few.

I believe it was truly beyond the capacity of the committee and the secretariat staff to dissect each and every amendment of this bill to an adequate standard in the very short time frame that was available. I want to thank the committee secretariat staff, led by Jacqui Dewar, as well as our committee. Included in the final committee report are quotes from the Queensland Resources Council and the Queensland Law Society stating that they were happy with the consultation process. To the contrary, there were other quotes that indicated otherwise which have failed to be included in the final report.

Those statements include one from Andrew Barger from the Queensland Resources Council, who said—

In introducing it, Anthony Lynham must have almost tossed up whether it was easier to list the bills that it did not amend. My tally marks on the introductory speech got to 29, which is probably up there as a personal best in terms of number of bills amended.

Later he said—

... in an ideal world you would not be trying to write a definitive submission on this bill in 15 business days.

Additionally, in response to a question I asked regarding the size of the bill, Queensland Law Society President Bill Potts stated—

The most difficult position that we have in assisting the parliament in its important business is hoping that we have not missed anything.

There were also a number of times during the public hearing in Brisbane when the Queensland Resources Council stated that consultation was ongoing, indicating that the committee was being asked to pass a bill that was simply not yet complete. Statements like those do not make us feel as though all the unintended consequences of this bill were able to be properly considered and investigated. Both the committee and stakeholders were simply unable to scrutinise all amendments in the very limited time available. The Labor government likes to portray itself as open and accountable, yet a massive bill such as this one portrays the exact opposite and fails any good government test.


There are three separate amendments that the LNP believes are of significant concern. Firstly, we oppose the scrapping of reporting on the foreign landownership report that the state government is currently required to produce on an annual basis. By removing this section, Labor is taking away a key source of data, as well as the transparency of landownership that Queenslanders deserve. Our communities deserve to know who, how much and what types of land are owned by foreign individuals and companies. AgForce is in agreement with the LNP on this issue. We are committed to always opposing moves to reduce transparency on foreign landownership in our state.

Secondly, we oppose the amendment that would allow the state to access private land without consent. Again, AgForce agrees with this side of the House. This bill is evidence of Labor's further reduction of property rights with no compensation for the landholders. This bill breaches fundamental legislative principles by providing the government with powers to authorise access with insufficient regard to the rights and liberties of landholders. We do not believe this is a legitimate reason to be able to enter private freehold land without consent or a permit.

Lastly, the LNP opposes the amendment that seeks to extend ministerial decision-making powers to allow a minister to cancel, vary or remove a condition of any exploration permit at any time without application or seeking the views of the permit holder if an exceptional event has occurred. Those types of events are natural disasters or financial crises that negatively affect the resources industry. The minister may change a work program condition to suspend or defer all exploration activities for a period due to a weather event. The new ministerial power to terminate and change exploration licences is open to exploitation and misinterpretation.

The Queensland Resources Council has raised serious concerns regarding this power, as it opens up considerable risk to investments that can be ended by the simple stroke of a minister's pen. The Queensland Law Society is also concerned. The Queensland Law Society is worried that the landholder will not be given the right to be heard in respect of the exceptional event or the proposed change, and does not afford the holder a formal right of appeal in respect of a minister's decision. The LNP simply does not trust this Labor government not to abuse this power and cancel licences purely for political gain.

To say the least, this bill is monstrous. The amount of change that this government is attempting to push through without proper and adequate consideration is extravagant. To conclude, my fellow LNP committee members and I worry that there are consequences that may have fallen through the cracks due to the incredibly short time frame that we were presented with to review this bill.

 **Hon. DE FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (Minister for Child Safety, Youth and Women and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (3.23 pm): I rise in support of the Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. In doing so, I acknowledge the State Development, Natural Resources and Agricultural Industry Development Committee, which obviously had a very significant task. I also acknowledge the minister for his exceptional work on this body of amendments. The bill seeks to amend 29 acts, including the Aboriginal Land Act 1991, the Torres Strait Islander Land Act 1991, the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Land Holding Act 2013, the Foreign Ownership of Land Register Act 1988, the Land Act 1994, the Land Title Act 1994, the Surveyors Act 2003, the Surveyors Regulation 2014, the Mineral Resources Act 1989, the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004, the Right to Information Act 2009 and the Electricity Act 1994.

Despite those very worthy amendments, today I would like to speak to the amendments to the Water Act 2000. The amendments to the Water Act will improve operational efficiency, strengthen compliance and enforcement provisions, ensure consistency with local government infrastructure charging notices, facilitate balanced gender representation on category 2 water authority boards and modernise the selection and appointment process for directors, reduce regulatory burden and clarify the application of a number of provisions applying to category 1 and category 2 water authority boards.

In my portfolio, for me the matter at hand is the issue of using these amendments to assist in achieving the government's target of having 50 per cent female representation on government boards. Members of this House are very well aware that the government set those targets when we were reelected in 2015. At that point, we had 31 per cent female representation on government boards. Last week at a function I was very pleased to announce that, in fact, we have reached 48 per cent. We are looking at achieving 50 per cent representation by 2020. Nine government departments have already achieved that fifty-fifty status. I congratulate all of those agencies and, in fact, every single agency that has been working very hard to achieve that goal.

I acknowledge the work of the minister and his department in this regard. They were starting from a very low base and within the department have done some excellent work with Deloitte, which we engaged to help us get up the Women on Boards initiative by altering their website. They have been working closely with a number of their boards and these amendments will help them to achieve parity, which I know everybody will be very pleased to see.

In 2015, the department advised category 2 water boards of our Women on Boards initiative and the requirement that by 2020 all new board appointees be women. However, in January 2019, category 2 water authority boards had only approximately 10 per cent representation of women. This bill makes a number of amendments to the Water Act to modernise and clarify the requirements for the selection and appointment of directors on water authority boards. It will facilitate greater gender equity on authority boards and remove unnecessary administrative burden and ambiguity.

The committee report outlined the concern expressed by some water boards around the new requirements and possible additional costs and less service delivery. I say to those boards that there is significant evidence around not only the economic benefits of having gender parity on boards but also the clearly evidenced improvement in diversity and range of decision-making. When we first put the Women on Boards initiative in place, we commissioned Deloitte to undertake an economic analysis of the benefit of having gender parity. That report found that gender parity on boards will translate to an increase of \$87 million in productivity gains for Queensland, without requiring additional workers or hours worked. Since that time, there has been much evidence about the benefits of that initiative.

During Queensland Women's Week I was delighted to speak at a breakfast for women in engineering. I was speaking to them about our goal around having women on boards. They have a target of 30 per cent female representation in their workforce.

A woman came up to speak to me after my address and told me that she is on four boards. She has spent 15 years on various boards. One of the boards she is on now is a government board which has gender parity. She said to me that she knows that without doubt the decisions being made by that board are the best and most well-informed decisions she has ever seen any board she has been a member of make. She says it is due to the diversity of opinion and constructive conversations allowed around that boardroom table. It was wonderful to actually hear personal testimony of the benefits of gender parity.

I note from the committee report a very good suggestion from the Glamorgan Vale Water Board. It suggested that the amendment be extended to include reference to balanced gender, multicultural and youth representation. This government is certainly extremely positive and encouraging of increasing diversity. It can only contribute to better decision-making by our boards.

I am very happy to support this bill, particularly in this regard. I think everyone concerned is going to be very pleased with the outcomes they see from having increased female representation and greater diversity in decision-making. I look forward to next year being able to announce to this parliament that this government has achieved 50 per cent representation on government boards with the assistance of very important amendments such as these.

Mr POWELL (Glass House—LNP) (3.31 pm): I too rise to address the Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. For members of the community who want to understand the detail of this bill, I refer them specifically to the contribution of the member for Burdekin, the shadow minister, but also to the contributions of the LNP members of the committee—the member for Condamine, the member for Buderim and the member for Bundaberg. They have done an excellent job outlining what this bill is about. It is a very complex bill. There are many acts that it is amending. There are several concerns with the bill, but three in particular that the LNP has.

I want to confine my comments to those elements of the bill that pertain to the Land Act. The explanatory notes at page 4 make reference to the fact that the amendments will consider the most appropriate tenure and use assessments of state land. The explanatory notes state—

The Land Act requires unallocated land to be evaluated against the matters listed in s 16, to assess the land's most appropriate tenure and use. The matters listed in s 16 that must be considered include the object of the Land Act and State, regional and local planning strategies and policies. State commitments and undertakings in relation to the land is now included as a matter the chief executive must consider.

The reason I want to focus on this provision is regarding a block of land in the community of Peachester in the electorate of Glass House. It is lot 8 on SP304066. It holds a very strategic place in the heart of Peachester. It is on Kilcoy Beerwah Road at the corner of High Street. It concerned me and certainly concerned the community of Peachester to find after many years an auction sign pop up on this block of state owned land.

The community were quite alarmed so contacted me. I immediately contacted the Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy requesting a stay on the sale of that property. The reason being that for the best part of three decades what is now the Sunshine Coast Regional Council have had their eye on that property as the prime location for a community park. To the minister's credit, I acknowledge that just over two weeks later we received a response saying that he has put a stay on that sale while discussions continue with the council. I will speak more about that in a little while.

I want to acknowledge the role of Mel Driscoll, Judy Tomlinson, Ray Pulham and Sally Joyce in bringing this to my attention and to the attention of the minister. One of the frustrations is that in the minister's response he still says—

I am pleased to advise you that I have asked the Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy (the department) to place a hold on the sale of the property to allow the department to offer the Sunshine Coast Regional Council first right of refusal to purchase the property.

That sounds fine except that it is basically suggesting that the council has to buy the property. As the ratepayers and taxpayers of Peachester have pointed out—they are one in the same—they already own it and why should they have to pay for it again. The question that has been put back to the minister, both by me and individuals such as Ray Pulham of Coochin Street, Peachester, is: can we stop the sale full stop and go back to the drawing board and commence some discussions with the council—

Mr WHITING: I rise to a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. It relates to relevance. This is way off topic. This is not in the long title of the bill or in the general principles.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stevens): Member for Glass House, could you please return to the long title of the bill. If this matter is related to the long title of the bill, could you please point out to the House how it is.

Mr POWELL: Certainly, Mr Deputy Speaker. As I said in my opening remarks, the explanatory notes state that the Land Act is being amended around tenure and the use of state land. It states that it is an important requirement to consider state, regional and local planning strategies. I will come to that in particular.

As Ray Pulham has pointed out in her recent correspondence with the minister, the reality is that for some 30 years the council has been considering this as a community park. Her correspondence states—

The community is incredibly disappointed that the culmination of their dedicated, selfless work and generous donations of time and services would be for the State to sell off this land without contacting Council or to seek consultation from the community with their intention to sell. The community commitment to securing a park reserve is minuted and recorded, including correspondence with Council and State going back 30 years. The High St site was chosen by the previous Councillor due to comprehensive plans—

there is that word again, 'plans', as per the acknowledgement in the explanatory notes—local plans in this instance—

for a larger out of town open space block being deemed too expensive to accommodate at the time.

One of the excuses that will be given is that the state has kindly over the course of a number of governments, including the LNP government, donated to the council a large block of land that is used for a cricket field, some historic sites and, hopefully, the site of a new rural fire brigade outside of Peachester.

Mr WHITING: I rise to a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, on relevance. I am listening to an adjournment speech not a speech on a bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Glass House, could you bring your speech back to the long title of the bill in your last four minutes.


Mr POWELL: If the member for Bancroft struggles with the connection between what—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Glass House, please return to your speech or take your seat. We are not going to get into cross-chamber debate. We will direct comments through the chair.

Mr POWELL: At page 4 the explanatory notes also talk about changes around ministerial consent. The explanatory notes state—

The Land Act currently provides over 70 instances where the Minister's consent is required to complete or approve a land transaction ...

That is why constituents like Ray Pulham have gone to the minister and said, 'We want you to stop this transaction. This does not need to be a transaction.' We have a council willing and interested in turning this block of land into a community park. All they are asking for—again, using the language in the explanatory notes—is consideration of the appropriate tenure and use. They are ready and willing to take it on. I ask that the minister respond to Ms Ray Pulham, Councillor Rick Baberowski and the Sunshine Coast Regional Council and come to the best solution for the Peachester community—that is, a park for community use, managed and operated by the Sunshine Coast Regional Council.

 **Mr STEWART** (Townsville—ALP) (3.38 pm): I rise today to make a brief contribution to the Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. I wish to focus on two aspects of the bill under debate this afternoon, and they are water and the exploration permits, as already highlighted by the minister in his second reading speech earlier today. Let us first look at water. We know that Australia is one of the driest countries on the planet. Water is an absolutely critical resource. We must do everything we can to protect this valuable resource.

As one of the members of the youth parliament said to me in a recent meeting we had, 'It all comes back to water.' I said, 'What do you mean?' She said, 'Everything we do comes back to water.' If you want to grow crops, it relies on water. If you want to run cattle, it relies on water. If you want to mine, it relies on water. If you want to establish towns and cities and infrastructure that go with that, it relies on water.

Mr McDonald: If you want a beer.


Mr STEWART: I take that interjection from the member for Lockyer. If you want a beer, it relies on water. The critical elements in this bill are around water. We need to make sure that we protect the multitude of users who access water. That is what this bill will do. A prime example is Townsville. As a growing city we were running out of water. As a growing city we needed to attract business and investment, and we needed to secure our water. That is why the Palaszczuk government committed \$225 million to increase the water supply in Townsville. It will secure our city's future. It will ensure that we can grow and become viable—and that we can continue to make great beer like Townsville Bitter.

We also need to ensure that graziers have access to the water that they need and that that is sustainable. We need to take on that responsibility as a government and as a community. That is exactly what this bill will do. It will ensure that there is fair and equitable access to every single drop of water in this great country of ours. As we have heard people say over many decades, future wars will be fought over water, not oil. With that sentiment, we need to protect our water assets and ensure that we keep water accessible by every means—to ensure that every drop is measured, that it is allocated in the right way, that we manage that water in the best way that we can. It is ironic that here I am talking about managing water and how precious it is considering that earlier this year we had that much rain in Townsville that we had water literally running through the streets and through our houses, but we know that we have to protect every single drop. That is exactly what this legislation will do.

The second part of the bill that I wish to speak about is the exploration permits. This will encourage more exploration specifically for future minerals. We have heard people stand up in this place and talk about lithium and what that will mean for batteries and energy storage. We know that Townsville is setting itself up to become one of the largest battery manufacturing plants in Australia, but that will rely on lithium, which will be mined just to the north of us in Greenvale. Exploration permits give the green light to those who wish to go out and look for other minerals and to speed things along. Like our water resources, we need to ensure that when any minerals are taken from our great land it is done in the best way we can. It needs to stack up environmentally to protect that precious water that I talked about earlier in my speech, but it also needs to stack up financially. We will continue to make sure that every time there is an application round these things stack up.

Townsville is right on the eastern edge of the north-west minerals province. By encouraging more exploration through the north-west minerals province—in fact, all through the north part of our country—it will create more opportunities to open mines which will create more jobs for the people of Townsville. I have not seen recent data, but at one stage we were the second largest fly-in fly-out hub in Australia for the north-west minerals province. As a city, we rely on mining as part of our economy and to provide the incomes to continue to drive ourselves forward.

We also know that if we open up this country to exploration it will build our export trade, particularly with our Asian partners in China, Japan and Korea. That will mean that the product will go out through the Port of Townsville. That is why we are investing \$193 million to widen that channel. It will allow bigger ships to come in to our port to take the future mineral concentrate that is exported to other countries. It will mean that we can provide the jobs for our kids and for our grandkids knowing that it is being done in a safe manner, knowing that we are looking after our essential resources—the minerals that we are mining and every single drop of water that we are measuring. This is about making sure that we are protecting our future. It is about not only providing jobs and creating jobs but also making sure that our kids have a great future ahead of them. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr WATTS** (Toowoomba North—LNP) (3.44 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution to the Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. I have some concerns about the process that the bill has gone through. This is a massive bill with massive ramifications across many pieces of legislation. I want to quote a couple of people. Andrew Barger from the Queensland Resources Council said—

In introducing it, Anthony Lynham must have almost tossed up whether it was easier to list the bills that it did not amend. My tally marks on the introductory speech got to 29, which is probably up there as a personal best in terms of number of bills amended.

Government members interjected.

Mr WATTS: This is in the report that was written by the committee.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stevens): Order! Member for Toowoomba North, direct your comments through the chair. We are not going to argue on either side of the House.

Mr WATTS: I am quoting directly from the committee report. It is a quote from the committee report, yet those opposite think that the committee report is not relevant. Is that what they are suggesting by their interjections? I am fully entitled to quote from the report. I think it is a dangerous precedent to set—that it has been suggested by those opposite that we are not allowed to quote from the committee report. The whole point of the committee is to help inform this House.

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member for McConnell!

Mr WATTS: Because those opposite have interjected and broken my train of thought, I will start from the beginning and quote Andrew Barger from the Queensland Resources Council again.

Government members interjected.

Mr WATTS: If they want to keep interjecting, I am happy to keep restarting.

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for McConnell, please stop your interjections.

Mr WATTS: The committee report quotes Andrew Barger from the Queensland Resources Council as saying—

In introducing it, Anthony Lynham must have almost tossed up whether it was easier to list the bills that it did not amend. My tally marks on the introductory speech got to 29, which is probably up there as a personal best in terms of number of bills amended.

...

In an ideal world you would not be trying to write a definitive submission on this bill in 15 business days.

Immediately, that is one of the concerns about this process. This bill is a massive bill. Even the explanatory notes are over 120 pages. For us to properly address this bill and any unforeseen ramifications that might come from a bill of this size is difficult. The Queensland Law Society stated in response to the question on the size of the omnibus bill—

The most difficult position that we have in assisting the parliament in its important business is hoping that we have not missed anything.

That is a concern when we have such a large bill. Whilst in itself there are some elements of the bill that we on this side have some concerns with, what we are most concerned with is that, when the government brings in a piece of legislation like this, it becomes very difficult to be able to fully comprehend any unforeseen circumstances. This bill sprawls across 234 pages and 29 separate acts, and I would suggest to the minister that in future it would be easier for this House, its members and its committee structure, including the people who offer guidance to us and make submissions through the committee process, to have more than one bill introduced to address these issues. Large omnibus bills like this are not helpful to this place, as many people have suggested.

Whilst there are elements in the bill that the LNP will support, there are also elements in the bill that we have difficulty with. One of those that I particularly have difficulty with is allowing state access to private land without consent, which is clause 45. It addresses changes to the Land Act that allows an authorised person without consent or warrant to enter freehold land if they need to access adjacent state land. I just think that is something we should not be doing in this place. There are times when accessing land and property without a warrant are useful for various government officers. Certainly, in my portfolio in a policing area, there are occasions when that might be important, but I think this is a step too far to have people traipsing across someone's agricultural land to gain access to state land.

AgForce rejected the need and legitimacy for extending the state's rights to access freehold land to access state controlled land. AgForce are concerned that we will have government officials and other people traipsing across freehold land so they can get to the state owned land without any access. I think that really talks to property rights in this state and who has them and how much a government should respect them or otherwise. If a government does not respect property rights, that slowly leads us down the path of socialism and I do not want to see us head down that path.

Government members interjected.

Mr WATTS: I hear those on the government benches in the chamber laughing. If you are talking about an attack on property rights, ask the taxidrivers how they feel about having their property rights attacked and stolen off them. The government was quite happy to take their money when they bought their licences but not return it later.


Government members interjected.

Mr WATTS: I hear the minister saying, 'What did you do?' I hear the minister saying that a lot.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Toowoomba North, please do not do taxi licence. Please come back to the long title of the bill.

Mr WATTS: Let me come back to the long title of the bill, which is difficult with all of the irrelevant interjections coming from the other side. The Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill is a complex piece of legislation that is stretching across multiple acts of this House. I am very concerned that there may be some unintended consequences in the bill. Given the amount of time that was put through the committee process, the analysis of that I think is very difficult. I think it is a dangerous precedent. This minister is better than that. I am sure that going forward he will not be bringing such a large omnibus bill into the parliament.

Whilst the bill was going through the committee process, we had people talk about ongoing consultation and this shows that it was a rushed process and that it was ill prepared. I hope very much that we do not have unintended consequences come forward or we will see this minister back in here amending this massive omnibus bill. I hope that is not the case. I urge the minister in future to break down legislative changes into smaller chunks so that it is easier for people to deal with and understand. This would ensure that we get the good governance of Queensland—something that is sadly lacking under this Labor government.

 **Mrs GILBERT** (Mackay—ALP) (3.53 pm): I rise to contribute to the Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. The bill's policy objective is to amend a large range of acts to ensure effective and responsive frameworks within mines and energy and to enhance the water compliance frameworks. We are all too aware of the issues that we have with water when there is a lack of it. In my

region, agriculture, aquaculture, mining and urban living all compete for valuable water resources. It is important that the water supply that we have is never taken for granted, is allocated wisely and efficiently, and is protected from waste and contamination.

The 2018 independent audit of Queensland non-urban water measurement and compliance, commissioned by the Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy, together with the Murray-Darling Basin Water Compliance Review, identified opportunities to improve Queensland's rural water management. A number of recommendations were made, particularly in relation to information systems, governance and compliance. This bill removes ambiguity from the Water Act in relation to certain offences and strengthens compliance actions.

The backyard to my region is the famous Bowen Basin mining region. The resource industry is important to the economic growth of Central and Northern Queensland. Under the current framework, unlimited renewal of exploration permits along with the ability to vary relinquishment requirements has resulted in some exploration areas being held for too long, delaying production and the associated benefits to Queensland.

The amendments support greater potential for the development of the state's resources through: facilitating land turnover by providing an overall cap of 15 years, including the initial term and renewals, for exploration permits for coal and minerals; providing exploration permit holders and authority to prospect holders flexibility to amend their activities on the ground in line with exploration results through the introduction of outcomes based work programs; and providing exploration permit holders and authority to prospect holders sufficient time to determine which areas need to be retained and which may be relinquished by increasing time before the relinquishment due date.


The resource authority amendments will rebalance land turnover and retention. Capping the overall life of exploration permits for coal and minerals and providing more time before each relinquishment cycle will drive exploration activities and decision-making. This will provide greater confidence in the sector to either turn over land or invest in commercially viable discoveries.

The proposed amendments will maximise flexibility for industry during exploration, reduce administrative burden for both industry and government, and encourage progression to production. There are not proposed changes to other existing safeguards, such as environmental obligations, land access framework requirements and native title processes.

The permit holders that have not finalised exploration by the end of the 15-year period due to an exceptional event, such as a natural disaster, may have the final term extended by up to three years. This is an important amendment for North Queensland and Central Queensland where we see during some years destructive cyclones and flooding and this year wildfires. In addition, relinquishment requirements will no longer be able to be delayed except in very specific circumstances—for example, in an exceptional event due to an explorer being locked out by an overlapping tenure holder or where a part of an exploration permit is subject to application for a mineral development licence of mining lease. In this situation, relinquishment is deferred until the application has been decided.

The Coordinator-General has signed off on two mining projects in the last couple of weeks in the Bowen Basin—Winchester South, which is about 40 kilometres south of Moranbah, and just today Olive Downs South, which is south-west of Moranbah and the neighbouring mine to Winchester South. The mines will source their workforce, firstly, from the regional mining towns. This will be great for those towns in the Bowen Basin like Moranbah, Clermont and Nebo. Winchester South proponents, Whitehaven, have already started their workforce planning to include displaced workers from mine sites that are at the end of their life.

In the environmental impact statements the Coordinator-General has invoked the Strong and Sustainable Resource Communities Act to ensure local employment. For the first time in Queensland this act has been applied to both the construction and operational sides of the project. The Palaszczuk Labor government is backing in mining projects and mining companies in Queensland. This legislation will enhance the ability for landholders and mining companies in Queensland to do business. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr CRANDON** (Coomera—LNP) (3.59 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. As mentioned by the member for Everton in the debate earlier today and others more recently, this bill is a large omnibus bill that comprises 234 pages and amends 29 separate acts. The bill deals with several issues including, among other things: Indigenous and general land access, gas production tenure management, foreign landownership registers, the Surveyors Act, the establishment of CleanCo, and category 2 water governance arrangements. Some areas of the bill are supported by the LNP; others are not.

I note that the committee did not make a single substantive recommendation despite the fact that stakeholders raised some legitimate and reasonable concerns. I also note that the LNP has serious concerns that stakeholders have not had suitable time to properly analyse the bill which, as I mentioned earlier, comprises 234 pages with amendments to 29 separate acts. We on this side of the House oppose scrapping the foreign landownership report, a report the state government is currently required to produce annually. AgForce do not support these changes either and see this as weakening the reporting of foreign ownership of agricultural land in Queensland. By removing this section, Labor is taking away a key source of data and transparency that Queenslanders deserve when it comes to land ownership. Simply put, Queenslanders deserve to know who, how much and what types of land are owned by foreign individuals and companies. The LNP will always oppose moves to reduce transparency on foreign landownership in Queensland.

The LNP also oppose the changes to the Land Act 1994 that allow an authorised person without consent or warrant to enter freehold land if they need access to adjacent state land, as outlined in clause 45 under a new section granting this power. I note AgForce rejects the legitimacy for extending the state's rights to access freehold land in order to access state controlled land. This is simply a further erosion of property rights with no compensation to the landholders. As noted in the committee report, the bill breaches fundamental legislative principles by providing the government with powers to authorise access without sufficient regard to the rights and liberties of landholders. As such, we on this side of the House do not believe this is a legitimate power—the power to enter private freehold land without consent or permit.

The amendments to the Mineral Resources Act 1989 provide increased ministerial powers to the minister to cancel, vary or insert conditions for an exploration permit in an exceptional event. Once again, we oppose this amendment. Among other things, the minister may change a work program condition to suspend or defer all exploration activities for a period due to a weather event. We are of the view that this new ministerial power to terminate or change exploration licences is open to exploitation. The Queensland Resources Council has raised serious concerns with granting this ministerial power as it opens up considerable risk to investments that can be ended with the stroke of a minister's pen.

So, too, the Queensland Law Society have concerns that a minister would be given the power to unilaterally impose, vary or remove a condition in an exploration permit, without application by the holder, where the minister considers the conditions must be amended because of an 'exceptional event' affecting the permit. QLS say they have concerns that the permit holder is not given the right to be heard in respect of the exceptional event of the proposed change and also the change does not afford the holder a formal right of appeal in respect of the minister's decision.

In this regard, both the QRC and QLS have concerns with the broad definition of 'exceptional event' within the bill which they believe is open to exploitation, as mentioned above. It seems to me that there is a trust issue here. Certainly we on this side of the chamber do not trust this antimining Labor government to not abuse this power. It seems the QRC and the QLS are of the same mind, and can we blame them? We have already seen how politics can interfere with the approval of mining projects in Queensland with the disgraceful interference in the Carmichael project by this Palaszczuk Labor government.

Another aspect of the bill amends the Aboriginal Land Act 1991 and the Torres Strait Islander Land Act 1991 to reduce government's legislative burden by replacing a subordinate legislation process with a ministerial declaration process. The bill also amends these acts to clarify the interpretation and application of certain provisions in them. As well, the bill amends the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Land Holding Act 2013 to allow for a process to transmit granted leases where the lessee dies intestate and the lessee's estate is not being administered. As I understand it, there are approximately 130 leases held in the name of deceased lessees who have died intestate and those estates are not being administered. For the benefit of those opposite, I point out that 'intestate' does not mean that they are in another state in Australia; it is quite a different meaning.

The Surveyors Act 2003 is an act that establishes the Surveyors Board of Queensland to register surveyors in Queensland and establish professional standards for the surveying profession. There is a raft of administrative and disciplinary issues that have hindered the effective operation of the Surveyors Board which are addressed in the bill. Among them are: insufficient expertise and capacity of the Surveyors Board to deal with registration and compliance of mining surveyors; unclear delegation powers for the Surveyors Board, leading to it dealing with minor administrative functions; an inability to appoint an investigator with expertise other than surveying qualifications has hindered the Surveyors

Board seeking advice about compliance with parts of the professional surveyors standards, for example, the conduct of a surveying business; and the cost of seeking information from registers and rolls held by the administering agency can be a hindrance to the Surveyors Board assessing competence, conducting investigations and carrying out compliance monitoring following disciplinary action.

The bill also implements the government's response to the independent audit and Queensland's commitment under the Murray-Darling Basin Compliance Compact, removes ambiguity from the Water Act in relation to certain offences and strengthens compliance action. The bill amends the South-East Queensland Water (Distribution and Retail Restructuring) Act 2009 to validate infrastructure charges notices issued by distributor-retailers that contain minor procedural irregularities. This will ensure consistency with the local government infrastructure charging framework under the Planning Act 2016. Category 2 water authority boards will be required to comply with the Queensland government's Women on Boards initiative to establish a gender equity target of 50 per cent representation of women on the boards of Queensland government bodies by 2020. It seems like that is a 'good luck with that!' situation. They are finding it difficult to find women out there who want to actually sit on the boards. The bill also makes amendments to the Water Act to clarify requirements for the selection and appointment of directors on water authority boards.

The CleanCo related amendments to the Right to Information Act 2009 made by the bill will protect CleanCo's competitive interest within the National Energy Market and aligns with existing protections in place for CS Energy and Stanwell. The related amendments made by the bill to the Electricity Act 1994 will enable a regulation to be made to designate CleanCo as a state electricity entity. This will ensure that CleanCo can be subject to government directions under the Electricity Act 1994 as is currently the case for CS Energy and Stanwell. The amendments also provide legislative protection for the entitlement of employees that transfer from CS Energy or Stanwell to CleanCo.

I close with a comment on the ridiculously short time frame given for consideration of this bill not from me, but from the QLS and the QRC. As I alluded to earlier, the Queensland Law Society outlined the size of the omnibus bill and the difficulty in properly analysing all of the changes within the short time frame in order to meet the submission date. They state in their submission—


The most difficult position that we have in assisting the parliament in its important business is hoping that we have not missed anything ...

In their submission the QRC stated—

Even for an omnibus Bill, this legislation is extraordinarily broad in scope, amending according to the references in the Minister's Explanatory speech, a staggering 29 different Acts. The breadth and complexity of this Bill makes it very difficult for any stakeholder to be confident they have understood all the ramifications of these amendments in the 15 business days between the Bill being tabled and submissions falling due for the Committee.

These comments are no surprise to those on this side of the House. We are used to being guillotined in debate and it seems—

(Time expired)

 **Ms PEASE** (Lytton—ALP) (4.09 pm): I rise today to speak in support of the Queensland government's Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. May I begin by acknowledging the work of the State Development, Natural Resources and Agricultural Industry Development Committee in its consideration of the bill. May I thank the committee members including my colleagues the members for Bancroft, Mount Ommaney and Ipswich West and of course the secretariat for their outstanding consideration and work on this bill.

The objectives of the bill are to: improve the administrative efficiency and to ensure regulatory frameworks within the Natural Resources, Mines and Energy portfolio remain effective and responsive; enhance the water compliance frameworks; and implement measures to improve performance of the resources tenure management system. In order to achieve these objectives, 29 acts will be amended. This seems to be a very big, scary number for those opposite, but they should rest assured that these are all very sensible amendments.

Specifically, the Aboriginal Land Act 1991 will be amended to reduce regulatory burdens and improve administrative efficiency. The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Land Holding Act 2013 will be amended to provide more efficient processes for the transition of leases. The requirement to create and table an annual report on foreign ownership under the Foreign Ownership of Land Register Act


1988 will be removed. It is important to note, however, that this data will still be collected by the Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy and, despite the misrepresentation by those opposite, the minister can request the creation of the report.

The Land Act 1994 will be amended to provide new mechanisms to facilitate dispute resolution between leaseholders and sublessees. As we heard earlier in the debate, this mechanism is a substantial step in the right direction to resolve disputes on state land including, for example, Tangalooma resort. The Land Act amendments will also ensure access to inaccessible state land where, after substantial good-faith negotiations, an agreement with the landholder cannot be reached. Despite the comments of those opposite, this provision has significant safeguards to ensure the landholder is not left worse off.

Amendments to the Surveyors Act 2003 and the Surveyors Regulation 2014 will be implemented to improve operation of the Surveyors Board of Queensland by clarifying administrative arrangements and disciplinary processes. Measures to continue to improve performance of the resource tenure management system will be instigated through amendments to the Mineral Resources Act 1989 and the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004. These amendments aim to provide certainty to landholders who will have exploration tenures over their property. In addition, it will ensure that companies that are holders of exploration tenures upgrade to production tenures where appropriate and within a reasonable period of time.

Amendments are put forward to the Water Act 2000 to improve operational efficiency, strengthen compliance and enforcement provisions, ensure consistency with local government infrastructure charging notices, facilitate balanced gender representation on category 2 water boards, modernise the selection and appointment process for directors, and clarify the application of several provisions applying to category 1 and 2 water boards. These amendments are key planks in the Palaszczuk Labor government's objective to reach 50 per cent representation of women on government boards. At 48 per cent currently, it is a significant success.

As well, there are minor amendments to the Right to Information Act 2009 and the Electricity Act 1994 to ensure that the state's new government owned corporation electricity generator CleanCo is subject to the same regulatory framework as the existing government owned corporation electricity generators Stanwell Corporation Ltd and CS Energy. I look forward to CleanCo entering the market towards the end of this year as it will provide cost savings to my constituents in Lytton while driving down emissions, something about which my constituents will also be happy to hear. May I acknowledge the individuals and organisations who made submissions on the bill. I commend the Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill to the House.

 **Mr MILLAR** (Gregory—LNP) (4.15 pm): In rising to make a contribution to this omnibus bill, once again I draw the attention of the House to the Labor government's heavy reliance on omnibus bills where a number of unrelated issues are thrown together in one bill. This not only makes proper scrutiny by the correct committee less straightforward but is also a major obstacle for stakeholders wanting to give the committee input on upcoming legislation that may impact them. The bills are difficult for the media to report and it is confusing for members of the public when searching for amendments that may affect them or their businesses.

Week after week, it seems that we see these bills being used by the Labor government as a strategy to avoid scrutiny. I thought the Health and Other Legislation Amendment Bill was the worst to date. It changed laws affecting the manufacturing, selling, supply and use of paint in the same bill that dealt with prescription of medicinal cannabis, the lawful cremation of human body parts used in schools of anatomy, and a timely payment of exit entitlements from retirement villages. At least this bill has a portfolio related coherence, but it amends some 29 acts and regulations. As the minister's introductory speech made painfully clear, it reads like a BuzzFeed article. As a result, there are parts of the bill I can support and there are parts of the bill about which I have grave concerns. In the short time allowed for this debate I will do my best to air my concerns to the minister.

Clauses 36 and 37 will scrap the annual report by the state government on the ownership of Queensland land by foreign interests. The Commonwealth government maintains a register of foreign landownership but this register is only maintained in a very broad way. It reports, without detail, on the total foreign ownership of land across Australia. In this sense, it does not represent the interests of the state of Queensland and cannot supply the level of detail required so Queenslanders can have informed public discussions about the level of foreign ownership in different segments of the Queensland economy and what that means for Queensland's interests. This is particularly true around agricultural

land but also applies to foreign ownership in tourism, residential housing and even essential infrastructure which could include power networks, communication networks, ports, roads and even prisons.

As the AgForce submission to the committee states, the Commonwealth report fails to make detailed comment on who is considered to be 'foreign', particularly in respect of corporations. It also does not define, when the ownership is partial, what level of ownership is required to be reported particularly in respect of leases for terms of five to 25 years.

Queensland has a complicated land tenure system, and information on leasehold by foreign interests is an important detail if we are to see a true picture of the situation. The annual report of the Queensland foreign ownership of land register also provides annual snapshots of the changes in the level of foreign ownership from year to year. This ability to make comparisons over time is vital if Queenslanders are to have an informed discussion about one of the most paramount interests.

It is also vital for the state government to ensure its policy aims are being achieved on the ground. The Australian government report provides none of this, and the removal of this valuable tool is not in Queensland's interest. We will be a state of Sergeant Schultzes who know nothing about our own backyard. Potentially, there are very negative consequences in choosing to be blind.

Clause 45 will allow the state access to private land without the landholder's consent. The rationale is that the government requires this amendment so it can enter and cross private land in order to access state land. This will apply to all land, be it freehold, leasehold or in trust such as Woorabinda's lands. The purpose of the entry is explained as being for control of feral pests, exotic weeds and fire hazard management.

Members have heard me in this chamber on many occasions pleading with this Labor government to be better neighbours in all three areas of land management on state land and in our national parks. This issue is not one of land management; this issue is one around trust, respect and property rights.

If an individual buys a block of land with no access, they have to construct an access. They require a proper survey and a plan, they require local government approval and they foot the bills for the survey, planning, approval and construction of that access. If the state government has obtained land to which it has no access, the rules should be the same. If the state government has allowed its access to be compromised by erosion or lack of maintenance then it should correct this at its own expense.

I have had constituents who neighbour a national park in Gregory tell me that the only way Parks and Wildlife staff, who do a great job, can access part of the park is via the constituents' private road, across the constituents' property. Why? It is because the national park tracks have been allowed to fall into disrepair. This is just irresponsible freeloading. I see it time and time again. The Labor government is shifting costs onto the landholder with one hand and taking away rights with the other.

Every other landholder has to pay their way and provide their own roads so they can fulfil their obligations under various state acts relating to vegetation, environment and biosecurity. The state government should not be bludging. It should be a model of compliance, but that is not—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stevens): Member for Gregory, I do not think 'bludging' is an appropriate parliamentary word. I ask you to withdraw.

Mr MILLAR: I withdraw. The real breach of fundamental legislative principles is highlighted in the AgForce submission to the committee. The amendments will empower the chief executive to authorise access by government officers with no knowledge of, notice to or consent by landholders. There is no other way to see this than as the dismantling of fundamental property rights. Landholders cannot be held responsible for the safety of government employees accessing their land in such a way. Nor can landholders feel such powers will not be abused to assist the government in compiling databases on their property which may trigger targeted action against them, with all the legal costs that may entail.


With the challenges Queensland faces in terms of climate change and food security, the Queensland government should be doing everything it can to build strong and collaborative relationships with Queensland landholders and within industries like agriculture and mining, which are the foundations of our ability to pay our way, yet it seems to me that the Labor government is making a virtue of destroying those relationships as some sort of perverse virtue signalling to green elites. Those green elites do not provide the money to fund our schools or our hospitals, to build our roads or to provide public transport. It is mining and agriculture that do that.

What else do we find in this bill? We find an attack on mining in the form of clause 260. This inserts a new section 141A, allowing the minister to impose, vary or remove a condition on an exploration permit at any time without application, without seeking the views of the holder or any right of appeal. Recently Bill Shorten said that he did not give a thought to sovereign risk. We all heard that comment. Apparently the Labor government here in Queensland are of like mind. They introduced legislative changes that, as the owners and managers of state land, they themselves do not comply with. There is no thought for the risk and the impacts to the state's businesses.

Both the resources industry and the agricultural industry require stability if they are to meet their capital and investment requirements. The Palaszczuk government seems to be dedicated to destroying Queensland's reputation for certainty and stability. A recent survey of global mining companies ranked Queensland behind the Democratic Republic of the Congo for certainty of environmental regulation. We were also poorly rated for regulation duplication and for inconsistency in interpretation of regulations.

Yesterday *Queensland Country Life* reported that AgForce will destroy 10 years of best practice management data from Great Barrier Reef catchments to protect the privacy of individual landholders. They fear that when the environment minister's new laws are passed the data could be seized by the department and used to victimise farmers, so we lose all of that knowledge. That is what happens when you staff your environment and science departments with activists. That is what happens when you do not listen and learn.

I implore this minister and all ministers to stop doing this. Instead, they should try to develop trust with the people of Queensland. Our farmers, our graziers, are true environmentalists when it comes to Queensland's landscapes. They do everything right because they want to protect the land they own so that they can pass it on to future generations. It is up to the minister and the Labor government—whatever government is in power—to have a relationship with our landholders and our mining companies to make sure we continue to see investment in Queensland. That is the way we should be doing it.

 **Mr KELLY** (Greenslopes—ALP) (4.24 pm): Before I address the couple of substantive clauses in this omnibus bill that I would like to discuss, I would like to respond to many of the concerns raised by speaker after speaker about omnibus bills—or, as one member put it, 'ominous' bills. It has happened in not just this debate but also previous debates. I would have liked to pride myself on being part of the Palaszczuk government that is completely and utterly different from the preceding Newman government, but as I listened to speaker after speaker—every single speaker, after whingeing about not having time enough to speak, read the exact same speech, one after another, and made no new points—I realised that one of the points that was being made again and again was about omnibus bills.

I thought I would take advantage of the excellent library service available here in the parliament and asked it to do some research for me around omnibus bills. There is in fact no definitive definition of 'omnibus bill' for the purposes of the Queensland parliament. Generally, though, an omnibus bill is one that covers a number of diverse and unrelated topics amending more than one act. An example of this would be bills that have a reference in their title to amending other acts, such as the Guardianship and Administration and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2012. I posed the question: how many such bills were passed by the parliament during the tenure of the Newman government? It seems that more than 70 of these bills were put through the parliament. You cannot simply read 'other legislation' in the bill title and assume it is an omnibus bill.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stevens): Order! Conversations across the House will not be tolerated.

Mr KELLY: You cannot assume that 'other legislation' automatically means it is an omnibus bill.

Mr Powell interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Glass House, the member is not taking your interjections.

Mr KELLY: The library did search for those bills that a speaker referred to as an omnibus bill, and they came up with 17 such bills—although, given the contribution this afternoon by the member for Coomera, I will have to ask them to look for bill debates in which the word 'ominous' was used and add them to this total!


I will not go through all of the 17 bills, but I did think one bill would be of interest to the House. The Land, Water and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013, which dealt with fairly similar matters to the ones we are dealing with here, amended 20 acts. Of those 20 acts, five had no relationship to the

area of responsibility of the minister introducing the bill. I suggest that what we have going on here is not good parliamentary debate; it is opposition for the sake of opposition. It is laziness and it is characteristic of those opposite.

I will now talk about a couple of clauses that I think are quite important. I particularly want to look at the dispute resolution issues. A number of constituents have come to see me with concerns in relation to situations where sublessees are having disputes with people who hold a head lease. In particular, a number of constituents have come to see me in relation to Tangalooma. The amendments proposed in this bill provide a way forward. The frustration for the constituents in my electorate is that they have felt there is no way for them to try to resolve their dispute. They are not looking for a 'winner takes all' situation. They are not looking to destroy the other party. They want to be good sublessees. They want to be people who work with the other party. In the present situation they feel that they have zero opportunity to do that.

The minister and his team have done a great job of listening to people who have these concerns. They have been very generous with their time in terms of talking to people who have these concerns. With regard to the notion that this is a very large bill and there is too much for people to get their heads around, the reality is our ministers are out there talking to people all of the time. They are consulting with the community all of the time. They do not simply walk in here with a bill and say, 'There you go. We're going to ram that through.' This is the result of ongoing discussions and consultations with a whole range of stakeholders. Members have come in here and said, 'This is a large bill. We can't get our heads around this.' If I was a policy officer at the Law Society, I would be embarrassed to stand up and say, 'Oh, this is a bill that covers the exact policy area that I'm employed to understand and I can't get my head around it in 15 working days.' These dispute resolution clauses certainly provide a sensible way forward.

In my remaining time I want to quickly touch on the clauses of this bill that deal with accessing state land via private land. I was on the agriculture committee when it conducted a fairly extensive inquiry into invasive weeds. One of the issues that came up frequently during that inquiry was concerns and criticisms raised by landholders of state owned lands not being managed properly and appropriately and one of the concerns raised by public servants was that they could not access those lands. The provisions in this bill are sensible and require that notice is given, require that those people traversing land comply with biosecurity, require that people do not enter buildings and require that if there is any damage done it is made good. These provisions will be very important in terms of dealing with one of those issues that had been identified on numerous occasions during the inquiries that I was involved with. With those few words, I commend this bill to the House.

 **Mr PURDIE** (Ninderry—LNP) (4.31 pm): I rise this afternoon to make a short contribution on the Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019, which is an omnibus bill. I want to acknowledge the honourable member for Greenslopes for the detailed history and legal explanation he just gave in relation to an omnibus bill. As a new member in this place, I was enlightened by his contribution. I now know that this is an omnibus bill and appreciate that the library found a bill from a couple of years ago that amended 20 separate pieces of legislation, but today we are amending 32 separate acts. This is a bill which comprises over 250 pages which is extremely large in volume. I want to acknowledge the relevant committee members whom we heard from earlier this afternoon for their detailed deliberations in relation to this bill even though they only had a relatively short time to get through it.

The bill deals with several issues including Indigenous and general land access, gas production tenure management, foreign landownership registers, the Surveyors Act, the establishment of CleanCo and category 2 water governance arrangements. While we will be supporting most of the recommendations made by this bill, we will be opposing three separate amendments which I will refer to shortly. Of great concern, however, is the lack of transparency and accountability once again shown by this government in attempting to combine so many separate pieces of legislation into one bill. Given the government's track record on limiting opportunities for debate and scrutiny, it is deeply concerning to not only me and my colleagues but also key stakeholders, including the Queensland Law Society and the Queensland Resources Council, which have flagged their apprehension in having to consider such an extensive body of legislation in such a short time period. The risk of oversight and of not appropriately dealing with all potential ramifications of these amendments has been clearly spelt out by the Queensland Resources Council, which said—

Even for an omnibus Bill, this legislation is extraordinarily broad in scope, amending ... a staggering 29 different Acts. The breadth and complexity of this Bill makes it very difficult for any stakeholder to be confident they have understood all the ramifications of these amendments in the 15 business days between the Bill being tabled and submissions falling due for the Committee.

These sentiments are echoed by the Queensland Law Society, which stated—

The most difficult position that we have in assisting the parliament in its important business is hoping that we have not missed anything.

These submissions alone are enough reason to raise alarm bells. Instead of taking the time to review, discuss and debate legislation in this chamber, we are today being asked to simply rubberstamp amendments which seek to not only impose on the rights of landholders in this state but also further reduce transparency and give one person—the minister—unfettered power to change or cancel the conditions of an exploration permit in this state.

This is a government that has made its political intent clear when it comes to mining and the resource industry. To further erode the checks and balances that allow this state to reap the rich rewards of a sustainable resource industry is yet another slap in the face for democracy and the rights of all Queenslanders. That is why we strongly oppose clause 260 of this bill which would extend ministerial decision-making powers to allow a minister to cancel, vary or insert conditions for an exploration permit in an exceptional event. Clause 260 inserts proposed new section 141A which allows the minister to impose, vary or remove a condition of an exploration permit at any time without application or seeking the views from the permit holder if an exceptional event has occurred. These 'exceptional events' are defined as natural disasters or financial crises which negatively affect the resource industry.

Both the Queensland Law Society and the Queensland Resources Council have rightly questioned this very broad definition which, by its very meaning, can be classed as unusual or not typical. The Queensland Resources Council said that this additional ministerial power opens up considerable risk to investments that can be ended on the stroke of a minister's pen. Similarly, the Queensland Law Society highlighted concerns with the use of ministerial discretion without input from the permit holder. According to the QLS, the permit holder—

... is not given the right to be heard in respect of the exceptional event of the proposed change ...

It goes on to say that this—

... does not afford the holder a formal right of appeal in respect of the Minister's decision.


It is abundantly clear that this new ministerial power that grants the minister the power to terminate and change exploration licences is open to exploitation. Given the shifting goal posts that have characterised the Adani project, it is also clear that this government's definition of an 'exceptional event' or 'not typical' is, in reality, as unpredictable as its rail schedule.

The LNP also opposes clause 45, which would allow the state access to private land without consent. This is yet another attempt to undermine the rights of property holders in this state. We have seen how serious the Palaszczuk government is about protecting farmers with its response to the disgraceful and disrespectful behaviour of animal activists trespassing on farms and causing significant stress to business owners and their families. The LNP will not tolerate such shameful attacks and is proposing much harsher penalties for these protesters. Similarly, we do not support clause 45 of this bill which will allow changes to the Land Act to allow an unauthorised person without consent or warrant to enter freehold land if they need to access adjacent state land. We do not believe this is a legitimate reason to be able to enter private land without consent or a permit. The bill breaches a fundamental legislative principle by providing the government with powers to authorise access with insufficient regard to the rights and liberties of landholders. Whether it is by stealth or sheer arrogance, this government seems hell-bent on eroding the fundamental rights of landholders in this state. However, we will continue to call it out and hold it to account.

We are also opposed to clauses 36 and 37 which would remove another layer of transparency in government decision-making. Clauses 36 and 37 remove section 16 of the Foreign Ownership of Land Register Act 1988, effectively scrapping the requirement of the government to produce an annual foreign landownership report. By removing this section, Labor is taking away a key source of data and transparency that Queenslanders deserve when it comes to land ownership. Queenslanders deserve to know who, how much and what types of land are owned by foreigners and multinational companies. The thousands of hectares of high-value agricultural land in this state sustain a profitable domestic and export market that boosts the coffers of this spendthrift Labor government. Queenslanders do not want to see it sold off to the highest bidder.

Overall, this bill attempts to bypass the established legislative process that holds governments to account. By attempting to rush through this legislation, Labor is withholding the opportunity for proper scrutiny and debate and, in the process, failing Queenslanders. Today, we have heard how some of

the amendments in this bill seek to erode the rights of landholders, remove accountability and increase ministerial discretion. Only the LNP will stand up for the rights of landholders and hold this government to account. That is why the LNP cannot support this bill in its entirety.

 **Mr PERRETT** (Gympie—LNP) (4.39 pm): I rise to speak to the Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. It is indicative of this government that it introduces bills that are given only a brief time frame for public consultation and investigation by a committee and are rammed through the parliament to prevent a fair and reasonable time for debate, or it introduces a massive bill covering a wide range of issues. This bill is a large omnibus bill that sprawls across 252 pages and amends 32 separate acts. It deals with several issues, including Indigenous land access, gas production tenure management, the establishment of CleanCo and category 2 water governance arrangements.

According to the explanatory notes, the objectives of this bill are to improve administrative efficiency and ensure that regulatory frameworks stay effective and responsive, enhance the water compliance frameworks and implement measures to improve the performance of the resources tenure management system. How can the government really believe that stakeholders have had enough time to analyse all of those changes? It defies belief that, despite concerns raised by stakeholders, the Labor dominated committee could not provide a single substantive recommendation to this bill. The Queensland Resources Council stated—

Even for an omnibus Bill, this legislation is extraordinarily broad in scope ... The breadth and complexity of this Bill makes it very difficult for any stakeholder to be confident they have understood all the ramifications of these amendments in the 15 business days between the Bill being tabled and submissions falling due for the Committee.

The government's hypocrisy is astounding. It is self-serving about consultation when it suits. At the last sitting we debated a bill that Queenslanders were told was a priority in 2015, but it took four years to deliver. Clearly, priority is about political expediency and consultation only when it suits. Even the Queensland Law Society was unable to thoroughly investigate the bill and limited its analysis. It stated—

Due to the size of the Bill, QLS has limited its comments ... There may be other unintended consequences which we have not been able to identify due to time constraints.

The opposition will be opposing three separate amendments in this bill that weaken the reporting of foreign ownership of agricultural land, allow unauthorised persons to enter freehold land and increase ministerial powers to make decisions. Removing any obligation on the state government to produce an annual foreign ownership of land report will take away key sources of data and transparency. This government constantly spins that it is all about transparency and accountability. What could be more transparent than letting Queenslanders know who, how much, or what type of land is owned by foreign individuals and companies?

Australia is an attractive destination for investment in broadacre agriculture. The removal of this obligation and the assumption that the federal government's foreign investment report is an adequate replacement does not match the information that is available from the state. The state and federal governments have slightly different systems for the definition of leasehold land up to 20 years and leases beyond that. The value of annual acquisitions is reported under the state system and not under the federal system.

The general manager of policy at AgForce, Dr Dale Miller, told the committee that, although information would still be collected and available at the titles office, it is open to wrong comparisons and conclusions being drawn. We need to compare like with like. Dr Miller advised the following—

... the advantage to date has been that we have had a consistent report coming out, so it has enabled us to make comparisons across time on investment levels and enabled everybody to be speaking the same language ... around the information that we have at a state level in terms of investment. If you provide us with raw data without the analysis and the assessment that goes with it, then you run the risk of people talking about different things. As we have seen between Commonwealth and state reporting, there is already some variation in how definitions are applied. Having a single report that is consistent which everybody works to has advantages. Returning to the idea of informed debate, we want people to be talking about the same thing rather than getting confused and disagreements arising because of it.

The government's addiction to increased powers of entry are seen in this bill. It proposes a new power for authorised persons to access state controlled land by crossing neighbouring freehold, leasehold and trust land. It reduces property rights and takes away the rights and liberties of landholders regarding their properties and provides no compensation to landholders. The chief executive of AgForce, Michael Guerin, told the committee—

The proposal is concerning, particularly in light of the diminution of other property rights, such as under the Vegetation Management Act 1999, and the deficit of trust that agricultural and other landowners currently have in this government.

There is not a legitimate reason to enter properties without consent or permission. AgForce proposed that the government develop an access agreement that protects the interests of landholders. We have heard much about the spread of invasive pests and weeds and biosecurity risks. The Law Society identified a number of considerations about this proposed amendment, including the biosecurity risk, adequate notification methods, time frames and fairness. There is nothing in this bill to meet those considerations. Dr Miller said further—

... the biosecurity obligation is on landholders ... everyone who seeks to access their land has an obligation to try and meet the requirements under the landholder's biosecurity plan ... it is ... concerning for landholders to manage pests, weeds and other issues when they have outside parties coming in.

He stated further that there could be a problem in adequately managing these issues. Time and time again the government has been told that the majority of landholders are responsible managers of their land. They want to meet their legal and moral obligations to look after their land. This amendment would make that so much harder.

I am concerned about the scepticism from government members of the obvious increased biosecurity risk from people crossing the land. AgForce was asked by the committee to provide examples of any precedents where state government bodies or inspectors have spread weeds from one space to another. Among the examples AgForce highlighted was the risk associated with weed seed spread from the maintenance of utility corridors. In the north part of the Gympie electorate at Bauple, roadside slashing contractors slashed through seeding giant rat's-tail grass, meaning that the sticky seeds moved further along the roadside into private properties adjoining the land. Giant rat's-tail grass is an insidious weed that is completely out of control. It affects thousands of properties in the state. From small acreages to rural properties, everyone has been hit. In the Gympie region, hundreds of properties have been impacted.


The spread of weeds and the cost to control them is now making some rural properties nonviable. Rural landholders are struggling to stay ahead in the war on weeds. A recent example where I live is where some machinery work on the roadside spread giant rat's-tail grass and parthenium, among other weeds, yet property owners, under their biosecurity plan, have to do everything possible to minimise the spread, including erecting a biosecurity sign on their front entrances that restricts entry on to their property. Property owners frequently have problems with workers from utility companies, such as electricity contractors from Energex and Ergon, coming on to their properties and spreading weeds.

AgForce advised the committee about a 2017 study into the risk of weed seed spread from vehicles owned by Powerlink, a government owned corporation. It tested six Powerlink Toyota utes for weed seeds. Over 80 per cent of the 209 viable seeds that were found were weed species. In fact, seeds were not only attached to the underside of vehicles; they were also found in the cabins, with peak numbers occurring during autumn. During a pest advisory forum held by North Queensland Dry Tropics in Collinsville in April last year, property owners from the Collinsville region raised their concerns about utility contractors spreading weeds. This problem is not confined to the practice of utility workers.

Despite the committee chair telling the public hearing on 25 March that the department would be asked the same question it had asked AgForce—that is, to provide examples of any precedents where state government bodies or inspectors have spread weeds from one space to another—there was no response. AgForce told the committee of a specific example of land managed by the department of state development. It stated that the state department—

... is thought to have caused weed seed spread issues along the coal seam gas pipeline easement, especially in the vicinity of Larcom Creek and Calliope River near Gladstone. The spread of giant rat's tail grass (a Restricted Biosecurity Matter) has moved from the pipeline corridor into adjoining grazing properties managed by Jim Elliot. This particular issue has been repeatedly raised with State Development Queensland since April 2015 and further at a Queensland Government Community Cabinet Meeting at Gladstone on 31 January 2016.

These are just a snapshot of the problems raised by stakeholders about this legislation. As I outlined earlier, I will be opposing three separate amendments to this bill that weaken the reporting of foreign ownership of agricultural land, that allow unauthorised persons to enter freehold land and that increase ministerial powers to make decisions.

 **Mr BROWN** (Capalaba—ALP) (4.49 pm): I rise today to speak in support of the Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. This bill amends 24 different acts, large parts of which relate to reducing administrative and regulatory burdens and improving efficiencies, and ties in with the delivery of a number of important legislative changes in relation to some of the Palaszczuk government's election commitments.

Firstly, the bill lays some important groundwork for the government to properly deliver its election commitment in regard to establishing CleanCo. To have CleanCo up and running as soon as possible will be fantastic for Queenslanders. I have lost count of the number of times constituents in my


electorate of Capalaba have raised with me the impact of climate change and what we can do about it. When finally established CleanCo will not only support a cleaner more efficient power supply but also create competition in the market which will ultimately lead to the reduction of power prices for consumers.

To get there, however, some work has to be done first and the passage of this bill will be vital to helping CleanCo get up and running sooner rather than later. When we set up a new government owned corporation it is absolutely critical to ensure it has been done so correctly. This bill does that by amending the Right to Information Act to protect the competitive interests of CleanCo which will bring it in line with other state owned energy generators ensuring that the entitlements of workers transferring from either CS Energy or Stanwell into CleanCo are protected in legislation.

Another important part of this bill is how it supports the promotion of women onto government boards. As a Labor government we know and understand the value that women's leadership brings to the boardroom. Since we were elected in 2015 we have been committed to achieving gender parity on our statutory boards by 2020. Currently across all 21 of the category 2 water authorities roughly only 10 per cent of directors identify as women. At the same time, legislation has allowed directors on these boards, who are supposed to serve for only one term and up to three years, to remain in office until a successor is appointed which can occasionally be indefinitely. This bill provides greater opportunity for women to be appointed as directors on these boards by clearing up this section of legislation and eliminating this practice.

The bill will also deliver on a commitment made by the state government under the *Queensland Stolen Wages Reparations Taskforce report: reconciling past injustice* and will assist in the uptake of home ownership in the affected communities. We are also amending the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Land Holding Act 2013 to provide a more clear-cut process for transmission of leases under the act when the lessee has died intestate. As well, the bill changes the review period of the act, extending it from five years to 10 years, to help ensure the resolution of lease entitlements and any issues affecting the grant of leases are given priority.

The bill also makes changes to the Land Act to grant authorised officers the power to access state land by crossing through neighbouring freehold, leasehold or trust land in order to undertake compliance and maintenance activities when there is no alternative method of entry onto the state land, but only in limited circumstances when there has been an inability to negotiate with the landholder. This bill includes safeguards to protect and balance out the rights of neighbouring landholders and still allow the department to get on with the job at hand. This important bill benefits Queenslanders and helps us to deliver a number of key changes that we took to the last election. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr KRAUSE** (Scenic Rim—LNP) (4.54 pm): The Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill is a large omnibus bill that amends 29 acts. It is bad enough that each sitting week the government abuses its numbers and gags debate on every single bill that comes before the House; it is even worse when we have bills such as this that cover such a broad range of acts and we only get 10 minutes to speak on it. It limits the ability of all members to put before the House their concerns with the amendments on behalf of their communities.

As the shadow minister pointed out, the LNP will be opposing parts of the bill, including the scrapping of the foreign landownership report and the provisions that allow the state to access private land without consent. I will confine most of my comments to the changes being made to the Water Act, in particular in relation to category 2 water authorities. I refer to the proposals in the bill that will require category 2 water boards to comply with the government's target of equal gender representation on such boards by 2020.

One such board that will be included in those changes is Roadvale Water Board in the Scenic Rim electorate. The proposal, one that most local users of water at the Roadvale Water Board would have no disagreement in complying with, is coupled, unfortunately, with the removal of elections for category 2 water boards. The removal of elections is a disgraceful attack on locals when it comes to the Roadvale Water Board and I note also the Glamorgan Vale Water Board which made submissions to the inquiry.

The community I represent rejects the way that this proposal takes away their local democratic voices when it comes to running their water board. As I said, the local users of water at the Roadvale Water Board would have no issue with complying with requirements for equal representation of men and women on the board. In fact, it is my understanding that when board members met with the minister's staff about this issue it was made quite clear that they would ensure equal representation on the board if asked to do so. There have been members of the board of both genders previously,

although the impression I get is that quite often the challenge is finding anybody to take a position on the board. This is not a job that pays handsomely—board members might get \$1,000 a year—but one that is taken on as a service to the community.

Roadvale Water Board has been operating for over 50 years. It serves only about 300 water users, but for many in the area it is a lifeline, especially to farmers who otherwise would have no reliable source of water. Its costs are far below that charged by Seqwater or Queensland Urban Utilities as a result of a very lean, low-cost, community based structure. Its annual turnover is approximately \$300,000. Its directors, four of them, elected as they have been for the past 50-odd years by the ratepayers who rely on the water, are often not just the decision-makers but also the people who have the know-how and the local knowledge to fix things when they need fixing. In short, it is a local community asset, built, run and paid for by the community.

Labor is cynically using the Water Act to take this community input away from the Roadvale Water Board—using legislation to enforce a system that could see the minister in Brisbane appoint outsiders to the board, which is what locals fear. There is no reason why the government could not change tack, ensure that local elections are held so that locals can have their say on directors, all the while ensuring that its targets are met. The government could have introduced legislation to put this into effect, but instead it has chosen the path of potential takeover or usurping local voices in favour of Brisbane voices. Roadvale Water Board is no SunWater or Seqwater.

Dr Lynham interjected.

Mr KRAUSE: I note the minister is laughing. He thinks it is a funny matter that people who have voted for their water boards for the last 50-odd years will not have the opportunity to do it anymore. It is no joke for the hundreds of people who showed up to a community meeting in Roadvale to oppose the minister's changes. It is not a board that handles millions of dollars per year with thousands and thousands of customers; it is essentially a local co-op and now that local co-op is losing its right to elect its own directors. It is a disgrace that this Labor government is not only gagging our voices in this parliament week in, week out when it sets time frames for debate that prevent members from speaking on legislation, but also removing the right of locals to elect local representatives to these boards.

We have to ask, what is next? The removal of elections for local government? There is no well-run, efficient local organisation that Labor will not get their grubby mitts on to play politics with, which is exactly what is occurring here. Last year when these changes were proposed, we had a packed meeting at the Roadvale School of Arts. People voted unanimously—


Government members interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms McMillan): Order! Member, resume your seat for a moment. I redirect you back to the bill. I ask members to my right to pay their respects to the member on his feet.

Mr KRAUSE: Last year when these changes were proposed, at a packed meeting at the Roadvale School of Arts locals voted unanimously—every man and woman—against Labor's changes. They rejected them because they reject Labor's removal of the right of locals to elect their water boards through this Brisbane-centric legislation, which threatens the imposition of outsiders on what is a local service requiring local input and knowledge. They reject the fact that they will lose the right to elect their directors outright. They fear that this is the beginning of a much larger, deep rooted agenda by the government to usurp those local bodies and roll them up into either Seqwater or another large bureaucratic entity, with all the costs that go with them.

I sponsored a petition against the abolition of elections. The petition was supported by nearly 1,000 people, which is quite a few when you consider the small population around Roadvale. I can tell all members that the petition was supported by members of the community across the political spectrum: Labor, the Greens, the LNP and other parties, too. I know that because some of the people who signed that petition have been very prominent and active members of Labor and the Greens in the local community. They reject the loss of local control to this Labor Brisbane-centric government.

The community I represent in this place will not forget about this issue and nor will I. Time after time this Labor government stacks the rules against rural communities when it comes to road funding, local government amalgamations, electricity pricing and now water boards. They ignore our needs in times of natural disaster, such as following the hailstorms at Kalbar last year when the federal government provided disaster support while the state government sat on its hands, or when the minister for agriculture cruelly ignored pleas for a drought declaration that was blindingly obviously needed. In 2020 we need a change in government to change the rules. Between now and 2020 I will be fighting for that change to bring the LNP back to office, to fix this issue with the local water boards and so many other things that this Labor government continually messes up.

 **Mr ANDREW** (Mirani—PHON) (5.02 pm): I rise to speak on the Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. My first concern with this omnibus bill relates to the amendments proposed to the Land Act 1994 whereby the elected minister will delegate a further 70 instances of decision-making to the chief executive of the responsible department. While I recognise that cutting red tape by way of reducing administrative overheads has its place, in this instance I believe that the approach is flawed and potentially open to the abuse of delegated power.


Looking back through this state's early history, there is a precedent as the Land Court was created as a mechanism to curtail the misuse of power over the division and disbursement of land titles. I expect that, at the present time, land title matters would ordinarily be processed by the applicable public servants and passed up to the chief executive, who would make a guiding recommendation to the minister. Ultimately, that translates into the minister making the final decision, whilst oversight is afforded to members of this House and the people of Queensland.

We should not lose sight of the fact that matters pertaining to land titles often involve incredibly large monetary outcomes and, at times, decisions made on land titles and land use can have very broad impacts on a great number of people, communities and other economic stakeholders. Furthermore, this amendment bill dispenses with the requirement for the state based reporting of foreign landownership and infers responsibility and oversight solely to the federal register system which, in my opinion, is not up to the job.

My second concern relates to the amendments proposed to the Electricity Act 2014. I caution the government on the sensibility of forming another costly government owned corporation, namely CleanCo, when CS Energy and Stanwell currently exist within the electricity generation space. In the first instance, the creation of another silo of middle and executive management is likely to erode any financial effectiveness by the creation of CleanCo.

Furthermore, while the present Queensland government has made it abundantly clear that renewables are the future, in the next breath it pays lip-service to the skilled workers employed in our coal- and gas-fired industries, whose jobs are most at risk of being alienated. Has nothing been learnt from the mess caused by splitting up Queensland Rail, and the loss of permanent work and dignity for thousands of Queenslanders, particularly across regional Queensland communities? If the present and the future Queensland governments seek to pursue renewable energy, I strongly recommend that those currently employed by CS Energy, Stanwell and their cousins, Powerlink and Energy Queensland, be offered the first chance at a meaningful transition to the new opportunities that arise within the energy industry.

To conclude on a positive note, I appreciate the inclusion of the 15-year time limit of exploration permits. For far too long, resources and tenure holders have been getting away with sitting on mineral prospects that should be developed. The resources sitting in the ground are not serving the people of Queensland through export income or jobs.

 **Mr LISTER** (Southern Downs—LNP) (5.05 pm): I too rise to make a contribution on the Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. As many speakers who have come before me have observed, the 'other legislation' is by far the dominant feature of this particular bill. In my relatively short time in this place—18 months or so—I have not seen such a big omnibus bill. I echo the frustrations expressed by the shadow minister, the member for Burdekin, who talked about the difficulties that we experience in digesting the legislation and making meaningful contributions. I think that also extends to the public and the interest groups that want to influence the legislation that we pass. There simply has not been enough time. There were only 15 days between the tabling of the bill and the closing of submissions, which is not enough time. Stakeholders expressed that view in their submissions and during their appearances before the committee.

The LNP will be opposing three separate aspects of the bill, which I will go into shortly. Despite the scope and complexity of this particular omnibus bill, we note that the committee was unable to make any single substantive recommendation. Perhaps that is why some of the stakeholders raised very legitimate and reasonable concerns. It is another example of a bill being rammed through this place with lip-service paid to consultation, turning this place into a mausoleum.

The LNP will be opposing three particular parts of the bill. Firstly, clauses 36 and 37 refer to the removal of the requirement for the state government to produce an annual foreign landownership report. AgForce does not support these changes. They see this as a weakening of the reporting of foreign ownership of agricultural land in Queensland. By removing this section, Labor is taking away a key source of data and transparency that Queenslanders deserve when it comes to landownership. For

years, in the seventies and eighties, Labor cried foul about the absence of a foreign land register. When it was introduced in 1988, there was praise from the Labor Party and strong support for the purpose of the legislation.

I looked back at the second reading debate held on 27 October 1988. Keith De Lacy was the shadow treasurer in the then Labor opposition. He was one of those shadow treasurers who used to balance the books, so he is quite distinct from the Labor Party of today. He said—

I did not think that I would ever see the day when a foreign land-ownership Bill was introduced into this House. For many years the Labor Party has been calling for such legislation ...

...

A foreign land-ownership register is needed in Queensland. For at least the last 10 years it has been part of the Labor Party's policy. Virtually all sections of the Queensland community, including that section of the community which the National Party would call its own, that is, the grazing fraternity, have called for it. The grazing fraternity has been very concerned about the sell-off of our national estate to foreign people.

I would contrast that with the hand-wringing we heard before from the member for Bancroft where he decried the scaremongering by people about foreign ownership. I was quoting from a Labor luminary. I think that debunks what he had to say. We definitely oppose the abolition of the foreign ownership of land register. To say that the function is replicated by the federal arrangements is simply not true. The current Queensland register provides far more detail.

Dr Lynham: Tell Barnaby to pull his socks up. What's he been doing for six years about this?

Mr LISTER: I take the interjection from the minister. The point is that stakeholders like AgForce say that we ought to keep it. Considering Labor's record of saying that this is an important aspect of the legislative landscape in Queensland I think we ought to.

The second aspect of the bill we will be opposing is allowing state access to private land without consent. This is at clause 45. The changes to the Land Act 1994 allow an authorised person without consent or warrant to enter freehold land if they need to access adjacent land. Obviously AgForce objected to this as well. A continuing theme in the bills debated during my time in this House is the persistent attack on the rights of landholders. We have lost count of the number that have come through where this particular provision has been enabled. This effectively gives public servants superior rights of entry to police. That does not make sense. This is an attack on the rights of property owners.

Government members interjected.

Mr LISTER: I say to those opposite who are interjecting that perhaps they might like to come out and speak to some of the landowners in my neck of the woods. Perhaps the minister would like to come out to Goondiwindi. I could shout him lunch at the Toobeah Hotel and introduce him to some of the people affected by this bill.

An opposition member interjected.

Mr LISTER: I take that interjection. This does not accord with the wishes of the people who are going to be affected.

This bill is evidence of the further socialisation and diminution of property rights with no compensation back to landholders. The bill breaches fundamental legislative principles by providing the government with powers to authorise access with insufficient regard to the rights and liberties of landholders.

The third aspect of the bill that we have particular concern about and will be opposing is extending ministerial decision-making powers, which is at clause 260. Clause 260 inserts new section 141A. This section allows the minister to impose, vary or remove a condition of an exploration permit at any time without application or seeking the views from the permit holder if an exceptional event has occurred. Exceptional events are natural disasters or financial crises which negatively affect the resource industry.

The minister may change a work program condition to suspend or defer all exploration activities for a period due to a weather event. The new ministerial power it grants the minister to terminate and change exploration licences is open to exploitation. The reason I say that is that this government—I do not point my observations at the minister because he is a good guy and I think he has the best interests of Queenslanders at heart, but he is part of the government—has a sustained history of antagonism and obstruction when it comes to the exploitation of mineral resources in this state, notably coal.


We have seen the cartoonistically ludicrous attempts to waylay the opening up of the Galilee Basin. It is a joke around the state. They manage to come in here every day and try to sell it to us. I am concerned that that kind of approach to the bush and to the resources industry in our state means that

we cannot entrust the minister and the executive with the power to make decisions like that. It is too broad. It smacks of other legislation we have seen such as the special wildlife reserves legislation and so forth. We oppose it.

I turn now to water compliance and enforcement. In his second reading speech today the minister talked about the importance of fairness and the use of shared water meters and so forth being monitored. I think that is a good thing and a good part of this bill. I would say to the minister that the department does not have a good track record of undertaking enforcement. He would be aware that constituents of mine have complained about quite egregious cases of water theft where there is a clear prima facie case to have an investigation undertaken but the department has shown a marked reluctance to get involved in that aspect of enforcement. I would say to the government, 'Please use this for good. It is a good aspect of this bill, but please grow some teeth and actually go after those who are thieving water because it undermines confidence in the system.'

We have heard a number of people talk about water authority boards. About the only members who would really understand the working of these boards are those from electorates that have class 2 water authorities—electorates like Scenic Rim, Gregory, Warrego and Southern Downs. The Kaywana Bore Water Board, the Callandoon Water Supply Board and the Yambocully Water Board are statutory authorities but they operate on a small scale.

The positions of director are unpaid. They are lucky to ever get enough people to come onto the board. The notion that we could impose criteria to make sure the right people are selected shows that this is designed in a vacuum because they struggle to get anybody at all—man or woman. It is impossible to get enough people on these boards because they are unpaid. They involve physical work at two o'clock in the morning—replacing pipes, switching valves and that sort of thing. It really smacks of political correctness not understanding the needs of the bush. Other than that we support the bill.

 **Mr HART** (Burleigh—LNP) (5.15 pm): I also rise to contribute to the debate on the Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. As we know, this is an omnibus bill. It goes for 234 pages. It is quite a large bill. Each of the pages of the bill changes a word or a number of words in various acts. I understand there are something like 29 separate acts that this bill alters. Anybody on the other side of the House who says that they have gone through the whole bill, torn it apart and looked at how it is going to affect the people of Queensland is probably not telling the truth necessarily. The explanatory notes go for 126 pages. There is a page in the explanatory notes for every two pages of the bill.

There was not long offered to the committee to have a look at this bill. There was a very short time frame for anybody who was interested in contributing to the outcome of the committee's consideration to give feedback to the committee and for the committee to examine it. Members would be surprised to learn that, at the end of the day, the committee only made one recommendation even though they were presented with a lot of information which said that the people involved did not have enough time to look at it and had some concerns. The committee, which is obviously controlled by the government, made one recommendation concerning the bill. That recommendation was to pass the bill. There was another recommendation unrelated to the bill.

It was interesting to read the statement of reservation from the member for Condamine, the member for Buderim and the member for Bundaberg. They were actually paying attention during the committee hearing. They had a few things to say with regard to why the committee only made one recommendation. I would encourage members in the chamber to read the statement of reservation. It states—

The report contains some quotes that would indicate the Queensland Resource Council and the Queensland Law Society both were happy with the consultation process.

We have heard from numerous members today that that is clearly not the case. Andrew Barger from the QRC said—

In introducing it, Anthony Lynham must have almost tossed up whether it was easier to list the bills that it did not amend.

That is the length that this bill goes to. It covers a lot of different areas. Quite frankly, the QRC and the Queensland Law Society were not happy with the consultation process, yet the committee report seems to indicate that they were. The statement of reservation also states—

There were a number of times during the public hearing in Brisbane where QRC stated consultation was ongoing which would indicate the committee was being asked to pass a Bill that was not complete.

One would have to wonder about that statement coming from three members of the committee. The QRC was giving them an indication that they were still talking to the government about aspects of this bill. It was a moving target while the committee was considering the bill. The committee system in this House has worked quite well in the past, but I suspect that it is not working as well as it has in the past.

Many members in the House have talked about CleanCo, which is part of this bill. They have raised the issue of renewable energy and the ongoing race of the Queensland Labor Party to get to a 50 per cent renewable energy target and the impact that may have on the people of Queensland and the cost that may have on electricity bills. I would like to add to the contributions of those members by stating that at last year's estimates hearing I asked the minister where the initial funding, the \$250 million that was announced overnight, was coming from and whereabouts I would find that \$250 million in the budget papers? The minister said that it was coming in the fullness of time. I am not quoting the minister. I am perhaps putting words in the minister's mouth. He is a nice bloke; I accept that. At the end of the day the minister could not tell us where that money was coming from. He could not tell us when it would be put in place. In the next couple of weeks when the budget is handed down we will look for where that \$200-odd million is going to come from. Given that this government is in quite a bad financial position at the moment, finding that \$250 million is going to be quite difficult.

According to the Powering Queensland Plan, CleanCo is going to add a thousand megawatts of new renewable energy into Queensland on top of the renewable energy that we already have in order to reach this 50 per cent target. Typically, renewable energy, if you are looking at wind power or solar power, costs between \$2 million and \$3 million a megawatt. A thousand megawatts of new renewable energy put into the system is going to cost somewhere between \$2 billion and I suspect closer to \$3 billion on top of that \$250 million that I said the government would struggle to find. Where are they going to find \$3 billion? We will be watching the budget closely to see where that money is coming from. The bill provides for CleanCo to become part of the national energy market. This will align CleanCo with CS Energy and Stanwell. It will have the same conditions and RTI protections as CS Energy and Stanwell. The point is that at the end of the day where will this money come from?

I will briefly touch on a couple of other things in this bill. As the shadow minister has said, the LNP agrees with the majority of this bill but there are some provisions that we have an issue with. We certainly have an issue with the removal of the requirement to provide a list of foreign ownership of land. You have to ask: what is the government trying to hide? After all, this is a government that tells us that they are transparent and accountable. When you take away access to things like registers of foreign ownership of land—the government is collecting that data after all, but it is not going to make it publicly available to the people of Queensland. I accept that the Commonwealth government has its own reporting scheme, but a lot of people rely on the Queensland list for certain information, especially the media. If we are collecting all of this data—

Ms Leahy interjected.


Mr HART: I take the interjection from the member for Warrego. The Commonwealth information is different and is presented in a different format. You have to ask: what is the government trying to hide? They have gone to great lengths to collect the data but they do not want to make it available to the people of Queensland. That is not being transparent and accountable. I would like to hear from the minister as to what his thinking is behind this.

Then there is the increase in ministerial powers in the decision-making process. We all know what happens when we let a Labor minister, even though he might be a good bloke—

Ms Leahy: Dracula in charge of—

Mr HART: I take that interjection from the member for Warrego again, even though she did not finish it. It is like putting Dracula in charge of the blood bank. Quite frankly, we do not trust Labor ministers to make decisions on anything. We only have point to what has been happening with the Carmichael Mine and the chopping and changing all over the place and the sovereign risk that the state now has because we have allowed ministers to make on-the-run, on-the-fly decisions.

Then there is the provision for authorised officers to go on to freehold land to have a look at state land. We are taking away the property rights that our farmers have had for years and years. There does not appear to be any good reason for that. Again, an explanation from the minister about that would be beneficial for members of the House.

 **Ms LEAHY** (Warrego—LNP) (5.25 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. This is a large omnibus bill that sprawls across some 234 pages and covers a diverse suite of legislation—some 29 acts of law. I think that that is probably about half of the minister's portfolio responsibilities. I went through and had a look at it. We now have another nine pages of amendments with another four acts being amended.

It is very difficult for stakeholders to work their way through this legislation and understand exactly what it does and then work out what their legitimate concerns are that they wish to raise. That was a significant issue that was raised by submitters—the broad and complex nature of the bill. Stakeholders were concerned about the time frame that they had to consider the bill. There was something like only 15 business days for consideration. When you are amending roughly half of the legislation that you are responsible for, if it is only worth about 15 business days of consideration, perhaps that shows where things sit in the hierarchy here. So here again we have another example of the Palaszczuk Labor government ramming laws through without proper scrutiny and without proper regard to the impost on stakeholders.

When we are amending legislation such as this, we need to look very closely at what the outcomes of the amendments will be. It is hard for stakeholders to drill down when there are so many different pieces of legislation being amended and to try to match up the amendments with the different acts—more than 29 different acts are amended. We in the LNP do have serious concerns that the stakeholders have not had suitable time to analyse the bill. They have not had a lot of time—and we only saw the other amendments this morning—to assess the impacts of the amendments to more than 29 separate acts.

I refer to the contribution of the shadow minister for natural resources, who outlined that the LNP will oppose some parts of the bill, particularly scrapping the foreign landownership report. Clauses 36 and 37 remove the requirement for the state government to produce its annual report on foreign ownership of land and to table that report in this House. The LNP will oppose the changes to part 4 of the bill—that is, clauses 36 and 37—that removes section 16 of the Foreign Ownership of Land Register Act 1988.

What a lazy Labor government we have. They could not even be bothered putting together a five-page report once a year about the foreign ownership of land in Queensland and tabling it in this House. It is not exactly an onerous document. It is only five pages. I actually have last year's report here and I have looked at previous years. I think I have looked at them every year they have been tabled. They are a short document but they are very comprehensive.


The Labor government are so lazy and arrogant. They do not want to continue with this report that has been in place for something like 30 years. They would much rather abolish the annual report than continue to report to parliament and allow this parliament and the public the opportunity to scrutinise and track the changes that are happening with the foreign ownership of land. They are taking away a really key source of data and transparency.

Debate, on motion of Ms Leahy, adjourned.

ELECTORAL LEGISLATION (POLITICAL DONATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 16 May 2018 (see p. 1213).

Second Reading

 **Mr BERKMAN** (Maiwar—Grn) (5.30 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

It is a very proud moment for me to rise and move the second reading of a private member's bill. This will be the first time that a Greens bill will move through the second reading debate in this parliament and the first time the Queensland Labor Party and the LNP will have to show their hand and justify in this place their ongoing reliance on corporate donations. This bill proposes to ban all political donations from corporate political donors, which includes all companies registered under the federal Corporations Act and their industry representative bodies. The bill would not apply to charities, not-for-profit organisations or employee and employer organisations under state or federal industrial relations legislation.

The bill proposes an essentially identical regime to that already legislated by this parliament in relation to developer donations, but it expands this to apply to all corporate political donors. After relentless campaigning from the Greens and community groups all over the state, we have finally won

a ban on developer donations to both the state and local governments in Queensland. When government of one persuasion or another finally accepts community sentiment on this broader issue and takes steps to get big money out of politics altogether, we will reflect on today as a pivotal moment towards that goal.

Every time you ask someone from the Liberal and Labor parties about getting big money out of politics, you will always hear the same response—‘We play within the rules. It’s all perfectly legal’—and they are right. They are absolutely right—just like the donations One Nation sought from the NRA would have been perfectly legal had they materialised. Disgraced former Queensland Senate candidate Steve Dickson—notably, a former minister in the Newman government—spoke of this in excruciating detail. Mr Dickson suggested, quite reasonably some would suggest, that, with sufficient financial backing, One Nation could have picked up more than a handful of Senate seats and held the balance of power. Mr Dickson put it so eloquently when he said—

We get the balance of power, very simply that means that we have the testicles of the Government in our hand at every given stage.

Steve got caught out, but let us face it: he got caught out describing out loud, in no-frills language, what so many of us are concerned about. Reform on political donations is not just about what influence or outcomes can or cannot actually be bought or sold; it is about the relentless erosion of public confidence in our political system.

Labor and the LNP are living on a different planet, quite frankly, if they cannot see that people are deeply concerned about the undue influence of corporate donors and lobbyists on government decision-making and how this affects all of us day-to-day. What the major parties also do not get or continually choose to ignore is that this is not just about a few insiders getting a better deal than the rest of us—although, of course, there are plenty of enraging examples that we can point to.

This is lawful corruption of our system and it makes our lives worse. It means worse jobs and lower pay. It makes governments disinclined to go after corporate tax evasion at the expense of better schools and hospitals. It hurts renters and first home buyers by protecting investors and big banks. It pushes us ever closer to the brink of climate disaster. You cannot serve two masters. Either you are working for the people of Queensland or you are working for the big corporations who pay your way through elections.

The total numbers are pretty daunting. According to AEC and ECQ data, since 2012-13 the big parties in Queensland have taken more than \$14 million in corporate donations and donations from corporate aligned industry lobby groups. That is \$5.9 million to Queensland Labor and \$8.7 million to the LNP. We could point to any number of specific examples, including Queen’s Wharf, where we have seen that the casino owners are massive donors. Last year they treated MPs to a swag of treats—like free footy tickets, nights in luxury hotels and trips to the Commonwealth Games—and this is on top of the \$100,000-plus that was donated to both Labor and the LNP in recent years. They have gambled on Labor and the LNP, and they have won big time. They have loaded the dice and they have won. They have made off like bandits.

Let us look at the recent announcement of \$1.5 billion for a fracking pipeline. Everyone knows the fossil fuel industry and the major parties are deeply, almost irreversibly, entangled. The most recent example was the staggering \$1.5 billion subsidy that federal Labor has promised to the fracking and LNG industry to help them build a pipeline—a free pipeline. How about that? How is that for outcomes? It is no surprise at all that the big companies that stand to benefit from Labor’s fossil fuel largesse, on behalf of the taxpayers of Australia, happen to be major donors to the Labor Party. I will name just a few of the highlights. Santos gave \$85,000 to Labor across the country, Chevron gave \$59,000, and Woodside gave \$117,000.

Energy companies are another prime example, with private energy companies like AGL, Origin, Alinta Energy and Energy Australia. Every time I talk to someone about private energy retailers, they ask the same question: if our electricity infrastructure is publicly owned, what on earth do these companies even do? The answer is that the private retail arm of these companies exists to buy and sell electricity and send you a bill—and to make profits for shareholders of course. What should ordinary Queenslanders think when they hear the people who are in charge of regulating the companies that send them the bill every quarter get massive donations from those same companies?

There are the banks, with donations to both sides. Of course, that begs the question: why are they donating to both sides? Is it a genuine contribution to the political discourse in Australia? Is it all just about improving democracy here? No, it is about access and outcomes.

I turn now to the bill and the committee report. The Economics and Governance Committee quite predictably recommended that my bill not be passed. While Queensland Labor is happy to ban developer donations and cut off a major source of electoral funding for the LNP, it has quite cynically stopped short of a more comprehensive reform and walked away from the chance to break ties with its corporate masters. Neither I nor anyone else in this place, I expect, will be surprised at that recommendation, but it is worthwhile looking at the detail of the report and consider what the committee says and perhaps more importantly what it does not say.

The committee has, at best, provided just a veneer of justification for government inaction on electoral funding reform. The bill is modelled almost entirely on the government's first round of reform, as I said—the recommendations of Operation Belcarra that ban corporate developer donations. This bill has been enacted in Queensland. While we do not have the benefit of the High Court reasoning on this decision, the legislation has survived constitutional challenge. The key quote from the committee report that justifies the recommendation that it not be passed is simply this—

The committee understands the motivation for the objectives of the Bill but notes the CCC found insufficient evidence during Operation Belcarra to extend their recommendation for electoral reform beyond banning donations from property developers to candidates, third parties, political parties and councillors.

This ignores the fundamental limitation of Operation Belcarra and the Belcarra report. They looked only into local government. The core business of local government is development, so is anyone surprised that they did not find a more expansive risk or issues? There is a conspicuous silence on this point in the committee's report. This would have been the perfect opportunity, if we were interested in investigating these issues further, to recommend that the CCC undertake a more sweeping and more broad based investigation of potential corruption and the political implications of corporate donations. Instead, the committee again said—

The committee is not confident that the evidence provided by Mr Berkman MP is sufficient for the Bill to pass the Lange Test ...

That is, 'We are not confident. Nothing here suggests that there is not real, concerning and fundamental evidence that political donations should be banned.' It tells me that nobody in Labor or the LNP is actually willing to set the CCC loose to look at this.


I have very little time remaining, but I want to pose a question around the fundamental legislative principles and their treatment in the report. The committee has identified that it thinks there are issues surrounding FLPs and the consequences in relation to the freedom of political communication for corporations by way of political donations. However, the committee seems to have overlooked the fundamental fact that the protection of FLPs does not apply to corporations. The term 'individual' is used in relation to that. Section 4 of the act refers to individuals—having sufficient regard to the rights and liberties of individuals. Both times this does not include corporate people; it only includes natural people.

Mr Power interjected.

Mr BERKMAN: I would ask the chair of the committee to look into that issue. What is his response there? Why is it that we are pretending that corporate fictitious people are real people? We govern here for real people, not the fake corporate people.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Whiting): Before I call the member for Redcliffe, member for Maiwar, upon reflection of some of the language that you used in that speech reflecting what the former member for Buderim had said, that would be unparliamentary. I would ask you to withdraw that.

Mr BERKMAN: I withdraw that, Mr Deputy Speaker.

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (5.40 pm): I rise to speak against the private member's bill being the Electoral Legislation (Political Donations) Amendment Bill 2018. In doing so, I find it disappointing that although the member for Maiwar has been a little bit more moderate in terms of his language in this debate about criticism of the reasoning of the parliamentary committee, that is not the way it has been reflected in social media today. I speak about him referring to a committee as the 'Labor dominated parliamentary committee'. This is a cross-parliament committee. He should respect the process; he should respect the parliament and the role of parliamentary committees because he is a member of this Legislative Assembly and he sits on those committees. He should respect their role.

In social media comments made by the member for Maiwar today he stated that the committee 'canned' the bill and 'failed to name a single good reason why the bill should not be passed'. I do not believe that making reference to High Court decisions and constitutional validity of legislation is not a good reason, and the member for Maiwar has not touched on that at all. He has made accusations

about the major parties in relation to donations from corporations. He really did not touch on unions at all in his speech despite his bill doing so. He talked about corporations and made allegations, but he did not actually go to the issue of the reasoning that the High Court has time and time again found in challenges before it when it comes to bans on political donations. We can say that is not relevant, but it is because we do not want to waste taxpayers' dollars trying to challenge or uphold a piece of legislation that we know from day one is constitutionally flawed. We must have justifiable reasons to put bans in place. They were the CCC's points. That is the point that the chair of the CCC made. Yes, Belcarra was about local government, but the principles that are reflected in the Belcarra report go to having justifiable reasons for a ban to be put in place and for it to be constitutionally valid, and that point has not been touched on at all. I am happy for the member for Maiwar, in his reply to the debate on this bill, to address that point and say where the justifiable reasons are.

We have heard that the government should refer this to the Crime and Corruption Commission. If the member for Maiwar has any evidence to support an allegation of corruption in relation to political donations, I strongly encourage him to refer it to the Crime and Corruption Commission for investigation. However, we are not going to ask the CCC to go off and investigate to try to provide evidence to support the member for Maiwar's bill. It is the job of any member bringing a bill before the parliament to provide the supporting evidence in relation to that bill, not put the bill into the parliament and ask the committee or the government to go off and find the evidence to support it.

It is this government, the Palaszczuk government, that brought in the threshold of \$1,000 or more and real-time disclosure. The member for Maiwar has stood here today in this chamber and referred to a whole lot of donations. He is able to refer to those donations because of the transparency in our system because we do not want donations hidden.

It is important to have transparency and accountability. We are absolutely committed to transparency and accountability around political donations. That is why we have done what we have done, and we call on the Commonwealth to have that transparency when it comes to federal donations. The member for Maiwar talked about donations and what the public deserve. I do believe that they deserve transparency when it comes to all donations. My question for the member for Maiwar when he rises again in reply to this bill is: when the Australian Greens, the Greens Incorporated, being the Greens head office in Canberra, made the donation of \$100,000 on 1 May this year and another \$21½ thousand donation on 2 May this year, can you please explain where those donations actually came from?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do not forget to direct your comments through the chair, please.

Mrs D'ATH: When it comes to transparency, when a head office gives large amounts like \$100,000 to the Queensland Greens, that means that the real-time disclosure is being worked around so they do not have to explain where that \$100,000 came from. Who are the donors who donated to the head office that now goes to the Queensland Greens for them to use in their campaign—and I do not know if it is the state campaign or the federal campaign? Does the member not think that the people of Queensland have the right to know what makes up that \$100,000 donation and that \$21½ thousand donation and all of the donations that came before that: \$44,000, \$41,000 and \$10,000? It is important that those donations are disclosed. If the member is going to come in here with a private member's bill talking about transparency when it comes to donations and criticising the various parties in relation to their donors—and he has full knowledge of those donations thanks to the Palaszczuk government's transparency around all of this—the Greens themselves must be willing to clearly show with real-time disclosure who the donors of all of this money were. I think that is a fair request and it is a fair question to put to the member for Maiwar to answer when he rises to speak in reply to this bill.

I reiterate that it was the CCC in the Belcarra report that said—

... the CCC's view is that until such time as unions and other types of donors demonstrate the same risk of actual or perceived corruption in Queensland local government as property developers, a more encompassing ban is not appropriate.

Mr MacSporran went on to state in a committee hearing on the Local Government Electoral (Implementing Stage 1 of Belcarra) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018—


In an ideal world, and my personal view would be, you would ban all donations, but the High Court has said, and the law is, that there needs to be an evidence based response which is proportional to the threat identified. That is why we singled out in our case in Belcarra property developers and not others because the evidence simply did not meet the expectation.

The onus is on the member bringing this bill forward to show the evidence that underpins his bill. I understand that he does not believe that certain organisations or businesses should be donating to political parties; I get that argument. However, he has to be able to justify why that ban should be imposed on that area of society or business. When it comes to donations and third-party donations he

has to be able to justify that legislation being upheld in the High Court. We have a responsibility to do that. We should not be wasting taxpayers' dollars introducing legislation that will be challenged and very likely overturned by the High Court because the case law is there.

There are numerous cases: *Lange v Australian Broadcasting Corporation*; *Unions NSW & Ors v New South Wales*; *McCloy v New South Wales*; and, of course, the most recent case in relation to Gary Spence and the state government in which the federal government sought to introduce legislation to circumvent any ban on donations. Not only was this government's legislation upheld as constitutionally valid; what the Commonwealth Liberal government did was found to be invalid and unconstitutional. It shows that you must have evidence to support what you are doing.

I look forward to hearing from the member for Maiwar about why and how he believes his bill can overcome those principles that have been very well established in the High Court. In fact, the reasoning in the Spence case comes down tomorrow. I look forward to reading those reasons to support future reforms in this state and to ensure that we introduce strong and robust laws which are operationally strong and constitutionally enforceable in the best interests of all Queenslanders.

 **Mr JANETZKI** (Toowoomba South—LNP) (5.51 pm): I will enjoy the lover's tiff tonight between the Greens and the Labor Party in relation to donations. I expect that by Saturday all will be forgiven. I reckon the Greens will be preferencing Labor and Labor will be preferencing the Greens. Normal service will be resumed. The normal love affair will continue.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Whiting): Order! Member for Toowoomba South, please remember to stick to the long title of the bill. I will give you some latitude.

Mr JANETZKI: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. Ahead of the election on Saturday and potentially a Labor-Greens alliance of some kind, bills such as this should alarm all Australians because they highlight the ideological irrationality of what is on display. If they felt so strongly about these issues, would the Greens contemplate refunding the \$1.6 million donation from Wotif founder Graeme Wood? If it were that heartfelt, would the Greens contemplate that? At the 2016 federal election there was another \$600,000 donation from Graeme Wood. When that first \$1.6 million donation was presented to the Greens, I recall Bob Brown saying that he would be forever grateful for the donation. When the Greens say that the objective of this bill is to eliminate the alleged, actual or widely perceived risk of corruption impacting Queensland democracy, would they contemplate the potential refunding of those donations?

The member for Maiwar noted that the object of the bill is to prohibit the making of political donations. The Attorney-General spoke about that. The member for Maiwar noted the stakeholder and community feedback and that there was widespread understanding within the Queensland community that political donations increase both the actual and the perceived risk of corruption.

A whole range of donations were rattled off by the member for Maiwar but, as the Attorney-General said, the problem is that there is no evidence. Later I will turn to what the High Court said, but no evidence has been tendered. The transcript from the committee hearing showed that. Notably, the only other people to attend with the member for Maiwar were from the Environmental Defenders Office in talking about these laws. However, no evidence was tendered at that committee as to the alleged corrupting influence of corporate donations.

As the Attorney-General said, High Court decisions in *Lange*, *Unions NSW*, *McCloy* and even the recent High Court decision involving Gary Spence have given guidance on these matters. It has been established that it is lawful to prohibit donations from certain categories of donors, including property developers, and in New South Wales for example the tobacco, liquor or gambling industries, and of course foreign donations. As I said, for a party that alleges it relies on evidence based decision-making, the Greens offered truly nothing in respect of this bill in terms of evidence. We heard donations being rattled off and about projects, but there is no link between the two.

The member for Maiwar said that the risk of corruption has been repeatedly examined in major inquiries in Queensland and Australia over the last 25 years, highlighting the inherent potential of donations to lead to perceptions of corruption. The only evidence that was really tendered concerned the inherent potential of perceptions of corruption or a widespread understanding. This is evidence that just simply does not stack up. There has been no proven evidence and, as we know, the High Court has made decisions. There must be a true link to some corrupting activity, and only limitations that have a legitimate aim are justified.

Let me turn to two words that neither the Labor Party nor the Greens mentioned tonight and that were not mentioned during testimony in committee proceedings. During the hearings I believe the member for Mermaid Beach went down this path. Two words missing from this bill are 'trade unions'.

Clause 6 of the bill states that 'a company registered under the Corporations Act is a prohibited donor'. Expressly excluded are organisations registered as an organisation under the Industrial Relations Act 2016. There was no mention tonight, there was no mention at the hearings or there is barely a mention in the explanatory notes of why that would be justified in the circumstances that we see right throughout Australia. Who can participate in the democratic process and exercise their freedom of political communication, and who cannot? Who is in and who is not? We know who is not.

The small pharmacy or small family business employing local people is out, but who is in? It is the Plumbers Union, whose constructive relationship with Labor sees only licensed plumbers installing water meters. A small business such as a mechanic who services all the local vehicles and who employs a couple of people is out. Under this bill they cannot exercise their political rights, but who is in? It is the RTBU that runs the railways to the detriment of Queensland transport users and calls the shots on how staff are employed. Family owned corner stores that are the heartbeat of their community and want to exercise their concerns maybe on trading hours are out, but who is in? It is Simmo and the ETU, back-channelling with the member for Miller, calling the shots on board appointments and policy direction of the Labor Party. Agtech businesses, start-ups concerned about the direction of agriculture in Queensland, are out, but who is in? It is AWU branch secretary Steve Baker, who at the start of this year could not explain \$50,000 of spending on his AWU credit card.

This is a personal favourite of mine. In the political donations landscape of today, Clive Berghofer, perhaps Queensland's greatest philanthropist, who legitimately donated tens of millions of dollars to medical research and to community-building infrastructure right throughout Queensland, especially in Toowoomba, is out, but who is in? It is Dave Hanna and the CFMMEU—guilty of rape, guilty of destroying documents that were headed for the royal commission. Last year alone in Queensland the CFMMEU was fined \$432,000 and nine individual officials were fined a total of \$90,000. The same CFMMEU and nearly 80 of its officials across Australia were charged in court over \$13 million of fines amid \$2.5 million donated to the Australian Labor Party over the last three years.

Bill Shorten shows up at their rallies. Bill Shorten lets them determine preselections. Bill Shorten lets them determine policy settings. Bill Shorten lets them call the shots, lets them call for the overturning of industrial relations laws introduced by Labor but added to by the coalition. It is Bill Shorten who is brokering deals with the CFMMEU. Bob Hawke has said that if he was in charge of the Labor Party he would kick this union out.

Tonight there has been a lot of talk about evidence as to corrupting influence. I turn to the Federal Court, where a lot of evidence is tendered. In 2016 a Federal Court judge said—

The CFMEU's record of non-compliance with legislation of this kind has now become notorious ...

He also said—

Has there ever been a worse recidivist in the history of the common law?


Judge White said—

It bespeaks an attitude by the CFMEU of ignoring, if not defying, the law and a willingness to contravene it as and when it chooses.

Judge Burnett said—

The only reasonable conclusion to be drawn is that the organisation either does not understand or does not care for the legal restrictions on industrial activity imposed by the legislature and the courts.

This bill has again proven the ideological irrationality of the Greens. It is bills of this nature that should concern all Australians at the prospect of a Shorten led Labor government in alliance with the Greens from this Saturday. It is that which should concern the Australian people. It is that which should alarm this House. That is why this bill cannot be supported by the opposition and should be rejected by the entire House.

 **Mr RUSSO** (Toohey—ALP) (6.00 pm): Before I address the long title of the bill, it is interesting to hear the member for Toowoomba South talking about preference deals when the LNP will preference the Greens in South Brisbane at the next state election.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Whiting): Order!

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Order! I have said, 'Order!' Three times I called for order. Member for Toohey, I will give you the same warning that I gave to the member for Toowoomba South: stick to the long title of the bill. I am giving you a little bit of latitude.

Mr RUSSO: I rise to oppose the passing of the Electoral Legislation (Political Donations) Amendment Bill. In my contribution to the debate of the bill I will be urging the members of this House to vote down this piece of legislation. The best way I can describe this bill is that it is one step too far and serves no utility in providing the people of Queensland any positive engagement with the democratic process, either during campaigning or at election time.

The Palaszczuk Labor government has taken positive steps to adopt the recommendations of the Belcarra report, and at the time of the Economics and Governance Committee report into this bill there had been proclaimed the Local Government (Implementing Stage 1 of Belcarra) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2018, which I will discuss in more detail. The remainder of my contribution opposing the passage of this legislation has been taken from report No. 21 of the Economics and Governance Committee of November 2018.

At this stage of the debate I believe it is important to note that the objective of the bill, as outlined in the accompanying explanatory notes, is to 'eliminate the actual and widely perceived risk of corruption within Queensland's democratic as a consequence of corporate donations to politicians, candidates and political parties'. The bill proposes to build upon the 'restrained reforms' of the government's Local Government Electoral (Implementing Stage 1 of Belcarra) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, introduced on 6 March 2018 and passed on 17 May 2018, and to 'help restore Queenslanders' confidence in their political system'.

The bill amends the Electoral Act 1992 and the Local Government Electoral Act 2011 to prohibit the making of political donations by for-profit organisations to candidates in state or local government elections, groups of candidates in local government elections, third parties, political parties, councillors and members of state parliament. The bill also proposes to make it unlawful for a prohibited corporate donor to solicit a person to make a political donation and for a person to solicit, on behalf of a prohibited corporate donor, another person to make a political donation. After examination of the bill, including the policy objectives it is intended to achieve, and consideration of the information provided by submitters and witnesses, the committee recommended that the bill not be passed.

I will now deal with the law as it was at the time the committee was conducting its inquiry into the private member's bill. As I said earlier, the Electoral Act 1992 and the Local Government Electoral Act 2011 govern the conduct of state and local government elections in Queensland, providing for a range of matters such as the distribution of electorates, enrolment and voting, registration of political parties, and election funding and disclosure requirements. All candidates, registered political parties, associated entities, groups and individuals are required to inform the Electoral Commission of Queensland of any loans, donations and gifts of \$1,000 or more given and/or received within seven days of receiving them. There are no donation caps or caps on electoral expenditure in Queensland. Gifts of foreign property, anonymous gifts to a political party totalling \$1,000 or greater, and anonymous gifts to a candidate totalling \$200 or greater are prohibited.

Most recently, the Local Government Electoral (Implementing Stage 1 of Belcarra) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill amended the Electoral Act and the Local Government Electoral Act to introduce a ban on donations by property developers to political parties, elected members and candidates in a local or state government election. Candidates, groups of candidates, third parties, political parties, associated entities and councillors are prohibited from receiving gifts from a property developer or industry representative organisation where a majority of members are property developers. It is unlawful, on behalf of a prohibited donor, for another person to make a political donation and a person to accept a political donation made by or on behalf of a prohibited donor.

In September 2016 the Queensland Crime and Corruption Commission commenced an investigation, Operation Belcarra, into complaints regarding the conduct of candidates in several local governments during the 2016 local government elections. One of the aims of the investigation was to examine practices that may give rise to actual or perceived corruption, or otherwise undermine public confidence in the integrity of local government, and to identify strategies to prevent or minimise corruption risks and increase public confidence. In conducting Operation Belcarra, the Crime and Corruption Commission found 'widespread non-compliance with legislative obligations relating to local government elections and political donations ... largely caused by a deficient legislative and regulatory framework'. The Crime and Corruption Commission published *Operation Belcarra: reforming local government in Queensland* in October 2017. The Belcarra report made 31 recommendations 'to improve equity, transparency, integrity and accountability in council elections and decision-making'.


The Local Government Electoral (Implementing Stage 1 of Belcarra) and Other Legislation Amendment Act was proclaimed in 2018. The Belcarra act contains retrospective transitional provisions which provide that any donation received after 12 October 2017 which is a prohibited donation under the act is to be paid back to the person who made it within 30 days of the act commencing.

Following the Crime and Corruption Commission's investigation and subsequent publication of the Belcarra report, the government introduced the Belcarra bill on 6 March 2018. It addressed a number of recommendations from the Belcarra report—recommendation 20 and recommendations 23 to 26. As we know, the Belcarra bill was the first stage of integrity reforms to implement the government's response to recommendations from the report. Of relevance to this bill, the Belcarra bill gave effect to recommendation 20 of the Belcarra report to prohibit candidates, groups of candidates, third parties, political parties, associated entities and councillors from receiving gifts from property developers. The amendments relating to political donations commenced on 2 October 2018.

I think it is important in my contribution to the debate that I address what the High Court of Australia has said about the implied right to freedom of political communication. There is a view that the proposed amendments in the bill may affect people's freedom to participate in the political process at a local and state level, both generally and regarding the treatment of fundraising contributions.

I think it is relevant, as did the committee, to explore the nature of the right to freedom of political communication in Australia as part of my contribution to the debate on the bill. Articulated by findings of the High Court of Australia in the early 1990s, Australians enjoy an implied right from the Australian Constitution to the freedom of communication on political matters. However, this right is not absolute and can be restrained by legislation, with certain qualifications.

Three judgements of the High Court are especially relevant to the bill, but I will only deal with one. In *Lange v Australian Broadcasting Corporation* from 1997 the High Court unanimously acknowledged that there was an implied right of communication within the Australian Constitution. This implied right will invalidate a law that burdens or restrains political communication to an impermissible extent. In *Lange v ABC*, the court outlined a test to determine the validity of a law. The Lange test is subsequently available to the courts to decide whether or not a law is invalid with regard to political communication. The Lange test involves two considerations. In closing, I recommend that the House not pass this bill.

 **Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (6.10 pm): I rise to speak against the Electoral Legislation (Political Donations) Amendment Bill 2018 introduced into the parliament in May 2018 by the member for Maiwar. This legislation smells to high heaven of grandstanding and political hypocrisy in relation to what the member for Maiwar has tried to put into effect in law through this House. I am told that the member for Maiwar is a lawyer and I believe that a lawyer would be able to read or understand a High Court ruling, even if he read it very slowly. This matter has been to the High Court. In fact, legislation that has been passed through this House on political donations has been challenged in the High Court and clear definitions have been made by the High Court in terms of interest and outcome and who can and who cannot.

For the member for Maiwar to bring in this legislation, which he would know is unenforceable through the High Court, tells me that we are on a journey of political grandstanding to say that the Greens are good fellows and are not corruptible like all of the other parties, yet that is quite clearly not the case if we look at all of the donations they have received in \$10,000 lots from 41 Brazilia Drive in Glen Waverley in Victoria funding campaigns across Australia. Then there is the \$1.6 million that the shadow Attorney-General referred to from a corporate boss. A corporate boss made a donation of \$1.6 million to the Greens, but that is okay because he gave it to the Greens, according to the member for Maiwar, and of course they only take it on good conditions, according to the member for Maiwar. Here again we have the ultimate hypocrisy in terms of the member for Maiwar bringing this legislation into the House to make it law in Queensland when he knows through the High Court that it cannot be made as law in Queensland.

The Belcarra bill brought into effect prohibition on political donations from property developers and relevant industry organisations. Even the Crime and Corruption Commission itself made it clear in its submission that it is not aware of, and does not believe it holds, sufficient evidence of corruption arising from corporate donations at a state or local level. We have an inference from the member for Maiwar that it is out there, it is terrible and it has influenced decision-making through this House and the only incorruptible ones are the Greens. I draw the analogy of the Greens using their influence in the LGAQ. With apologies to Greg Hallam, the LGAQ is the Labor-Greens alliance of Queensland. With the 10 per cent of the vote that the Greens command throughout Queensland, Labor cannot govern without the Greens. Labor cannot govern without Greens preferences under the compulsory preferential voting system. Do members not think that the Greens have some influence on our friends in government in the Labor Party?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Whiting): Order! Member for Mermaid Beach, as I have said to the last two speakers, be aware of relevance. I am giving you a bit of latitude, but I bring you back to the long title of the bill.

Mr STEVENS: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. The nexus that I was drawing in terms of the Labor-Greens alliance of Queensland and corporate donations is the fact that the member is suggesting that the corporate donations are not about too much influence. People such as the union movement have philosophical views in supporting the interests of the Labor Party. It is the arm—the wing—of the union movement as those people see it and the people in the Labor Party should follow union direction. Just the same, people in this country have the right, as the High Court has said, to have a philosophical leaning. I am sure that members will find that the mining industry and Adani people, for instance, do not believe that the Greens are in their best interests with the black-throated finch and all of the problems there. Philosophically, why can they not support a party that supports their vision and their *modus operandi* of doing business just as the Greens, philosophically, see the Labor Party rather than the LNP as their way of getting matters achieved through their influence in the Labor Party with the 10 per cent vote?

I am equating the influence that is given through the preferential voting system to the fact that they are entitled to do that. No-one is saying that Clive Palmer cannot put his preferences wherever he wants, and the Greens are entitled to do that as well. Rather, what they are saying is that philosophically the corporate bodies cannot support those groups that are in their interests. It is a lot of rubbish. As I said at the portfolio committee meetings, I raised a matter with regard to not-for-profit organisations and their interests. They obviously can support who they want in terms of reaching an outcome. For instance, I believe the Rugby Union is looking for some money from the federal government to be in terms of development, which probably will not happen because they will not get into power.


Everyone has a right via the High Court decision as long as there is not corrupt influence. The member for Maiwar has made no identification of corruption; he just believes that there is a perception. The fact of the matter is the Crime and Corruption Commission boss himself has said that there is no corruption out there to be identified by corporations and this bill by the Greens, with a maximum of 10 per cent of the vote, is designed to bring everyone back to their level and leverage their vote in the community because most corporates see the Greens as the vandals, given the damage that they do right throughout Queensland. I say to the tourism minister opposite that if we did not have the Greens there would be a wonderful tourism cable car attraction on the Gold Coast.

Getting back to the bill, the bill restricts political communication. With regard to the bill before us tonight, as the committee explored in its report, there is an implied right of political communication within our country's Constitution, as acknowledged in *Lange v ABC* in 1997. It naturally follows that a law which restricts this right to an impermissible extent is invalidated. In determining whether a law is invalid, we apply the *Lange* test, which asks, firstly, whether the law burdens political communication and, secondly, whether it is appropriate and consistent with the system of government established by our Constitution. During the inquiry I raised the fact that we have a ruling by the High Court—the ultimate decision-maker relating to Australia's direction under the rule of law—that, unless there are sound evidentiary connections between a donation and a particular outcome, political donations should be allowed.

Given the lack of evidence provided to us in our examination of the bill, we cannot be satisfied that this legislation would pass the relevant test. As the committee concluded in its report, it is not clear that the proposed law would be justified as a proportionate means of achieving its purpose. Put simply, it is my belief that this bill, if passed, would attack the right and freedom of Queenslanders to be part of the political process.

The CCC indicated that, should corporations be banned from making political donations owing to this bill, they will simply find another medium to get their message out—in other words, through third-party advertising from organisations such as GetUp! and the rest of the crew as we have seen during the current federal election campaign. As the committee discussed, the US has seen a movement towards third-party political community campaigns. Should corporate donations to political parties be banned in Queensland, it seems reasonable to assume that third-party campaigns would similarly become prevalent here. Not only is the bill unfounded but also it is ill thought out and, if passed, would be ineffective.

I reiterate that there is no justification for the proposed legislation. The CCC was unable to find sufficient evidence of this supposed corruption bemoaned by the member for Maiwar. We can only conclude that this bill is a transparent attempt by the Greens to scramble for some importance in this state which, thankfully, overwhelmingly recognises their irrelevance.

 **Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (Minister for Local Government, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (6.20 pm): I rise to speak in opposition to the Electoral Legislation (Political Donations) Amendment Bill 2018. In doing so, I acknowledge the work of the Economics and Governance Committee, particularly the work of the chair, the member for Logan. I accept the committee's recommendation to not support the bill introduced by the member for Maiwar.

The bill is poorly thought out and, should it be passed, will almost certainly be challenged in the High Court. As we have seen across Australia, whenever amateur Greens get a foothold in legislatures such as ours, we can expect poorly thought out legislative proposals. This bill is no exception.

Mr Bleijie: But make sure you give me your preference at the next election.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I take that interjection from the Manager of Opposition Business. His party is seeking to make sure that there are more Greens in this chamber. That seems like a strange course of action.

I hesitate to echo the comments made by the member for Mermaid Beach in his contribution, but the failure of these proposals will be used by the Greens to grandstand to the next election and beyond. However, the Palaszczuk Labor government is here to ensure that, in Queensland, a sensible legislative program is maintained. As a serious party of government it is our responsibility to the people of Queensland to ensure that our legislative framework is designed with the best interests of Queenslanders at heart and, to that end, with its constitutionality in mind.

Various decisions by the High Court of Australia have shown that in Queensland and the rest of our country there is an implied right to freedom of political communication. However, we have seen through decisions such as *Lange v Australian Broadcasting Corporation* 1997, *Unions NSW v New South Wales* 2013, *McCloy v New South Wales* 2015 and *Unions NSW v New South Wales* 2019 that there are reasonable limits to this implied right to freedom of political communication. That was accepted and acknowledged by the member for Maiwar in his contribution.

I believe that it should be apparent to this House that the member for Maiwar's bill goes well beyond this reasonable limit. That is why I say that we need to design a legislative framework, as this government is doing, with the best interests of Queenslanders at its heart, but with constitutionality in mind. We can have a heart about what we want to do, but we have to have the mind to get it right. It should indeed be concerning to the constituents of the Maiwar electorate that their learned representative does not recognise that.

Additionally, the evidence of the Crime and Corruption Commission to the committee hearing demonstrates that this bill is neither necessary nor good for our electoral system. Furthermore, the member for Maiwar's bill evidently breaches the fundamental legislative principle that requires legislation to have sufficient regard to the rights and liberties of individuals.

However, I have good news for the member for Maiwar, for the other members of this House and for the members of the Queensland community: the Palaszczuk Labor government is already embarking on serious and meaningful reform of our electoral systems and governance frameworks. In the spirit of improving the quality and transparency of our electoral systems, the Attorney-General and I have already introduced laws. Despite the efforts of Mr Gary Spence and the Liberal National Party at both state and Commonwealth levels, donations from property developers to state and local campaigns have been banned. We have already introduced real-time donation disclosure. In more good news, during the last sitting week, as members would be aware, the Attorney-General introduced the Electoral and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019 and I have introduced the Local Government Electoral (Implementing Stage 2 of Belcarra) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019.

I say to the member for Maiwar that the Queensland parliament is not a place for grandstanding; it is a place for serious business and serious reform in the interests of the citizens of Queensland. I hesitate to keep saying that in the context of feeling like I am echoing the comments of the member for Mermaid Beach in his contribution. I feel embarrassed about that and ashamed that he is not here to enjoy listening to me.

I want to return very briefly to some remarks that were made by the member for Mermaid Beach in his contribution. Mr Deputy Speaker, I assure you that I am not going to offend your rulings, because I am not going to list the number of LNP members in this House who are here only thanks to Labor preferences.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: If the Manager of Opposition Business wants me to list the opposition members who were elected only due to One Nation preferences, I can do that. These things can be thrown around. In essence, the key message that each and every one of us in the chamber needs to


understand is that this bill is not serious. It is not using the mind. It might have some heart on its sleeve, but it is not using the mind; it is merely an opportunity for the Greens to grandstand. The member for Maiwar knows that. He knows that this bill will not stand up to the test of constitutionality and nor does it meet the bar set by fundamental legislative principles. Members on this side of the House know that and, from the contributions that I have heard of the members opposite, they know that.

It is very important that we understand that principle, that central tenet about legislating in this place. It is not a parlour game. It is not a debating technique to pass legislation. Legislation sets the laws and the principles in this state. We need to do that, as I said, with the best interests of Queenslanders at heart and the very important element of constitutionality in mind. Constitutionality is not just a thing to play with; it involves dollars. If this bill were to be passed, there would be an expectation that we would be defending it in the High Court. That is going to come at a cost of hundreds of thousands of Queensland taxpayers' funds.

Mr Power: The Greens will pay it.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I take that injection from the member for Logan. Perhaps the Greens could come to the party. They have plenty of large donors who could give them the support to do that. That might be a solution, but I do not think that is their intention. That is why it is very important that we remind ourselves of the seriousness of legislating. As I say, it is not a parlour game. This place is not an echo chamber of debate. This is a place where a bill such as this bill before us has the ability to become law. It is not a grandstanding exercise; it is an exercise that needs to happen in the interests of Queenslanders.

That is why I call on all members of the House to oppose the bill. I encourage members to support the government's decision and the recommendation of the parliamentary committee to oppose this bill. It is not good legislation. It is only going to cause challenges and difficulties for Queenslanders. It is not going to be the solution to our problems; it is merely a vehicle for grandstanding.

 **Mr O'CONNOR** (Bonney—LNP) (6.29 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Electoral Legislation (Political Donations) Amendment Bill as a member of the Labor controlled Economics and Governance Committee.

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Whiting): Order! I will give you the same direction I have given to nearly everyone else: please stick to the long title of the bill. I am giving some latitude.

Mr O'CONNOR: We investigated this bill and handed down our report last year; unanimously deciding that it should not pass. The committee received 19 written submissions from members of the public, a briefing from the member for Maiwar on the bill and a public hearing last August with only representatives from the Environmental Defenders Office in attendance.

The impetus for this bill was the poor perception of politics. None of us in this place can deny that there is certainly a huge issue with how politics and politicians are viewed in Queensland and nationally. We are about as popular as the usual suspects such as used car salespeople, real estate agents or lawyers. Of course, I mean no offence to the many upstanding members of those professions by comparing them to politicians. This bill does have the very worthy aspiration of wanting to help restore the confidence of Queenslanders in their political system—and that is something every member of this House should be working hard to do—but this bill will certainly not achieve that.

We truly live in one of the best democracies in the world. Over the weekend we will see a further example of just how lucky we are because we will be able to visit our local schools or community halls, buy a democracy sausage and support a local organisation before ticking a few boxes on a piece of paper to pick who we think should represent us. Australia is a pioneer of free and fair elections and of enfranchising people by allowing them to have a vote. It is obviously compulsory here, which is unusual, but even voting on a Saturday is a rarity in other jurisdictions. That is such a simple way of making sure that as many people as possible are heard.

In the mid 1800s we actually invented the secret ballot. Having a private voting booth was something that came from our country. This then spread to other western democracies and was known as the Australian ballot internationally. My point is that our system is good but the perception of it is a problem. I disagree with the member for Maiwar's assertion that this bill is necessary to ensure that elected representatives in the Queensland parliament are here to further the interests of Queensland society as a whole, not a narrow set of corporate interests. While I can certainly say that I am here to serve our society, the community that I am part of and that I represent comes first and foremost. From what I have seen, this is the case for all members of this place, although we, of course, do have different ideas about how this state should be managed.

This bill seeks to ban political donations by for-profit corporations to council and state election candidates, to elected councillors and MPs, to groups, third parties and to political parties. Queensland already has some quite stringent donation laws with real-time disclosure and a \$1,000 threshold for the declaration of a donation or a gift. More restrictive laws do not necessarily improve the perception of politics, particularly when they are used to blatantly hinder one side of politics as we have seen.


As a committee we heard expert advice that the proposed amendments may impact on the freedom people have to be part of the political process in Queensland. Of course, we do have freedom of political communication in Australia, but it can be limited through legislation with a number of qualifications set out through judgements of the High Court. A significant one that other members have mentioned is *Lange v Australian Broadcasting Commission*, which established the Lange test with two key components. No. 1 was whether the law burdens political communication. No. 2 was whether the law is appropriate and consistent with the system of government set out in our nation's Constitution. There were other decisions, like *Unions NSW v New South Wales*, which determined that laws such as this may be valid if they create reasonable and proportionate limitations on implied freedom for legitimate ends with means that are a proportionate response.

The Crime and Corruption Commission acknowledged this when it highlighted that any restriction needed to be a response based in evidence and one which was proportional to the threat. It stated it is 'not aware of, and does not consider it holds, sufficient evidence in this regard.' I think that is a very important point. The CCC is the body that has extraordinary powers and is in charge of public sector ethics, political accountability and in investigating corruption in this state and it found that it did not have any basis for this sort of legislative response. It also took a similar position when the government expanded the developer donation ban to the state level without any basis. We do need to reform how political donations are made, but I do not believe this approach is the answer. I do not think it would even do anything to address the perception people have about politics. That does not mean that we should do nothing. My point is that who we are and how we act as politicians is far more important. That is how we can improve the perception of politics.

I think campaign expenditure caps are something worth investigating to help even the playing field. At the moment our side of politics is completely outgunned by the union movement at every election. At the federal level we are seeing a self-proclaimed billionaire in Mr Palmer spend tens of millions of dollars on some of the worst advertising in an attempt to win a Senate seat.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Pugh): Order! Member for Bonney, I would ask you to come back to the long title of the bill.

Mr O'CONNOR: I think it exposes a serious flaw in our system when a wealthy individual can drop so much money on a single campaign to try to win a position. To conclude, I believe we do need to improve our political donation system, but this method could cause further issues through being overwhelmingly and incorrectly restrictive. Fundraising will never have a positive perception, but unfortunately elections can be expensive—especially when we are up against the might of the union movement. There are issues with perception, but there is clearly no evidence that a disproportionate response such as this is necessary. This bill is not the way to go about restoring faith in our political system from both a freedom of political communication perspective and, in a practical sense, in terms of whether it would hold up to any challenges.

 **Mr BROWN** (Capalaba—ALP) (6.36 pm): I note the member for Bonney touched on Clive Palmer and his expenditure in the current election campaign. I note that some of that expenditure has been on sharing LNP videos which is a direct link to their preference deal with Clive Palmer. This legislation from the member for Maiwar ensures that there are more people like Clive Palmer in politics. Clive Palmer would be sitting in Fiji right now cheering this bill home.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Pugh): I would ask you to come back to the long title of the bill.

Mr BROWN: This bill is about political donations and expenditure of political donations. I am referring to an individual who is spending donations. Can you please clarify your ruling?

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am simply asking you to stay within the long title of the bill. Please continue.

Mr BROWN: In regard to individuals who are making large political donations, let us look at last year's donations. Who was the single biggest individual donor in Australia and which party did the donation go to?

Ms Pease: Tell us, member for Capalaba!

Mr BROWN: It was Professor Chilla Bulbeck from Western Australia to the Greens. There was a \$600,000 donation to the Greens. Do members know what that buys her? That buys her the top job in the WA Greens. It buys her individual power to control the WA Greens as the co-convenor of the Greens. She controls the Greens. She has bought the Greens out through a donation last year of \$600,000. This bill does not go to the small person, it goes to the likes of Clive Palmer and Professor Chilla Bulbeck. They want to concentrate individual wealth and hijack our political system.

If you are going to introduce a bill such as this to the parliament you had better come with clean hands. I met quite a nice young woman and candidate for the Greens in Bowman, Emerald Moon. Emerald Moon lives in inner-city Brisbane and used to work for the member for Maiwar. I table her email block for the benefit of the House.

Tabled paper: Copy of signature block, undated, of Assistant Electorate Officer, Maiwar electorate, Ms Emerald Moon [760].

That document states that she works from Monday to Thursday. I met Emerald Moon at a Redlands Chamber of Commerce event held at 9 am on 31 January 2019. Emerald Moon introduced herself as the Greens candidate. She was accompanied by the Greens manager of the Bowman campaign, Kathy Mazlin. That was a Thursday morning. I would like the member for Maiwar to clarify for the benefit of the House and reply to this—


Mr BERKMAN: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. How is this in any way relevant to the bill before the House?

Mr BROWN: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. This goes towards using corporate donations for campaigning or taxpayers' money for campaigning. That is the point that I will make in this contribution.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Capalaba, it sounds like you are intending to bring your argument back to the long title of the bill, so I will ask you to continue.

Mr BROWN: For the benefit of the House, I would like the member for Maiwar to tell the House whether, at 9 am on 31 January, his assistant electoral officer and Greens candidate for Bowman was campaigning using taxpayers' money and with the benefit of the office of the member for Maiwar. It is important to note that when you come to this debate you must have clean hands, because you cannot tell all of us that we should ban corporate donations while, at the same time, you are using the privilege of your office and taxpayers' funds to send your assistant EO to campaign in a seat far from the electorate of Maiwar. I ask the member for Maiwar to clear this up. I ask the member for Maiwar whether his assistant EO was paid on 31 January. As I have said, this bill concentrates wealth into the hands of wealthy individuals. We should reject it wholly and solely.

Tabled paper: Extract from Facebook, dated 31 January, depicting Greens candidate for Bowman and others [761].

 **Mr PURDIE** (Ninderry—LNP) (6.42 pm): I rise to make a short contribution on the Electoral Legislation (Political Donations) Amendment Bill 2018. The LNP opposes the bill. As a member of the committee that deliberated on this bill, I acknowledge all committee members, particularly the committee chair, the honourable member for Logan; the deputy chair, the honourable member for Mermaid Beach; the very honourable member for Bonney; the honourable member for Redlands; and I believe the honourable member for Pine Rivers was with us at the time and helped deliberate on this bill. I acknowledge the secretariat and Hansard for their help.

Obviously the Economics and Governance Committee recommended that the bill not be passed. The committee concluded that the bill proposes to restrict the implied freedom of political communication without sufficient justification for the restriction to be considered appropriate. The policy objective of the bill purports to be to eliminate the widely perceived risk of corruption within Queensland as a consequence of corporate donations to politicians, candidates and political parties; to help restore Queenslanders' confidence in their political system; and to build upon the 'restrained reforms' of the government's Local Electoral (Implementing Stage 1 of Belcarra) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. The policy objectives of the bill are achieved by amending the Electoral Act 1992 and Local Government Electoral Act 2011 to prohibit the making of political donations by for-profit corporations to candidates in state or local government elections, groups of candidates in local government elections, third party political parties, councillors and members of state parliament; and making it unlawful for a prohibited corporate donor to solicit a person to make a political donation and for a person to solicit, on behalf of a corporate donor, another person to make a political donation.

The Greens believe that the proposed amendments will eliminate the risk of corruption within Queensland's political donation system. However, that is just a perception, as these amendments do the opposite. They encourage corruption by treating the political donations from different sources unequally. That is unfair. Fairness should be one of the core values of any government.

The amendments restrict corporate donations only to political parties. This includes companies registered under the Corporations Act 2001 or an industry representative organisation in which a majority of members represented by industry organisations are corporate companies. However, unions will be able to continue to donate large amounts of money. How is this fair?

I know that this bill fails to provide any reliable evidence to support the reason for banning donations by for-profit corporations. Under this bill, corporations are prohibited from making donations to state political parties, but unions are still allowed to make unlimited donations. A bill that bans political donations from corporations but continues to allow donations from unions demonstrates how one-sided and self-interested the Greens really are, particularly when the Australian Labor Party, including the Queensland branch, is the main beneficiary of large amounts of donations from unions.

In his explanatory notes, the member for Maiwar asserts that there is a risk of corruption when a donation is received by a political party as the donor would expect that the recipient, in this case a political party, would in return make a favourable decision to benefit the donor. I note that the member for Maiwar did not talk about the founder of Wotif, who donated over \$2 million to the Greens party over the past few years. I acknowledge the member for Toowoomba South who elaborated on how, when receiving that donation, the Greens leader at the time said that he would be forever grateful.

Why would a union, a not-for-profit or a charity be any different? Is it the member for Maiwar's view that unions have no vested interest in their cause and that unions would not expect more favourable decisions to help their members? More importantly, would not union officials approving donations expect some direct benefits for transferring money from their union to a political party? It is laughable to suggest that a union that has a specific objective in mind would make a political donation for no reason and with no expectation of receiving something in return. Surely they would have better ways to use the hundreds of thousands of dollars they donate to Labor if they do not expect any benefit? Couldn't that money go to providing improved services for its members?


Unions have a stated interest to protect workers' rights. That is a genuine and respectable interest, but all too often union officials have a non-stated vested interest in filling their pockets through systemic corruption, such as we have seen with the CFMMEU, which is facilitated at various levels, including at the state and federal levels. It is clear that the Greens and Labor have an agenda to enhance and strengthen their own political donations and will do anything in their power to achieve that goal. Otherwise, this bill would have been applied equally to all entities outside of individual donors or there would be no restrictions on any particular entity, such as we see in South Australia, Western Australia, Tasmania, the ACT, the Northern Territory and at the federal level.

The bill completely disregards the implied right to freedom of political communication derived from the Constitution and High Court precedents. The High Court decision of *Lange v Australian Broadcasting Corporation* 1997, also known as the Lange test, and other New South Wales precedents are being infringed. Those precedents have the support of the Crime and Corruption Commission. I encourage the member for Maiwar to persuade the House how his justification trumps that of the High Court. This bill is not based on any evidence and ignores input from the Crime and Corruption Commission.

The Crime and Corruption Commissioner, Mr Alan MacSporran, stated in his submission to our committee—

The CCC acknowledges that one of the matters the Committee's current inquiry may consider is whether there is sufficient evidence to conclude that the Bill's provisions prohibiting political donations by for-profit corporations in State or Local Government elections is a proportionate response to any demonstrated threat of actual or perceived corruption in those areas of government. However, at the time of preparing this submission, the CCC is not aware of, and does not consider it holds, sufficient evidence in this regard.

There is no reason to pass this bill. It may create new opportunities for real or perceived corruption in Queensland—corruption opportunities that we do not need and do not want. We should be a fair state now and in the future.

 **Mr POWER** (Logan—ALP) (6.49 pm): I rise as the chair of the Economics and Governance Committee to let the House know that the committee, upon examining the bill, determined unanimously that the bill not be passed. I was deeply disappointed and a little hurt that the member for Maiwar said in his tweet—in his gratuitous attack—that it was a Labor dominated committee that rejected the bill when it was six members of this House who dutifully examined this bill and rejected it. It was not, as this tweet says, that we 'failed to name a single good reason why the bill should not be passed'. We gave a good reason. It was because of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia. We gave that as a good reason that this bill should not be passed.

He said 'we simply claimed corporate cash isn't a problem'. That is not true. We actually quoted in depth no less than the member for Maiwar's views on this. We did not pass over that. We gave the bill good consideration and put forward good reasons for not passing the bill.

I heard the member for Sandgate suggest in his contribution to the debate that this was grandstanding. I rejected that suggestion. I thought that the member for Maiwar would not grandstand in this place. However, when I heard his speech and saw this tweet which totally ignores our report and the evidence we put forward as well as the legitimate concerns that Queenslanders have about the influence of money in our elections, I believe he is totally misleading this House and all Queenslanders, especially those who are considering voting Greens, about his intentions with this bill. We unanimously rejected the bill. We did that not because we wish to ignore the effects of large donations on Queensland and Australian politics but because we recognise the clear limitations of action on limiting freedom of speech and donations that the High Court has repeatedly made clear.

To do anything other than what we suggested is to do one of two things. One is to dismiss the High Court and make laws that are simply against our Constitution and will be struck down. The other is that this is a cynical piece of politics—a bill written not to improve Queensland by passing it but a bill written to fail to pass this House but then be misrepresented to supporters. This tweet was evidence of that even before it came before the House. This is chaotic, misleading or cynical, but either way it cannot be said that this bill will benefit Queenslanders.

Greens supporters throughout the state or those who were thinking of voting for the Greens must be deeply disappointed that a party that they thought better of, a party that they once trusted with their vote, is on this, a very important issue, playing a cynical and misleading game. I say to voters across the spectrum—Liberal, Labor and Greens—that the Palaszczuk government has perhaps more than any other government in Queensland's history reduced the effect of donations on Queensland politics.

The Palaszczuk government has restored the disclose threshold of \$1,000 that the member for Bonney so rightly claimed as an important part of the transparency of our system. That was increased by the Newman government to \$12,800. We require six-monthly reporting by political parties and associated entities. We have restored the special reporting of gifts of \$100,000 or more. The Attorney-General highlighted the gift from the federal Greens which obscured the nature of that \$100,000. We have restored the threshold for anonymous gifts to political parties to \$1,000. We have introduced real-time disclosure of political donations. We have banned political donations from property developers at both a state and local level. That is despite the best efforts of the LNP to use the federal parliament to create loopholes and to take the legislation to the High Court where we know it will fail.

These provisions are to increase the transparency and reduce the problematic effect of big donors. This is real action on donations and money from the top end of town that attempts to buy our politics. This is action that the average voter who might be tempted to vote for the Greens is looking for.

We could at first reading take the member for Maiwar's explanatory notes at face value—that is, an attempt to stop corporate entities donating. However, members should be aware of the decisions of the High Court that have consistently made it clear that restricting donations and free speech through donations should be limited to specific classes of donor where there is direct evidence of problems. A complete ban on all corporate entities would face a dim prospect of success given the consistent rulings of the High Court on this issue. I will expand more on that. We see corporate entities giving to such causes as flood relief, scholarships, helping farmers and the Great Barrier Reef. Any court would find it difficult to see all these actions as directly benefitting the bottom line of corporations.

In a previous hearing of the Economics and Governance Committee on electoral laws, Mr MacSporran of the CCC put forward the view around the suggestion of a ban on political donations that while he and others might seek a wider ban, such as the one suggested by the member for Maiwar, he would not put forward legislation that had 'no realistic prospect of a successful challenge to the legislation'. The CCC's recommendation to the House is that the last thing we want is to recommend something that would be knocked over by the High Court. Mr MacSporran said—

That is just a waste of everyone's time. You could not ignore High Court cases. You need to account for that.

It is quite clear that a blanket ban on all corporations, ignoring all their history of philanthropy and giving and indeed political donations to support a particular philosophy rather than direct company profit, would be doomed to fail in the High Court. We would be passing a bill that would simply waste everyone's time.

It is important to note that in 1997 the High Court of Australia established the test for freedom of speech applying to donations—the Lange test. The test was whether the law burdens political communication and whether the law is appropriate and consistent to the system of government established by the Australian Constitution. It went further when this was tested directly with regard to the ban that the LNP strangely seems to want to put forward in *Unions NSW v New South Wales* and *McCloy v New South Wales*—the developer versus New South Wales. It was further expanded to third parties in *Unions NSW v New South Wales No. 2* and the Spence case.

Further to the Lange test they said that where there is a denial of a prospective burden on political free communication there needs to be an exclusively and well thought out reasoning. I put it that this bill does not meet this test. Whatever feelings we have about wanting to restrict donations, we need to do it in a way that is constitutional, will not fall over and will not be a waste of time.

We saw the LNP take to the High Court a much more limited electoral donation ban on property developers and challenge their validity. They failed and the government's carefully crafted laws were upheld. However, this is not to say that relevant issues may not come out in the reasons of the High Court. We await those reasons. No member of this House could in good faith vote for this bill with much confidence that the bill would be constitutional.

I note that the member for Sandgate suggested that if the state were to be burdened with hundreds of thousands of dollars of costs with regard to a High Court challenge that we could allay that waste of Queensland taxpayers' money if the Greens and possibly their millionaire donors put forward all the money to take this to the High Court. I wait to see if that offer comes.

For those who want greater restrictions on donations, we should note that this legislation does not stop big, single donors like Mr Palmer or third-party campaigns or, indeed, millionaires who donate to their party of choice—in some cases the Greens. I am disappointed that this was not a legitimate attempt to reform our electoral donation laws. Reforming donation laws carefully within the framework of the High Court is what the Palaszczuk government, through the work of the Attorney-General, is doing and will continue to do, especially after the affirmation of this approach by the recent High Court decision.

Debate, on motion of Mr Power, adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

Coomera Electorate, Palaszczuk Labor Government



Mr CRANDON (Coomera—LNP) (7.00 pm): Last sitting week I began to list the fails by this Labor government specifically relating to the Coomera electorate. I did not go anywhere near finishing the list as there is so much to outline in so little time. The list keeps growing too. Labor sold our assets. I table this list as absolute proof of that.

Tabled paper: Brochure, undated, titled 'The truth about who sold Queensland's assets' [\[762\]](#).

We see Labor allowing a drug kingpin to have a lavish wedding in prison. We see their failure in rushing to legislate to move 17-year-olds into juvenile detention. It was rushed and botched and there was nowhere to put them. As a result, we now see our kids, some as young as 10, in danger within our prison system—yes, our prison system. It is not juvenile detention when the people overseeing their incarceration are not fully trained specifically for the task of looking after kids. The damage—both physical, as we have heard, and psychological—is horrendous. The research confirms that most of these kids are going to be broken and damaged for years to come, if not for the rest of their lives. Labor are setting these kids up for failure by subjecting them to this inhumane treatment—and they are years away from a solution.

I mentioned the rail fail last week. There are still 440 services down. I mentioned two hospital failures last week as well, with the minister taking three months to respond to an urgent case. Sadly, that lady has now passed. We see uni students copping \$261 fines for parking at overfull park-and-rides. From my own inspections, I see upwards of 100 cars parked informally at Coomera and Ormeau park-and-rides. We see the suburban bus route fail, with many unable to catch a bus to the stations. They do not run long enough on each route and there are not enough routes on the northern Gold Coast.


That brings us to the third fail in this trilogy: first, the park-and-ride fail; second, the bus service fail; and, third, the exits 41, 45 and 49 fail. All we hear is, 'We're planning.' They have been planning for more than four years. The message from the people of the northern Gold Coast is: stop planning

and start building. That is for the exits and the park-and-rides. The member for Forde, Bert van Manen, has committed \$50 million for exits 41 and 49 from federal government coffers. Where is this minister's contribution? We have not seen one dollar. The federal member has also committed \$15 million for Coomera station—and not one dollar from this minister.

Where do I start with the police? Before the 2017 election, this Premier promised 44 additional police for the Gold Coast. How is that going? Well, we went backwards last time I checked, and I do not know where we are now. We certainly have not got the 44 that were promised. Coomera Police Station is under huge pressure, with police doing an amazing job with severely limited resources. The union will tell you that it is a workplace health and safety issue, and that is what I am hearing on the ground. I hear that the RAP squad is being recalled from Coomera, and there are so many officers on recreation leave, sick leave and long service leave. I heard it said the other day—yes, by a police officer—that they have been told that the population is up by more than 30 per cent, calls for service are up by more than 30 per cent and police numbers are up by zero per cent.

(Time expired)

Redlands Electorate, Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month

 **Ms RICHARDS** (Redlands—ALP) (7.03 pm): May in Queensland marks Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month to raise awareness of domestic and family violence prevention and to send a clear message that violence of this sort will not be tolerated. Last sitting week I had the privilege of joining our amazing Minister Farmer, the Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, at a function with the corporate community to discuss the multipronged strategies required and the diverse stakeholders and efforts required to strive to change the ending for our families who experience domestic and family violence.

In the Redlands we are so incredibly lucky to have such amazing organisations working so hard in the prevention space, and tonight some of them are here, joining with me to attend the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month parliamentary reception. I would like to thank just some of those Redlanders. We have Stacey Ross and her team from the Centre for Women and Co. here. They provide fantastic wraparound services and supports for women in our community. We have Katrina Beutel, who has been at the forefront of working with women in my Redlands community. She was the founder for the Centre for Women and Co. and has done a fantastic job. She is now working closely with Stacey Ross.

Betty Taylor is also amazing. Her dedication to the prevention of domestic and family violence and her work around strangulation and the prevention of that for women has been incredible. I strongly urge members to go to the Red Rose Foundation website and check out their work. They have a fantastic production called *Deadly Romance* that articulates the journey of Jacque Lachmund and her experience. I highly recommend it to everyone in the chamber.


Ange Hill and Judith Trevan Hawke of Zonta and all Zontians in my area do amazing work every day on the ground supporting women in my community. Rosemary Skelly and Valda Carrington from Maybanke are also here tonight. They run an amazing crisis shelter accommodation for women in my community. It was fantastic to be able to announce two months ago, with Minister de Brenni and Minister Farmer, the expansion of accommodation out there. Over \$1 million is being invested in my community for that, along with the necessary wraparound child support workers.

In the last parliamentary sitting week we had the Queensland Cancer Council's 'Australia's Biggest Morning Tea' launch. We had two morning teas in my community. The team at Tranquil Waters and Yvonne Murray are fantastic—the scones with jam and cream and the funds raised were incredible. Renaissance Retirement Living and the team there, together with our Redlands branch of the Cancer Council, raised over \$7,000 at their morning tea—a sterling effort. This is the second year running that our Redlands branch has been the leading fundraiser in Queensland. Tish Henderson and Pam Tranter do an absolutely fantastic job in making sure that we strongly support our community.

Also, it was Meals on Wheels' 45th birthday last week—45 years of supporting our seniors' community with meals.

(Time expired)

Warrego Electorate, Roads

 **Ms LEAHY** (Warrego—LNP) (7.06 pm): I rise to speak on an issue that is of great importance to my electorate, and that is roads. It concerns me greatly that the Auditor-General's report No. 4 for 2017-18 titled *Integrated transport planning* concluded that the existing state controlled road network

has been, and continues to be, underfunded. The Department of Transport and Main Roads forecasts that the renewal backlog will exceed \$9 billion over the next decade, thereby putting the sustainability of the transport network at risk. That is about three dual carriageway roads from Brisbane to Perth that are not being built in this state.

Despite this massive underfund by Labor, I will not stop fighting for communities in the electorate of Warrego for more road funding. People want to see road pavements widened—like the Mitchell to St George, the Meandarra to Westmar, the Jackson to Wandoan and the Wyandra to Charleville roads. I will keep fighting for our fair share of funding to upgrade these roads, especially those upgrades that will stimulate the economy such as upgrades to enable B-double access to roads like the Mitchell to St George road.


I will also keep fighting for speed limits to be reviewed on state controlled roads. This lazy Labor government has not returned the 110-kilometre per hour speed limit to the Warrego Highway on the Chinchilla to Dalby section or on the Surat to St George road, which were previously 110 kilometres per hour prior to the upgrades. Those roads are now safer—some with passing lanes. However, they are still 100 kilometres per hour. They should be returned to 110 kilometres per hour. Maybe the government are revenue raising on those roads.

Conversely, there needs to be the opportunity for some communities to lower their speed limits—for instance, at Yuleba, where we had a tragic fatality. I will keep fighting for funding for safety upgrades at intersections like the Jackson Wandoan Road on the Warrego Highway, the Landsborough Highway and the Main Street intersection at Augathella. I want to commend the Augathella Progress Association for the work that they have done in highlighting the need for that intersection upgrade.

There needs to be an emphasis on returning freight services to rail. There is a perfectly good railway line beside the Warrego Highway all the way from Quilpie to Brisbane. However, it carries no freight. I will keep fighting to get freight off the roads and onto rail, particularly where heavy freight should be targeted to go by rail.

My electorate has one of those very long-running insurance claims for the Angellala bridges. In 2014, the rail and road bridges were destroyed by an ammonium nitrate explosion. Now, five years later, we still have not heard the outcome of this insurance claim. Any funding that is received from this claim should be returned to the south-west people for the region's infrastructure and for the people of the south-west to determine how it will be allocated across their region.

Maryborough Electorate, Labour Day

 **Mr SAUNDERS** (Maryborough—ALP) (7.09 pm): I rise to talk about Labour Day in Maryborough. Labour Day in Maryborough has been revived. On 5 May, we held one of the biggest Labour Days in modern history in Maryborough. I would like to thank the people involved in Labour Day because Maryborough has a very proud history surrounding Labour Day. We have people like Billy Demaine and Brendan Hansen, who was not only a council representative but a state representative and a federal member for Wide Bay. There is a wealth of history in the Wide Bay area, particularly in Maryborough.

On the Sunday, we had a fantastic march with over 700 people marching the streets of Maryborough for Labour Day. When we restarted Labour Day four years ago, we had six people turn up, and we have built it now in a bit over four years to 700 people.

Mr Butcher: They're Bruce Saunders supporters.

Mr SAUNDERS: They are. I take that interjection from the member for Gladstone because they are very good supporters of mine. They are very good community people too. They are community minded people. They are the people who have helped bring the services back to Maryborough city.


I would like to thank the following people: Alison Finley-Bissett from the Together union; Pete Killeen from the AMWU—we call Pete the unofficial mayor of Maryborough because he has done so much work at Downer; Stephen McGinley from the Together union; Glenn Riley from the CFMMEU; and Jim Nilon from the Together union. There are so many people who got behind Labour Day and built it up. It was very poignant, because Pete said to me on Labour Day that this was the workers' Christmas. I am so proud to be the local member and to help revive Labour Day in Maryborough for our history.

One of the highlights of Labour Day was the standing ovation received by Maryborough's first lady, Mrs Moira Hansen, as she entered the Memorial Bowls Club, which is the home of the labour movement in Maryborough. I have had a lot to do with the Hansen family over the years. It was a fine

tribute when every man, woman and child in that bowls club gave Mrs Hansen a standing ovation. It brought tears to Mrs Hansen's eyes because this is a lady who has been a very strong part of the labour movement in Maryborough city through her family and also through connections with her late husband, Brendan. It was a fine tribute to a marvellous lady in our community.

It was fantastic to see the people lining the streets cheering on the community members for Labour Day. There are so many people who are making sure that Labour Day does not die in Maryborough. If Jason Scanes wins the election on Saturday, Labour Day will be very strong for many years to come because it is 45 years since we have had a Labor member for Wide Bay. We need to change the government because we need a Labor member in Wide Bay.

Scott, Mrs A; Heit, Miss L

 **Mr BOYCE** (Callide—LNP) (7.12 pm): I rise to recognise two Callide constituents, especially during this week where we have noted and celebrated the election of the first woman to the Queensland parliament, Irene Longman, some 90 years ago. I recently visited Mrs Annie Scott who celebrated her 105th birthday. Mrs Scott has lived all of her 105 years in the Taroom district, where I also live. Mrs Scott, with her husband Bob, ran beef cattle on their property Glenleigh. They were a racing family, owning racehorses—Bob being a jockey in his younger days. Mrs Scott never missed a race meeting in Taroom. I visited Mrs Scott on her birthday and she is still quite vocal on many subjects and sharp as a tack.

As a new bride, she always welcomed as family the young working men of the station into their home and she still recalls many stories of those days. Mrs Scott began work as a housemaid at the age of 14 at Glenhaughton Station where she met her husband Bob. As a young girl, she remembers it took two days to get to town to get supplies and three days to get home. Mrs Scott has seen the days of the horse and buggy, the days of doing the washing with a scrubbing board and a copper boiler and the days of scrubbing the timber floors of her home. She has seen World War II and man walking on the moon, right to the present ever-changing world.


At the age of 101 years, Mrs Scott survived a house fire, losing a lifetime of possessions and treasured memories. She walked barefoot to the neighbours to raise the alarm to be left with nothing but the clothes she stood in. Mrs Scott epitomises the strength and character of women of her generation and is loved and respected by all who meet her.

I move from the eldest woman in Callide to one of our younger women, Miss Laura Heit, a progressive young lady from Biloela who is reaching for the stars. Laura completed all of her schooling in Biloela—primary school at Redeemer Lutheran College and high school at Biloela State High School where she achieved an OP 1 and was named dux of the school. She is in her fourth year at UQ studying law and majoring in political science.

Laura recently represented Australia in Washington DC at the international finals of the Philip C Jessup moot competition. In Laura's own words, it was 'an experience I will never forget', mooted with students from over 100 nations from around the world. Not only was Laura's UQ team awarded Best Overall Respondent Side at the international finals and placed 11th overall, she was individually recognised as the sixth best speaker in the preliminary rounds out of the 700 students—an amazing achievement. I look forward with interest to watching her career unfold with these skills. I have great respect and admiration for women who pave the way for others to follow, those who have arrived at their positions by their own strengths and merits, not by quotas.

(Time expired)

Bancroft Electorate, Federal Election


 **Mr WHITING** (Bancroft—ALP) (7.15 pm): In this election we have heard a lot locally about a congestion busting investment. It is really important for the local residents in our area because residents in Petrie can spend many hours in their cars going backwards and forwards from work. I have compared the two sides in the election and what I have found is that Labor are well out in front with their proposal. They are offering \$1.5 billion for a Gateway Motorway upgrade, the next stage of the Bruce Highway upgrade from Pine Rivers to Caboolture, including an upgrade at the Dohles Rocks intersection, and a new bridge over the Pine River with four feeder roads to get traffic off the highway. The LNP have offered the Gateway upgrade from four to six lanes from Bracken Ridge. I note there will be no construction for about three years, and I cannot see any construction for about three years on the Bruce Highway part as well.

The Labor proposal is a real game changer for commuters in our area because it contains a bridge over the Pine River. This is very much needed. The state has been proposing it for many years. It would take traffic from Deception Bay and North Lakes around the back of Mango Hill and North Lakes and over the river on to the Gateway Motorway. I have been chasing it for years and I thank the Minister for Main Roads for assisting me with this. Early design work has started on the route, but we really do need federal funding because it is such a large project. In the last state election, the LNP candidates talked it up. They said that we need those roads and bridges over the river, but we have heard nothing more. What we have seen from federal LNP is nothing offered on this as well.

Another reason why the Labor package is superior is because it includes Cross River Rail. Some LNP members opposite have derided it as a Brisbane-centric project, but in my area and the outer areas it represents a big change for commuters. It would fix a bottleneck in the system. It would open up extra capacity on our local rail. It would mean 5,400 extra peak hour commuter seats for our residents. I calculate that it would save about 1½ hours each week for a commuter travelling Monday to Friday to Brisbane and back. That is 1½ extra hours with their family they could get through Cross River Rail.

In conclusion, I have looked at both sides and it is very clear that the package outlined by Labor for congestion busting in our area is a real game-changer for all those residents in the Deception Bay, North Lakes and Burpengary East areas. I recommend the residents in my area take a close look at this before they vote on Saturday.

Rural and Regional Queensland, Housing Market


 **Mr DAMETTO** (Hinchinbrook—KAP) (7.18 pm): When I walk the streets of Ingham, Cardwell and Tully, I find that the grave concern is our shrinking population. Locals understand why our little local economies are suffering. They all agree that we need to breathe new life into our small towns. To gauge how well a town is going, I like to talk to local real estate agents to understand how the market is faring. I have spoken to people like Felix Reitano, Jonathan Fenn, Mark Spina and Lawrence Molachino. For me, this is like holding a finger on the pulse of a small town to see how it is faring. Unfortunately, the report is not that good for some parts of Hinchinbrook.

Rural and regional Queensland housing markets have slumped and recent times have shown that Hinchinbrook property owners are screaming out for help. To save our small towns we need initiatives to boost our population and our economy. In the town of Ingham alone we have lost a fifth of our population in the last 10 years.

As we approach the 2019 budget I am reigniting my call for the state government to expand its First Home Owner's Grant to existing homes in rural and regional Queensland. I have recently written to the state Assistant Minister for Treasury to ask him to consider the proposal while deliberating this year's budget. In a response to our office they all but ruled out expanding the grant to existing homes in this year's budget. This response cited concerns about the impact that such schemes would have on housing affordability and availability as well as the building industry and its ability to compete in these areas. That is my point: we already have a substantial oversupply of run-down homes in rural and regional Queensland which are affordable for first home buyers with the help of such grants. We just need small incentives to help people step into the property market. Reintroducing the First Home Owner's Grant could reduce the negative market saturation and help people in rural Queensland own their own property sooner. At the same time it could stimulate the local economy by ensuring that that \$15,000 grant goes into incentivising young people to stay in our small towns and even attract young families to move to the regions.

I believe this is a commonsense solution to a prevalent problem and I cannot see why the government would be against it. Outside the major cities we would be hard-pressed to find a rural community in Queensland that would not benefit drastically from this. The government needs to understand that rural and regional Queensland is different to metro centres. Economics are flat and limited and no housing development is occurring. This incentive has the potential to turn things around.

Boyne Tannum Hookup

 **Mr BUTCHER** (Gladstone—ALP) (7.21 pm): I rise this evening to speak about a wonderful event held recently in my electorate, the Boyne Tannum Hookup. Held over the three days of the Labour Day long weekend, the event is now Australia's largest family fishing competition and simply goes from strength to strength every year. This year there were 3,074 entries, up from last year, with 31 per cent of those entries coming from outside of the Gladstone region, which is absolutely fantastic. We had

contestants from interstate. We also had two international visitors to the hookup this year. From impressive fishing weigh-ins, fun family entertainment to sampling delicious local produce, there was something for everyone over that long weekend not to mention over \$360,000 in prizes up for grabs.


I would like to take this opportunity to thank a lady by the name of Krystal Daly as well as Damian King and Jeff Taylor for taking me out on Jeff Taylor's boat at the last minute to help us get out there and catch some of those big fish. Unfortunately, we did not catch any prize-winning fish, but I am confident that the fish that I fed during those three days certainly will be better off for the experience.

This event is very important to Queensland's southern Great Barrier Reef region, with Gladstone and the beautiful Boyne Island-Tannum Sands fitting in that area. It gives families and community members of the region a chance to get out in our beautiful natural environment and it attracts thousands of visitors to the region over that long weekend whilst supporting local businesses. I must say that a lot of sporting groups and social groups in the community benefited from cooking the barbecues and running the bar.

According to Tourism and Events Queensland, people coming into the region over the weekend spend about \$174 per person per day, so it is certainly a big benefit to the region. The Hookup is now an event not to be missed. I would like to see many of my comrades in the chamber come along and join it next year. I say congratulations to everyone involved in bringing it together—Jen Maguire and the team from the Hookup. This is a successful event that has now been run for 24 years, and next year it will celebrate 25 years.

On the final night I had the opportunity to go on stage and announce that our government will be looking to move the start of the commercial barramundi season next year by a couple of weeks, which will certainly help those visitors coming to the region crack that elusive big barramundi that we see in the Boyne River estuary system in the Gladstone region. It is certainly a significant process and one that will require consultation with commercial and local fishermen. We need to make sure that we consult with those local fishermen who could be affected as well as other community groups including the Boyne Tannum Hookup. I am confident that we can win in a way that benefits our community and this great event, the Boyne Tannum Hookup.

Anzac Day; Nominate your Favourite Tradie Competition; North Kirra Surf Life Saving Club

 **Mrs STUCKEY** (Currumbin—LNP) (7.24 pm): The Anzac Day Dawn Service held at Elephant Rock on Currumbin Beach attracted over 20,000 people this year and was once again one to remember. Currumbin RSL President and decorated Vietnam War veteran, Ron Workman OAM, stepped down for medical reasons after 25 years in the role. Ron built this dawn ceremony into the revered and 'must attend' event it has become. Despite illness, he played a small yet significant role at this year's event. I would like to place on record, both personally and on behalf of the people of the Currumbin electorate and beyond, our deep gratitude and appreciation for the unconditional service he and his lovely wife, Marj, gave for so many years.


I was delighted to welcome the leader of the LNP opposition, Deb Frecklington, and her husband, Jason, who both agreed it was one of those experiences you must have on your bucket list. The service was conducted by new RSL President, Michael Humphreys. As has become the tradition during the ceremony, the ashes of service men and women were scattered in the ocean. This year 33 diggers, mainly World War II veterans, were laid to rest at sea. Another tradition is the Anzac essay competition I hold, which is open to our primary school students. This year's winners were Thewbelle Philp and Mila Du Preez from Elanora State School. Both girls presented their speeches superbly. Mila delivered hers at the dawn ceremony and Thewbelle, at the mid-morning service at the Currumbin RSL.

Earlier this year I ran a 'Nominate your Favourite Tradie' competition so residents in the Currumbin electorate could say why they thought their tradie was the best. We all have a favourite tradie—the one who is always on time, never leaves a mess and goes that extra mile—and I thought we should recognise them. This was the inaugural year of the competition and 80 nominations were received, all vying for the prize of a \$500 Makita gift voucher, which I donated, to be redeemed at Keith Stephens' Best Buy Power Tools store on Currumbin Creek Road. Keith should have won an award, too, as the service he gives customers is amazing and his product knowledge is second to none. I have bought quite a few tools for my husband there that I had not intended to buy, which I freely admit have been very well used.

In April the winner was announced. Grant Knauer from GBK Waste Removal was the lucky one. He was nominated by Ruth Wilcox, who has been a client for over 15 years. Ruth was very creative in her nomination using Grant's name as an acronym for her winning entry. She said she could not imagine anyone else providing the same excellent standard of service.

Earlier this month, North Kirra Surf Life Saving Club celebrated its 70th anniversary at their clubhouse, which was bursting at the seams with over 160 guests turning up for the event. In those early days the club really struggled, but members joined from Brisbane and now North Kirra is a prosperous club with over 350 members. Due to a significant population increase from new nearby apartment buildings, the club does a roaring business in its restaurant. Congratulations are in order to President, Craig Lowms, and his team. It was a pleasure to join them on this fantastic night.

Bayside Community Collective, Domestic and Family Violence

 **Ms PEASE** (Lytton—ALP) (7.27 pm): In 2015 our community formed the Bayside Community Collaborative and we have worked with our community to raise awareness of domestic and family violence. We have developed a strategic plan and we work closely with our local sporting clubs, community groups and employers. We have hosted a number of successful breakfasts. I am so proud to be part of the Bayside Community Collective, and some of the members were with us here tonight at the reception. Our membership includes our local faith groups, Brisbane East Zonta, WINNAN, Safe by the Bay, SCOPE, Wynnum & Manly Rotary, NAPCAN, Koha Shed, Wynnum QPS, BABI and community businesses and members, our local schools and sporting clubs.

Under a lovely moon last Friday night over 60 baysiders came together to say 'not now, not ever' to domestic and family violence in our community. As the sun went down and the moon rose over the magnificent Pandanas Beach, we locals stood together with Karyn Walsh from Micah, who shared her vision, and my good friend Jill Nock told her confronting and difficult story. Her message was powerful and, sadly, is reflective of many other stories. I commend her for her bravery in sharing her story. Roz Kinder from Zonta was also there. She read the poem *I got Flowers Today*, by Paulette Kelly. It was a time to remember those lost to us, a time to stand with those left behind and a time to promote a clear message that violence of any kind is not tolerated.

The state government is investing over \$300 million over six years to drive some significant reforms as well as continuing to support services throughout the state. Domestic and family violence is not a problem that the government can solve alone. This is a problem that only a community can overcome together. When one in six women and one in 15 men experience violence by a partner, when we see another woman lose her life to a violent partner almost every week, this means that almost everyone knows someone who has gone through this. It does not discriminate. That is why only as a community can we make meaningful long-lasting change. This is why it was so heartening to see so many people at our vigil. It is events like these as well as discussions that we have with our family, neighbours and others that can change how we deal with family and domestic violence. For too long it has been hidden away behind closed doors. Our vigil was about showing baysiders' strength and standing up and saying that when it comes to domestic and family violence, we baysiders say, 'Not now, not ever.'

The House adjourned at 7.30 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Andrew, Bailey, Bates, Batt, Bennett, Berkman, Bleijie, Bolton, Boothman, Boyce, Brown, Butcher, Costigan, Crandon, Crawford, Crisafulli, D'Ath, Dametto, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Frecklington, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hart, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Hunt, Janetzki, Jones, Katter, Kelly, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Lauga, Leahy, Linard, Lister, Lui, Lynham, Madden, Mander, 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