



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 July 2020

Subject	Page
ASSENT TO BILLS	1493
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 22 June 2020, from His Excellency the Governor, to the Speaker advising of assent to certain bills on 22 June 2020.	1493
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 30 June 2020, from His Excellency the Governor, to the Speaker advising of assent to a certain bill on 30 June 2020.	1494
REPORT	1494
Information Commissioner	1494
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Information Commissioner Report 1: 2020-21—Privacy and Public Data: Managing re-identification risk.	1494
PETITIONS	1494
TABLED PAPERS	1494
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	1500
Coronavirus, Update	1500
School Infrastructure	1501
Brisbane Airport, Runway	1502
Coronavirus, Health Update	1502
Coronavirus, Economic Response	1503
Coronavirus, Economic Recovery	1504
School Infrastructure	1504
Small Business.....	1505
Road and Transport Infrastructure	1505
COVID Works for Queensland Program.....	1506
Electricity Prices	1506
Gladstone Manufacturing Hub	1507
Police Service, Infrastructure.....	1508

TRANSPORT AND OTHER LEGISLATION (ROAD SAFETY, TECHNOLOGY AND OTHER MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL; TRANSPORT LEGISLATION (DISABILITY PARKING AND OTHER MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL	1508
Cognate Debate; Suspension of Standing and Sessional Orders	1508
NOTICE OF MOTION	1509
Disallowance of Statutory Instrument	1509
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	1509
New Acland Coalmine	1509
Virgin Australia Airlines	1509
School Infrastructure	1510
Taxes	1510
Coronavirus, Medical Research	1511
Unemployment	1512
Coronavirus, Health Response	1513
Small Business, Grants	1513
Coronavirus, Economic Response	1514
Queensland Rail, Staffing	1515
Queen's Wharf	1515
Youth Crime	1516
Cooler Cleaner Schools Program	1516
Members of Parliament, Remuneration	1517
Gold Coast, Road and Transport Infrastructure	1517
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Flyer, undated, by the member for Mudgeeraba, Ms Ros Bates MP, titled 'People Power delivers \$3 million upgrade to Worongary Road'	1517
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 4 June 2020, from the member for Mudgeeraba, Ms Ros Bates MP, to the Regional Director, South Coast, Department of Transport and Main Roads, Mr Paul Noonan, regarding the Mudgeeraba-Advancetown Road (Worongary Road) upgrade	1518
Crime and Corruption Commission, Report	1518
Law and Order	1518
Crime and Corruption Commission, Report	1519
Small Business	1519
Coronavirus, Hotel Quarantine	1520
Agriculture and Fisheries Industries, Exports	1520
Palaszczuk Labor Government, Integrity	1521
MOTION	1522
Business Program	1522
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to	1526
Resolved in the affirmative	1526
QUEENSLAND FUTURE FUND BILL	1526
Message from Governor	1526
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Message, dated 14 July 2020, from His Excellency the Governor, recommending the Queensland Future Fund Bill 2020	1527
Introduction	1527
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Queensland Future Fund Bill 2020	1527
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Queensland Future Fund Bill 2020, explanatory notes	1527
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Queensland Future Fund Bill 2020, statement of compatibility with human rights	1527
First Reading	1528
Declared Urgent; Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date	1528
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to	1528
Resolved in the affirmative	1528
Referral to Economics and Governance Committee	1528
NATURE CONSERVATION AND OTHER LEGISLATION (INDIGENOUS JOINT MANAGEMENT—MORETON ISLAND) AMENDMENT BILL	1529
Introduction	1529
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Nature Conservation and Other Legislation (Indigenous Joint Management—Moreton Island) Amendment Bill 2020	1529
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Nature Conservation and Other Legislation (Indigenous Joint Management—Moreton Island) Amendment Bill 2020, explanatory notes	1529
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Nature Conservation and Other Legislation (Indigenous Joint Management—Moreton Island) Amendment Bill 2020, statement of compatibility with human rights	1529
First Reading	1531
Referral to Natural Resources, Agricultural Industry Development and Environment Committee	1531
TRANSPORT AND OTHER LEGISLATION (ROAD SAFETY, TECHNOLOGY AND OTHER MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL; TRANSPORT LEGISLATION (DISABILITY PARKING AND OTHER MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL	1531
Second Reading (Cognate Debate)	1531
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Transport and Public Works Committee: Report No. 39, 56th Parliament—Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2020, government response	1531
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from <i>NewsMail</i> , dated 17 July 2018, titled 'Blind Justice: Bundy MP's petition for disability parking'	1540
MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST	1542
Liberal National Party, Commitments	1542
Liberal National Party, Performance	1544
Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance	1545
Coronavirus, Queensland Border Closure	1546

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 14 July 2020

Crime and Corruption Commission, Report	1546
Crime and Corruption Commission, Report; Coronavirus, Queensland Border Closure	1549
Cross River Rail	1550
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 14 July 2020, from the member for Chatsworth, Mr Steve Minnikin MP, to the Auditor-General, Mr Brendan Worrall, regarding Cross River Rail	1551
Liberal National Party, Public Transport	1551
Maiwar Electorate, Planning Laws	1552
Health Services	1553
CHILD PROTECTION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	1554
Introduction	1554
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Child Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020.....	1554
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Child Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020, explanatory notes.	1554
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Child Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020, statement of compatibility with human rights.	1554
First Reading	1556
Referral to Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee	1556
TRANSPORT AND OTHER LEGISLATION (ROAD SAFETY, TECHNOLOGY AND OTHER MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL; TRANSPORT LEGISLATION (DISABILITY PARKING AND OTHER MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL	1556
Second Reading (Cognate Debate)	1556
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Bundle of media articles relating to the issues experienced by families with children with disability and the Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2019.....	1560
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Bundle of letters in relation to disability parking permits for the legally blind.	1562
Consideration in Detail (Cognate Debate)	1571
Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill	1571
Clauses 1 to 37, as read, agreed to.	1571
Clause 38—.....	1572
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2020, amendments moved by Hon. Mark Bailey.	1572
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2020, explanatory notes to Hon. Mark Bailey's amendments	1572
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2020, statement of compatibility with human rights contained in Hon. Mark Bailey's amendments.....	1572
Amendments agreed to.	1572
Clauses 38 to 72, as amended, agreed to.	1572
Schedule 1, as read, agreed to.....	1572
Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill	1572
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2019, amendments moved by Hon. Mark Bailey.....	1572
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2019, explanatory notes to Hon. Mark Bailey's amendments.....	1572
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2019, statement of compatibility with human rights contained in Hon. Mark Bailey's amendments.	1572
Amendments agreed to.	1573
Clauses 1 to 17, as amended, agreed to.	1573
Third Reading (Cognate Debate)	1573
Long Title (Cognate Debate)	1573
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	1573
Error in Division	1573
BUILDING INDUSTRY FAIRNESS (SECURITY OF PAYMENT) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	1573
Second Reading	1573
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Transport and Public Works Committee: Report No. 36, 56th Parliament—Building Industry Fairness (Security of Payment) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020, government response.....	1578
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Bundle of documents relating to changes to legislation to ensure protection for subcontractors and suppliers.	1580
ANTI-DISCRIMINATION (RIGHT TO USE GENDER-SPECIFIC LANGUAGE) AMENDMENT BILL	1582
Second Reading	1582
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Extract from a social media page regarding gender-specific language.	1582
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, undated, titled 'Anti-Discrimination (Right to Use Gender-Specific Language) Amendment Bill 2018'.	1591
ADJOURNMENT	1596
Gold Coast Convention and Exhibition Centre, Expansion	1596
Bancroft Electorate, Unite and Recover Community Stimulus Program	1597
Pumicestone Electorate, Road Funding	1598
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Photograph depicting the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, Hon. Mark Bailey, the former member for Pumicestone, Mr Rick Williams, and others.....	1598
Care Bag Appeal; Child Protection	1598
Bundaberg Electorate, Hooning	1599
North West Freeway Proposal	1599
Members of Parliament, Representation	1600
Redlands Electorate	1600

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 14 July 2020

Theodore Electorate, Road Infrastructure	1601
Algester Electorate, Jobs and Infrastructure.....	1602
ATTENDANCE	1602

TUESDAY, 14 JULY 2020



The Legislative Assembly met at 9.30 am.

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

Mr SPEAKER: 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 oldest living cultures in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples whose lands, winds and waters we now all share.

ASSENT TO BILLS



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have to report that I have received from His Excellency the Governor letters in respect of assent to certain bills. The contents of the letters will be incorporated in the *Record of Proceedings*. I table the letters 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 Royal Assent, were assented to in the name of Her Majesty The Queen on the date shown:

Date of Assent: 22 June 2020

A Bill for an Act to amend the Associations Incorporation Act 1981, the Collections Act 1966, the Fair Trading Inspectors Act 2014, the State Penalties Enforcement Regulation 2014 and the Acts mentioned in schedule 1 for particular purposes

A Bill for an Act to apply a national law that regulates co-operatives, to amend this Act, the Associations Incorporation Act 1981 and the Acts mentioned in schedule 1 for particular purposes, and to repeal the Cooperatives Act 1997

A Bill for an Act to provide for an equitable and efficient system of portability of long service leave in the community services industry, and to amend this Act, the Bail Act 1980, the Building and Construction Industry (Portable Long Service Leave) Act 1991, the Contract Cleaning Industry (Portable Long Service Leave) Act 2005, the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020, the Holidays Act 1983, the Industrial Relations Act 2016, the Public Health Act 2005, the Public Health Regulation 2018, the Work Health and Safety Act 2011 and the Youth Justice Act 1992 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.

Governor

22 June 2020

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 22 June 2020, from His Excellency the Governor, to the Speaker advising of assent to certain bills on 22 June 2020 [[1122](#)].

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 Bill, having been passed by the Legislative Assembly and having been presented for Royal Assent, was assented to in the name of Her Majesty The Queen on the date shown:

Date of Assent: 30 June 2020

A Bill for an Act to amend the City of Brisbane Act 2010, the Electoral Act 1992, the Electoral and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2019, the Electoral Regulation 2013, the Integrity Act 2009, the Local Government Act 2009, the Local Government Electoral Act 2011, the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001 and the legislation mentioned in schedule 1 in relation to electoral funding and expenditure, and for other particular purposes

This Bill is hereby transmitted to the Legislative Assembly, to be numbered and forwarded to the proper Officer for enrolment, in the manner required by law.

Governor

30 June 2020

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 30 June 2020, from His Excellency the Governor, to the Speaker advising of assent to a certain bill on 30 June 2020 [\[1123\]](#).

REPORT

Information Commissioner



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have to report that I have received from the Information Commissioner a report titled *Privacy and public data: managing re-identification risk*. I table the report for the information of members.

Tabled paper: Information Commissioner Report 1: 2020-21—Privacy and Public Data: Managing re-identification risk [\[1124\]](#).

PETITIONS

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

North Queensland, Paediatric Cardiologist

Mr Dametto, from 2,288 petitioners, requesting the House to do all within its power for a full-time paediatric cardiologist to be based in North Queensland [\[1125, 1126\]](#).

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

COVID-19 Breach of Restrictions, Fines

Mr Dametto, from 1,256 petitioners, requesting the House to do all within its power to revoke or refund fines handed to Queenslanders who breached COVID-19 rules as a matter of principle [\[1127\]](#).

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

Bimblebox Nature Refuge

From 5,825 petitioners, requesting the House to assess an environmental value of the Bimblebox Nature Refuge and to grant it a state protected status as one of the few remaining forests in western Queensland [\[1128\]](#).

QPAC, Indigenous Art

From 199 petitioners, requesting the House to preference local Indigenous art and art forms for the fit out and interior design elements of the new QPAC and to name the theatre after a female Indigenous artist [\[1129\]](#).

Dakabin Tip Site, Investigation

From 412 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure a full and thorough investigation of the handling of the old Dakabin tip site be conducted through a relevant State entity [\[1130\]](#).

COVID-19 Breach of Restrictions, Fines

From 228 petitioners, requesting the House to dismiss the spirit of petition 3348-20 presented by Nick Dametto MP and reaffirm that in Queensland we will protect public health and prosperity through fines for flagrant breaches of public health orders and never attempt to remove freedom of assembly [\[1131\]](#).

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—

19 June 2020—

[968](#) Transport and Public Works Committee: Report No. 40, 56th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 18 March 2020 and 19 May 2020

[969](#) Letter, dated 21 May 2020, from Chair, Queensland Music Festival, Dominic McGann, to the Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef, Minister for Science and Minister for the Arts, Hon. Leeanne Enoch, enclosing the Queensland Music Festival audited accounts year ended December 2019

[970](#) Queensland Music Festival—Financial report for the 12 months ended 31 December 2019

- [971](#) Natural Resources, Agricultural Industry Development and Environment Committee: Report No. 1, 56th Parliament—Consideration of Auditor-General Report 9: 2019-20—Addressing mine dust lung disease
- [972](#) Natural Resources, Agricultural Industry Development and Environment Committee: Report No. 2, 56th Parliament—Consideration of Auditor-General Report 12: 2019-20—Managing coal seam gas activities
- [973](#) Natural Resources, Agricultural Industry Development and Environment Committee: Report No. 3, 56th Parliament—Subordinate legislation No. 250 of 2019 tabled on 4 February 2020
- [974](#) Drug Therapy Protocol—Pharmacists UTI Trial [Refer to subordinate legislation No. 90]
- [975](#) Transport and Public Works Committee: Report No. 36, 56th Parliament—Building Industry Fairness (Security of Payment) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020, interim government response
- [976](#) Right to Information Act 2009 and Information Privacy Act 2009—Annual report 2018-19
- [977](#) Gazette Notice for the Queensland Government Gazette, dated 19 June 2020, advising that His Excellency the Governor, acting by and with the advice of the Executive Council and pursuant to the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 2003, has approved a payment of \$121,044,130.72 (GST inclusive) from WorkCover Queensland to the Office of Industrial Relations, Department of Education, in 2020-21 for the prevention of injury to workers and related education, compliance and regulatory functions delivered by the Office of Industrial Relations under the Work Health and Safety Act 2011 and Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 2003
- 23 June 2020—
- [978](#) Auditor-General of Queensland: Report 16: 2019-20—Licensing builders and building trades
- [979](#) Education, Employment and Small Business Committee: Report No. 33, 56th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 18 March 2020 and 22 April 2020
- [980](#) Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee: Report No. 38, 56th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 18 March 2020 and 19 May 2020
- 24 June 2020—
- [981](#) Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 67, 56th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 5 February 2020 and 17 March 2020
- [982](#) Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 68, 56th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 18 March 2020 and 22 April 2020
- [983](#) Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 69, 56th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 23 April 2020 and 19 May 2020
- 25 June 2020—
- [984](#) Takeaway liquor authority notices issued in accordance with section 235D and 235F of the Liquor Act 1992 by the Commissioner for Liquor and Gaming
- [985](#) Professional Standards Act 2004: Professional Standards (Western Australian Bar Association Professional Standards Scheme) Notice 2020, No. 98
- [986](#) Professional Standards Act 2004: Professional Standards (Western Australian Bar Association Professional Standards Scheme) Notice 2020, No. 98, explanatory notes
- [987](#) Professional Standards Act 2004: Professional Standards (Western Australian Bar Association Professional Standards Scheme) Notice 2020, No. 98, human rights certificate
- [988](#) Professional Standards Act 1997 (WA): Professional Standards (Western Australian Bar Association Professional Standards Scheme) Notice 2020 [Refer to subordinate legislation No. 98 of 2020]
- [989](#) Professional Standards Act 2004: Professional Standards (Association of Consulting Surveyors National Professional Standards Scheme) Notice 2020, No. 99
- [990](#) Professional Standards Act 2004: Professional Standards (Association of Consulting Surveyors National Professional Standards Scheme) Notice 2020, No. 99, explanatory notes
- [991](#) Professional Standards Act 2004: Professional Standards (Association of Consulting Surveyors National Professional Standards Scheme) Notice 2020, No. 99, human rights certificate
- [992](#) Professional Standards Act 1994 (NSW): Professional Standards (Association of Consulting Surveyors National Professional Standards Scheme) Notice 2020 [Refer to subordinate legislation No. 99 of 2020]
- 29 June 2020—
- [993](#) Queensland Law Reform Commission: Report No. 77—Review of Queensland's laws relating to civil surveillance and the protection of privacy in the context of current and emerging technologies report, February 2020
- 30 June 2020—
- [994](#) Economics and Governance Committee: Report No. 41, 56th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 5 February 2020 and 22 April 2020
- 1 July 2020—
- [995](#) Coroners Act 2003, COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020, Crime and Corruption Act 2001, Criminal Code Act 1899, Evidence Act 1977, Justices Act 1886, Property Law Act 1974: Justice Legislation (COVID-19 Emergency Response—Proceedings and Other Matters) Regulation 2020, No. 103

- [996](#) Coroners Act 2003, COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020, Crime and Corruption Act 2001, Criminal Code Act 1899, Evidence Act 1977, Justices Act 1886, Property Law Act 1974: Justice Legislation (COVID-19 Emergency Response—Proceedings and Other Matters) Regulation 2020, No. 103, explanatory notes
- [997](#) Coroners Act 2003, COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020, Crime and Corruption Act 2001, Criminal Code Act 1899, Evidence Act 1977, Justices Act 1886, Property Law Act 1974: Justice Legislation (COVID-19 Emergency Response—Proceedings and Other Matters) Regulation 2020, No. 103, human rights certificate
- [998](#) COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020, Education (Accreditation of Non-State Schools) Act 2017, Education (General Provisions) Act 2006, Education (Overseas Students) Act 2018, Education (Queensland College of Teachers) Act 2005, Education (Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority) Act 2014: Education Legislation (COVID-19 Emergency Response) Regulation 2020, No. 104
- [999](#) COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020, Education (Accreditation of Non-State Schools) Act 2017, Education (General Provisions) Act 2006, Education (Overseas Students) Act 2018, Education (Queensland College of Teachers) Act 2005, Education (Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority) Act 2014: Education Legislation (COVID-19 Emergency Response) Regulation 2020, No. 104, explanatory notes
- [1000](#) COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020, Education (Accreditation of Non-State Schools) Act 2017, Education (General Provisions) Act 2006, Education (Overseas Students) Act 2018, Education (Queensland College of Teachers) Act 2005, Education (Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority) Act 2014: Education Legislation (COVID-19 Emergency Response) Regulation 2020, No. 104, human rights certificate

2 July 2020—

- [1001](#) Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee: Report No. 33, 56th Parliament—Aged care, end-of-life and palliative care, interim government response
- [1002](#) Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee: Report No. 34, 56th Parliament—Voluntary assisted dying, interim government response
- [1003](#) Crime and Corruption Commission Queensland—An investigation into allegations relating to the appointment of a school principal, July 2020

3 July 2020—

- [1004](#) State Development, Tourism, Innovation and Manufacturing Committee: Report No. 1, 56th Parliament—Forest Wind Farm Development Bill 2020
- [1005](#) COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020, Rail Safety National Law (Queensland) Act 2017, Transport Infrastructure Act 1994, Transport Operations (Marine Safety) Act 1994: Transport Legislation (COVID-19 Emergency Response) Regulation (No. 2) 2020, No. .. [Refer to subordinate legislation No. 92]
- [1006](#) COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020, Rail Safety National Law (Queensland) Act 2017, Transport Infrastructure Act 1994, Transport Operations (Marine Safety) Act 1994: Transport Legislation (COVID-19 Emergency Response) Regulation (No. 2) 2020, No. 92, explanatory notes
- [1007](#) COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020, Rail Safety National Law (Queensland) Act 2017, Transport Infrastructure Act 1994, Transport Operations (Marine Safety) Act 1994: Transport Legislation (COVID-19 Emergency Response) Regulation (No. 2) 2020, No. 92, human rights certificate

6 July 2020—

- [1008](#) COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020, Economic Development Act 2012: Economic Development (COVID-19 Emergency Response) Regulation 2020, No. .. [Refer to subordinate legislation No. 102]
- [1009](#) COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020, Economic Development Act 2012: Economic Development (COVID-19 Emergency Response) Regulation 2020, No. 102, explanatory notes
- [1010](#) COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020, Economic Development Act 2012: Economic Development (COVID-19 Emergency Response) Regulation 2020, No. 102, human rights certificate

7 July 2020—

- [1011](#) COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020, Planning Act 2016: Planning (COVID-19 Emergency Response) Regulation 2020, No. 101
- [1012](#) COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020, Planning Act 2016: Planning (COVID-19 Emergency Response) Regulation 2020, No. 101, explanatory notes
- [1013](#) COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020, Planning Act 2016: Planning (COVID-19 Emergency Response) Regulation 2020, No. 101, human rights certificate

9 July 2020—

- [1014](#) COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020, Economic Development Act 2012: Economic Development (COVID-19 Emergency Response) Regulation 2020, No. 102

10 July 2020—

- [1015](#) COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020, Land Act 1994, Retail Shop Leases Act 1994: Land Regulation 2020, No. 106
- [1016](#) COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020, Land Act 1994, Retail Shop Leases Act 1994: Land Regulation 2020, No. 106, explanatory notes
- [1017](#) COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020, Land Act 1994, Retail Shop Leases Act 1994: Land Regulation 2020, No. 106, human rights certificate

13 July 2020—

- [1018](#) Response from the Treasurer, Minister for Infrastructure and Planning (Hon. Dick), to an ePetition (3320-20) sponsored by the member for Mirani, Mr Andrew, from 1,304 petitioners, requesting the House to implement measures to ensure Queensland prospers and provides a long-term stable future for its people
- [1019](#) Economics and Governance Committee: Report No. 42, 56th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 23 April 2020 and 19 May 2020
- [1020](#) COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020, Youth Justice Act 1992: Youth Justice (COVID-19 Emergency Response) Regulation 2020, No. 123
- [1021](#) COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020, Youth Justice Act 1992: Youth Justice (COVID-19 Emergency Response) Regulation 2020, No. 123, explanatory notes
- [1022](#) COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020, Youth Justice Act 1992: Youth Justice (COVID-19 Emergency Response) Regulation 2020, No. 123, human rights certificate
- [1023](#) Natural Resources, Agricultural Industry Development and Environment Committee: Report No. 4, 56th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 18 March 2020 and 22 April 2020
- [1024](#) Natural Resources, Agricultural Industry Development and Environment Committee: Report No. 5, 56th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 23 April 2020 and 19 May 2020

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS (SO 32)

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

The following statutory instruments were tabled by the Clerk—

Health Act 1937:

- [1025](#) Health (Drugs and Poisons) Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2020, No. 90
- [1026](#) Health (Drugs and Poisons) Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2020, No. 90, explanatory notes
- [1027](#) Health (Drugs and Poisons) Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2020, No. 90, human rights certificate

Education (Accreditation of Non-State Schools) Act 2017:

- [1028](#) Education (Accreditation of Non-State Schools) (National Declaration) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 91
- [1029](#) Education (Accreditation of Non-State Schools) (National Declaration) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 91, explanatory notes
- [1030](#) Education (Accreditation of Non-State Schools) (National Declaration) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 91, human rights certificate

Natural Resources and Other Legislation (GDA2020) Amendment Act 2020:

- [1031](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 93
- [1032](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 93, explanatory notes

Biosecurity Act 2014, Chemical Usage (Agricultural and Veterinary) Control Act 1988, Forensic Disability Act 2011, Mineral and Energy Resources (Common Provisions) Act 2014, Mineral Resources Act 1989, Nature Conservation Act 1992, Queensland Heritage Act 1992, Recreation Areas Management Act 2006, Transport Infrastructure Act 1994, Transport Operations (Marine Pollution) Act 1995, Transport Operations (Marine Safety) Act 1994, Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995, Vegetation Management Act 1999:

- [1033](#) Natural Resources and Other Legislation (GDA2020) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 94
- [1034](#) Natural Resources and Other Legislation (GDA2020) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 94, explanatory notes
- [1035](#) Natural Resources and Other Legislation (GDA2020) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 94, human rights certificate

Biosecurity Act 2014:

- [1036](#) Biosecurity (Siam Weed and Other Matters) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 95
- [1037](#) Biosecurity (Siam Weed and Other Matters) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 95, explanatory notes
- [1038](#) Biosecurity (Siam Weed and Other Matters) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 95, human rights certificate

Chemical Usage (Agricultural and Veterinary) Control Act 1988:

- [1039](#) Chemical Usage (Agricultural and Veterinary) Control (Record Keeping and Training) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 96
- [1040](#) Chemical Usage (Agricultural and Veterinary) Control (Record Keeping and Training) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 96, explanatory notes
- [1041](#) Chemical Usage (Agricultural and Veterinary) Control (Record Keeping and Training) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 96, human rights certificate

Superannuation (State Public Sector) Act 1990:

- [1042](#) Superannuation (State Public Sector) Amendment Notice (No. 1) 2020, No. 97
- [1043](#) Superannuation (State Public Sector) Amendment Notice (No. 1) 2020, No. 97, explanatory notes
- [1044](#) Superannuation (State Public Sector) Amendment Notice (No. 1) 2020, No. 97, human rights certificate

Ambulance Service Act 1991:

- [1045](#) Ambulance Service (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 100
- [1046](#) Ambulance Service (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 100, explanatory notes
- [1047](#) Ambulance Service (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 100, human rights certificate

Natural Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2019:

- [1048](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 105
- [1049](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 105, explanatory notes

Acquisition of Land Act 1967, Building Units and Group Titles Act 1980, Coal Mining Safety and Health Act 1999, Electricity Act 1994, Explosives Act 1999, Foreign Ownership of Land Register Act 1988, Fossicking Act 1994, Gas Supply Act 2003, Land Act 1994, Land Title Act 1994, Land Valuation Act 2010, Mining and Quarrying Safety and Health Act 1999, Petroleum Act 1923, Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004, Stock Route Management Act 2002, Surveyors Act 2003, Valuers Registration Act 1992, Vegetation Management Act 1999, Water Act 2000:

- [1050](#) Natural Resources, Mines and Energy Legislation (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 107
- [1051](#) Natural Resources, Mines and Energy Legislation (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 107, explanatory notes
- [1052](#) Natural Resources, Mines and Energy Legislation (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 107, human rights certificate

Coal Mining Safety and Health Act 1999, Mining and Quarrying Safety and Health Act 1999:

- [1053](#) Mining Safety and Health Legislation (Health Surveillance) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 108
- [1054](#) Mining Safety and Health Legislation (Health Surveillance) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 108, explanatory notes
- [1055](#) Mining Safety and Health Legislation (Health Surveillance) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 108, human rights certificate

Mineral and Energy Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2020:

- [1056](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 109
- [1057](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 109, explanatory notes
- [1058](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 109, human rights certificate

Coastal Protection and Management Act 1995, Environmental Protection Act 1994, Forestry Act 1959, Marine Parks Act 2004, Nature Conservation Act 1992, Queensland Heritage Act 1992, Recreation Areas Management Act 2006, Waste Reduction and Recycling Act 2011:

- [1059](#) Environmental Legislation (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 110
- [1060](#) Environmental Legislation (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 110, explanatory notes
- [1061](#) Environmental Legislation (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 110, human rights certificate

Waste Reduction and Recycling Act 2011:

- [1062](#) Waste Reduction and Recycling (Waste Levy Rates for 2020-2021) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 111
- [1063](#) Waste Reduction and Recycling (Waste Levy Rates for 2020-2021) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 111, explanatory notes
- [1064](#) Waste Reduction and Recycling (Waste Levy Rates for 2020-2021) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 111, human rights certificate

Prostitution Act 1999, Weapons Act 1990:

- [1065](#) Weapons and Other Legislation (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 112
- [1066](#) Weapons and Other Legislation (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 112, explanatory notes
- [1067](#) Weapons and Other Legislation (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 112, human rights certificate

Mutual Recognition (Queensland) Act 1992:

- [1068](#) Mutual Recognition (Queensland) (WA Container Deposit Scheme) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 113
- [1069](#) Mutual Recognition (Queensland) (WA Container Deposit Scheme) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 113, explanatory notes
- [1070](#) Mutual Recognition (Queensland) (WA Container Deposit Scheme) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 113, human rights certificate

Trans-Tasman Mutual Recognition (Queensland) Act 2003:

- [1071](#) Trans-Tasman Mutual Recognition (Queensland) (WA Container Deposit Scheme) Notice 2020, No. 114
- [1072](#) Trans-Tasman Mutual Recognition (Queensland) (WA Container Deposit Scheme) Notice 2020, No. 114, explanatory notes
- [1073](#) Trans-Tasman Mutual Recognition (Queensland) (WA Container Deposit Scheme) Notice 2020, No. 114, human rights certificate

Public Service Act 2008:

- [1074](#) Public Service (Rulings and Other Matters) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 115
- [1075](#) Public Service (Rulings and Other Matters) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 115, explanatory notes
- [1076](#) Public Service (Rulings and Other Matters) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 115, human rights certificate

Duties Act 2001, Land Tax Act 2010, Mineral Resources Act 1989, Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004, State Penalties Enforcement Act 1999:

- [1077](#) Revenue Legislation (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 116
- [1078](#) Revenue Legislation (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 116, explanatory notes
- [1079](#) Revenue Legislation (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 116, human rights certificate

Civil Liability Act 2003, Motor Accident Insurance Act 1994, Personal Injuries Proceedings Act 2002:

- [1080](#) Civil Liability and Other Legislation (Prescribed Amounts) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 117
- [1081](#) Civil Liability and Other Legislation (Prescribed Amounts) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 117, explanatory notes
- [1082](#) Civil Liability and Other Legislation (Prescribed Amounts) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 117, human rights certificate

Coal Mining Safety and Health Act 1999:

- [1083](#) Coal Mining Safety and Health (Methane Monitoring and Ventilation Systems) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 118
- [1084](#) Coal Mining Safety and Health (Methane Monitoring and Ventilation Systems) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 118, explanatory notes
- [1085](#) Coal Mining Safety and Health (Methane Monitoring and Ventilation Systems) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 118, human rights certificate

Architects Act 2002, Building Act 1975, Building Industry Fairness (Security of Payment) Act 2017, Housing Act 2003, Plumbing and Drainage Act 2018, Professional Engineers Act 2002, Queensland Building and Construction Commission Act 1991, Residential Services (Accreditation) Act 2002, Residential Tenancies and Rooming Accommodation Act 2008, Retirement Villages Act 1999:

- [1086](#) Housing and Public Works Legislation (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 119
- [1087](#) Housing and Public Works Legislation (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 119, explanatory notes
- [1088](#) Housing and Public Works Legislation (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 119, human rights certificate

Rural and Regional Adjustment Act 1994:

- [1089](#) Rural and Regional Adjustment Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2020, No. 120
- [1090](#) Rural and Regional Adjustment Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2020, No. 120, explanatory notes
- [1091](#) Rural and Regional Adjustment Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2020, No. 120, human rights certificate

Racing Integrity Act 2016:

- [1092](#) Racing Integrity (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 121
- [1093](#) Racing Integrity (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 121, explanatory notes
- [1094](#) Racing Integrity (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 121, human rights certificate

Adoption Act 2009:

- [1095](#) Adoption Regulation 2020, No. 122
- [1096](#) Adoption Regulation 2020, No. 122, explanatory notes
- [1097](#) Adoption Regulation 2020, No. 122, human rights certificate

Building Act 1975, Fire and Emergency Services Act 1990:

- [1098](#) Fire and Emergency Services Legislation (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 124
- [1099](#) Fire and Emergency Services Legislation (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 124, explanatory notes
- [1100](#) Fire and Emergency Services Legislation (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 124, human rights certificate

State Penalties Enforcement Act 1999:

- [1101](#) State Penalties Enforcement Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2020, No. 125
- [1102](#) State Penalties Enforcement Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2020, No. 125, explanatory notes
- [1103](#) State Penalties Enforcement Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2020, No. 125, human rights certificate

Casino Control Act 1982, Gaming Machine Act 1991:

- [1104](#) Gaming Tax Notice 2020, No. 126
- [1105](#) Gaming Tax Notice 2020, No. 126, explanatory notes
- [1106](#) Gaming Tax Notice 2020, No. 126, human rights certificate

Justice and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2020:

- [1107](#) Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 127
- [1108](#) Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 127, explanatory notes
- [1109](#) Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 127, human rights certificate

Community Services Industry (Portable Long Service Leave) Act 2020:

- [1110](#) Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 128
- [1111](#) Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 128, explanatory notes
- [1112](#) Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 128, human rights certificate

Further Education and Training Act 2014:

- [1113](#) Further Education and Training (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 129
- [1114](#) Further Education and Training (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 129, explanatory notes
- [1115](#) Further Education and Training (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 129, human rights certificate

Working with Children (Risk Management and Screening) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2019:

- [1116](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 130
- [1117](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 130, explanatory notes

Transport Planning and Coordination Act 1994, Working with Children (Risk Management and Screening) Act 2000:

- [1118](#) Working with Children (Risk Management and Screening) Regulation 2020, No. 131
- [1119](#) Working with Children (Risk Management and Screening) Regulation 2020, No. 131, explanatory notes
- [1120](#) Working with Children (Risk Management and Screening) Regulation 2020, No. 131, human rights certificate

REPORT BY THE CLERK

The following report was tabled by the Clerk—

- [1121](#) Report pursuant to Standing Order 169 (Acts to be numbered by the Clerk) and Standing Order 165 (Clerical errors or formal changes to any bill) detailing amendments to certain Bills, made by the Clerk, prior to assent by His Excellency the Governor, viz—

Associations Incorporation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019

Amendments made to Bill

Short title and consequential references to short title—

Omit—

'Associations Incorporation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019'

Insert—

'Associations Incorporation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020'

Community Services Industry (Portable Long Service Leave) Bill 2019

Amendments made to Bill

Short title and consequential references to short title—

Omit—

'Community Services Industry (Portable Long Service Leave) Bill 2019'

Insert—

'Community Services Industry (Portable Long Service Leave) Bill 2020'

Electoral and Other Legislation (Accountability, Integrity and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2019

Amendments made to Bill

Short title and consequential references to short title—

Omit—

'Electoral and Other Legislation (Accountability, Integrity and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2019'

Insert—

'Electoral and Other Legislation (Accountability, Integrity and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2020'

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Coronavirus, Update



Hon. A PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.34 am): At every stage of the coronavirus pandemic I have been up-front with Queenslanders about the risks we are facing. We have fought this disease, all five million of us. Every one of us has contributed something. We are


entering the most dangerous weeks of the battle so far—and that enemy is complacency. People are naturally worried about the escalating cases in Victoria and about fresh outbreaks in New South Wales. I want to reassure them that Queensland's borders remain strong. Measures to protect us have been strengthened, not weakened, and our border checkpoints have never been more alert. Since noon on Friday, 14,345 people have been processed through our airports, 370 people have been placed into quarantine, 10 people have been refused entry, 22,459 vehicles have been intercepted on our highways, 972 people have been refused entry, 36 people have been placed into quarantine and seven infringements have been issued. Those seven people each have been fined \$4,000.

From noon today, the cities of Liverpool and Campbelltown in New South Wales will be added to the list of hotspots along with all of the local government areas, of course, in Victoria which have been in place. No-one travelling from those cities will be able to quarantine in Queensland and they will be turned away at the border. Those who test our seriousness about our borders will learn a harsh lesson. Nothing is more important to me than protecting the health of Queenslanders. The reward for our hard work is being able to take the steps to get our lives and our economy closer to normal. It is little things like being able to get a beer at a bar and to catch up with friends on a weekend. It is about having our children back at school when around the world lots of schools are closed and children do not have that fundamental right. It is about getting jobs back.

We are opening up our economy here in Queensland where around the world economies are shutting down. Every visitor we welcome represents good news for our tourism and hospitality industry. By the end of the September quarter, we estimate an additional \$400 million will be spent at resorts and theme parks and in taxis and restaurants, keeping and creating more jobs. It is all part of our plan to help the Queensland economy recover.

We have seen how easily this can all be undone. I know that army of Queenslanders will not give up the fight. Our best weapon is social distancing. We have shown that it is possible to have thousands of fans back at the footy as long as we follow the rules. Nightclubs are not exempt from those rules. Already three venues have been fined \$6,675 each and one remains under investigation. Ultimately it is up to every single one of us to do the right thing, and that includes people going to nightclubs. A night out is not worth putting everyone else into lockdown. I urge everyone to do the right thing right throughout our great state of Queensland.

School Infrastructure

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.37 am): At the start of the year I joined the education minister at the new Fortitude Valley State Secondary College for the first day of a very special new school year. It was special for students, parents and staff because this historic school, which was closed by the former LNP government—and the member for Kawana was part of that government—has been transformed—

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! We are in ministerial statements, Premier. I ask you to continue.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Thank you. This historic school has been transformed into Queensland's first ever vertical school and the first high school to be built in the inner city in five decades. The Fortitude Valley State Secondary College is one of a total of eight new schools opened by our government this year. I know that a lot of other members of the House were also there on day one at each of their new local high schools. These are projects that not only create schools where Queensland children can grow and thrive but also create thousands of jobs and support Queensland's economy as we unite and recover from the COVID-19 pandemic. The schools opened this year represent an investment of \$450 million which supported 1,370 jobs. These schools include Ripley Valley State Secondary College, Ripley Valley State School, Yarrabilba State Secondary College, Mango Hill State Secondary College, Lee Street State Special School, Foxwell State Secondary College and Calliope State High School.

We are also delivering another five new state schools in 2021—a vertical high school at Dutton Park, a primary school at Pimpama, a high school at Baringa and a primary school and special school at Palmview. A solid, comprehensive education is the key to a solid future for all Queensland children. That is why the construction of new schools by our government will not stop there. We all are more than aware that the global economic headwinds are pointing towards unprecedented, difficult times in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic. Queensland's plan for economic recovery begins with job creation, and in the education space we are more than pulling our weight. We will ensure the pipeline of work on school construction projects can continue, and I have good news for Queensland today.

Mr Bleijie interjected.


Mr Hart interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Kawana, you are warned under the standing orders. You know about the use of props in this House and you are also interjecting. The member for Burleigh will cease his interjections.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Let me start again: there is more good news for Queensland today. I am pleased to announce the pipeline will continue well into the future of new schools. Today our government has allocated \$346 million on an education package which includes \$245 million to build four brand-new schools in Queensland—a new primary school at North Maclean bordering the Logan and Jordan area, a new primary school at Caloundra South, a new special school on the Gold Coast and a new primary school at a location to be identified in Brisbane's inner west but around the Indooroopilly-Chapel Hill-St Lucia area.


These areas are some of our state's fastest growing regions, with rapid housing development bringing many young families to these suburbs. Construction of these new schools will bring 870 jobs. This is about building for the future. It is about looking after education, looking after our young people and getting people into work building these new schools—870 jobs. The funding package will also include almost \$20 million to complete stage 2 of the Lee Street special school at Caboolture. It also includes more than \$80 million towards planning and land acquisitions for 2023-24. Just as we saw the excitement earlier this year at the new Fortitude Valley school, I look forward to seeing more Queensland children get the best possible education and these new schools will be opened in the coming years.

Brisbane Airport, Runway

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.41 am): The opening of Brisbane's new airport runway is the perfect example of the link between building infrastructure and economic prosperity. It is why our economic recovery plan includes \$50 billion worth of building the roads, schools and hospitals this state needs. Building them provides jobs today and greater economic prosperity in the future. At its peak, 675 people worked on building the runway. It cost \$1.1 billion but will add \$5 billion to our Queensland economy by 2035. This is because a second runway doubles Brisbane's capacity to carry both passengers and freight and it sets Queensland up for an incredibly bright future. Brisbane's airport is a major gateway for Queensland exports.

As Minister for Trade I am proud that nearly 95 per cent of our seafood exports travel via the Brisbane Airport. More than 97 per cent of our avocados, mangoes and pineapples are carried by planes across the globe. Now that Brisbane has doubled its capacity, the opportunity exists for our primary producers to increase theirs. It is estimated that this increased activity will add 7,800 new jobs. There is a saying, 'If you build it, they will come.' Brisbane has built a new runway, giving it the opportunity to rival the biggest and busiest airports in the world. The flights and the tourists are already returning domestically. Our economic recovery plan is already working.

Coronavirus, Health Update


 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumbidgee—ALP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (9.42 am): The World Health Organization has said the COVID-19 pandemic is far from over and the worst may yet be to come. Many countries around the world are struggling to cope with the volume of COVID cases. These health impacts are bringing with them catastrophic economic consequences, job losses and business closures. Some places that thought it was over for them are experiencing a second wave, and so we cannot afford to be complacent. We can take nothing for granted. The worst for Victoria may be ahead of it. If we are not careful, if we do not defend our borders, we risk a second wave here too. However, thanks to the efforts of Queenslanders, restrictions here are easing and Queensland's plan to unite and recover from COVID-19 is in full swing.

In the past fortnight we have moved to stage 3 of the road map, earlier than expected, and lifted some of our border restrictions. This will allow more people to get back to work, creating jobs for Queenslanders. In that same time, we have recorded just three new cases. All of these were contracted overseas. In total, 1,071 Queenslanders have tested positive for the virus and four are still fighting it. We are in this position thanks to the sustained hard work of every Queenslanders in following the restrictions and health advice.

In Victoria's last reporting period it recorded 177 cases and New South Wales recorded 14. Most concerning at the moment is the cluster of cases stemming from the Crossroads Hotel at Casula in New South Wales. So far, we have identified 21 cases of people who had visited that hotel and that is why the Chief Health Officer made a decision this morning to declare the local government areas of Liverpool and Campbelltown as hotspots. That means that anyone who has travelled in those local government areas in the 14 days prior to midday today will only be allowed into Queensland if they are Queensland residents and they will have to hotel quarantine. We are also strengthening penalties for people who breach these rules. We will propose this week that the maximum penalty should be \$4,004 or six months in prison.

We are continuing to encourage all Queenslanders as well as all visitors to Queensland to get tested if they experience any symptoms that could be COVID-19. Anyone entering Queensland will need to sign a declaration that they will get tested if they develop COVID-19 symptoms or face a hefty penalty. In peak tourist areas, we will have pop-up mobile testing clinics to boost our testing capacity. On the weekend the Cairns Public Health Unit trialled a pop-up clinic on the Cairns Esplanade and is looking at other locations. The Gold Coast has three pop-up clinics expected to be fully operational this week at the Gold Coast Airport, Albert Waterways and Surfers Paradise. We have been very well prepared since the start of this pandemic and can activate existing plans to deal with any new cases. If we do see a spike in cases, our hospitals and staff are ready because the Palaszczuk government has invested in health staff and in health infrastructure.

Coronavirus, Economic Response

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Treasurer, Minister for Infrastructure and Planning) (9.46 am): The economic and health impacts of COVID-19 continue to sweep the globe. This week we have already seen the number of cases world-wide grow by 230,000 in a single day. While Queensland's Asian trading partners are faring better than others, the enormous toll in the United States is ensuring that no nation will be spared from the economic contagion. Queensland continues to be a global leader in tackling COVID-19 thanks to our hardworking Queensland Health professionals and the diligence and patience of Queenslanders. That hard work is paying off as restrictions ease as we continue to deliver on our plan for economic recovery—our plan to Unite and Recover for Queensland Jobs. But we cannot sugar-coat the damage that has been done. Already revenue from state taxes and royalties has fallen by more than \$1 billion in just six months, and that is before we learn from the federal government what Queensland's GST allocation will be from a smaller—much smaller—pool.

Just as our revenue has taken a hit, our spending has increased as we fought to protect Queensland jobs and businesses. While the domestic economic volatility caused by Victoria's lockdown proves a continuing challenge to reliable economic forecasts, the Palaszczuk government is committed to delivering accountability through a COVID-19 fiscal and economic review in September. That will provide Queenslanders with important economic information ahead of the October election. In the meantime, we continue to take prudent, responsible action to manage the Queensland economy.

Last week I announced a series of savings initiatives that will ensure that any expenditure is focused around three key areas—supporting and creating jobs, delivering infrastructure and providing Queenslanders with the frontline services they deserve. These savings will be found across the Public Service and we have a target of \$3 billion to be saved over four years. This week I will also introduce a bill to establish the Queensland Future Fund—an investment vehicle to retire debt, to maximise the performance of Queensland assets and, very importantly, to protect those assets from any possible future LNP privatisation. By design, our economic recovery strategy is staged and flexible. Recent events in Victoria have reinforced the need for an agile response.

The Palaszczuk Labor government has a plan to chart a course through the recovery and into future growth. It is a plan that focuses on building vital infrastructure, strengthening Queensland industries and enabling future growth. It is a plan that supports regions and industries that continue to feel the impacts of the crisis. It is a plan that supports small business and our state's manufacturing sector as well as encouraging all Queenslanders to buy Queensland made. Most importantly, it is a plan that supports, sustains and creates Queensland jobs as together we navigate the challenging days ahead.

Mr Mander interjected.

Mr DICK: What is your plan, champ?

Mr SPEAKER: Treasurer! The Treasurer's comments will come through the chair.

Coronavirus, Economic Recovery



Hon. KJ JONES (Cooper—ALP) (Minister for State Development, Tourism and Innovation) (9.50 am): The Palaszczuk government has a clear strategy to rebuild Queensland's economy, create jobs and lead Queensland out of the coronavirus pandemic. We are the only side of politics with a plan to unite and recover for Queensland jobs. The LNP cut millions of dollars from Queensland's science and technology budget as well as reduced significantly the public workforce and that is why five years ago this week the Premier kickstarted Queensland's blueprint to create and invest in the skills and jobs of the future through Advance Queensland.

Our Advance Queensland Strategy has underpinned thousands of jobs created across Queensland and leveraged close to \$850 million in private sector investment in local companies and businesses. Ensuring we have a strong plan for the future has never been so important. As we speak, Queensland is leading the world in the fight against coronavirus. Thanks to \$10 million in funding through our government's Advance Queensland Strategy we are fast-tracking the University of Queensland's promising COVID-19 vaccine. Our funds are being used to manufacture millions of phials of this new vaccine ready to be distributed as soon as we have the results of the trials, significantly reducing the time it takes for the vaccine to be distributed. The University of Queensland is the only Australian organisation, and one of only six globally, to be tasked by the Oslo based Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations, or CEPI, to develop a vaccine against the novel coronavirus. I echo the comments of the Premier in saying yesterday was a very proud day for all of us to be standing in Queensland announcing that we are going to the next stage of human trials of this vaccine.

We understand that to safeguard jobs and to rebuild Queensland's economy we must invest in Queensland and in Queenslanders and that is exactly what our unite and recover strategy is all about, building on the success and the down payment of Advance Queensland. We will continue to back Queenslanders during these tough times.

School Infrastructure



Hon. G GRACE (McConnel—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Industrial Relations) (9.52 am): I proudly join the Premier in announcing that four new schools will be delivered: three schools to be built for day 1, 2022 and one in 2023. New primary schools in North Maclean in Logan and Caloundra South in Caloundra, as well as a new special school at Coomera on the Gold Coast will be delivered on time and on budget in 18 months time. I know that due to our record of delivering 18 new schools over the past few years, including eight opened this year, representing an investment of \$450 million and supporting nearly 1,400 jobs, we will deliver these schools. We are also delivering another five new schools in 2021.


Last week I was delighted to visit the high school site at Baringa in Caloundra and the primary school and special school sites at Palmview and saw firsthand the great progress being made. We have done it before and we will do it again because we know that ensuring every child gets a good education is one of the key building blocks of our society. The two primary schools just announced for 2022 will cater to the strong population growth being experienced in the Caloundra South and the Greater Flagstone priority development areas. The new primary school in Caloundra South will support the existing Baringa State Primary School which the Premier and I proudly opened and is now nearly at capacity and the new secondary school that is currently under construction and will open in 2021. The new primary school in North Maclean will be the first of many new schools that will be built in the Greater Flagstone PDA.

The new special school in Coomera will service the growing population in Coomera and Pimpama and provide special schooling relief to the existing Southport Special School on the Gold Coast and the Beenleigh Special School in Logan which, I might say, have also received substantial upgrades in the past year or so. We have also allocated \$65 million of funding for a new primary school to be built in Brisbane's booming inner-west suburbs to open on day 1 of 2023. We can now begin an extensive community consultation process to find the best location that will benefit the local community.

We are also building stage 2 of the Lee Street State Special School and I look forward to visiting that school with the local member, Minister Ryan, for the official opening of stage 1 in the coming months. As well as providing world-class education infrastructure, the scale of these projects means that there will be significant employment opportunities and around \$346 million worth of work in the pipeline for local tradies just for these projects alone. We are focused on getting people back to work as we unite and recover from the COVID-19 pandemic. These projects expect to support more than 870 local jobs. These projects are building on our record investment in building new schools and expanding existing schools in high growth areas to give every child a great start.

Mr SPEAKER: I acknowledge the attendance in the public gallery this morning of the former federal member for Dawson, James Bidgood. Welcome to the Queensland parliament.

Small Business


 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Small Business and Minister for Training and Skills Development) (9.55 am): The Palaszczuk government knows our small businesses have been doing it tough during the global coronavirus pandemic which has impacted economies across Australia and around the globe. Because of the great job we have done managing the health response to COVID-19, we can now start delivering Queensland's plan for economic recovery, Unite and Recover for Queensland Jobs. Part of that plan is about backing our small businesses and the Queenslanders they employ. Never before has this level of support been provided for our small businesses.

We are the only state that has offered almost \$200 million in grant funding, \$1 billion in interest free loans and payroll tax relief. We are also the only state to introduce a small and medium business procurement target of 25 per cent. It is about putting our money where our mouth is and buying products from local business. We are committed to continuing to support small businesses through the recovery.

Our small business grants have already helped almost 6,000 Queensland businesses impacted by the pandemic: businesses such as the Townsville Brewing Co. which was able to use its \$10,000 grant to help keep the beer cold and the business going during hibernation. They are also helping business owners like Jeff and Darlene who run Salads Made Fresh in the Redlands. They had to swiftly adapt their business for a new client base following the pandemic, going from supplying larger restaurants and RSLs to individuals in retirement villages. The grant has meant they can now set up a website with online ordering to make it easier for them to get food to their clients.

It is not just our grants that are helping businesses get through. Adnought Sheet Metal Fabrication in Rockhampton has been a fantastic supplier to government, supplying steel trolleys for the local hospital and air-conditioning cages for some of our local schools. Our business procurement target will ensure we do business with more local small businesses like Adnought, supporting them with about \$4 billion each year. We are also supporting our businesses with our free apprenticeships for under 21s initiative by removing the cost of training so they can skill up more local sheet metal workers in Central Queensland. The Palaszczuk government will continue to support our small businesses on our long road to recovery. This is all part of our plan to keep our businesses running and keep Queenslanders in jobs.

Road and Transport Infrastructure

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (9.58 am): As the most decentralised state in Australia, it is roads and transport that drive our economy, regional prosperity and jobs. Our 33,000-kilometre network of roads and 6,600 kilometres of rail link schools, hospitals, businesses, workers and world-class exports to markets around the globe. Global economies have been hit hard by the COVID-19 pandemic and both Australia and Queensland have not been immune. In true Queensland spirit, our community has rallied and thanks to our strong health response via the strong leadership of our Premier and Deputy Premier and by Queenslanders themselves, we have been able to kickstart Queensland's plan to unite and recover for Queensland jobs.

A cornerstone of the plan for economic recovery is more than \$1 billion in new and accelerated roads stimulus funding announced since COVID hit earlier this year. That will be delivered in addition to our record \$23 billion, 21,500-job pipeline of roads and transport infrastructure, because investing in Queensland infrastructure means Queensland jobs in our local communities, particularly when we most need them. We have collaborated with the federal government and I thank the Deputy Prime Minister for understanding the importance of this stimulus and working with me. The \$1 billion—more than 50 per cent funded by the Palaszczuk Labor government—will support more than 1,000 new jobs, seal key outback freight routes, accelerate shovel-ready projects and deliver local road projects that will supercharge our economy.

There is \$185 million in joint funding for 22 key inland freight upgrades; a \$200 million commitment to seal dirt outback roads and upgrade bridges; and a further \$200 million for key economic projects such as the Lawrie Street upgrade in Gracemere, the Cleveland-Redland Bay Road project in Redlands and upgrades to the Mount Lindesay Highway in a high-growth corridor. There is a joint \$415 million for shovel-ready projects, including our new Regional Economic Enabling Fund and

targeted road safety upgrades. In the Whitsundays we have \$15 million to lay more bitumen and seal sections of the Bowen Developmental Road. Last week I met with Mayor Andrew Wilcox, who has said—

Upgrades to the Bowen Developmental Road will provide a huge boost to all local businesses that rely on this critical link to get their products to market.

It will also boost our battling tourism sector by sealing the pathway for the valuable outback drive market to visit the Whitsunday ...

In Goondiwindi we have locked in more than \$6 million to widen the Barwon Highway. Of our funding Mayor Lawrence Springborg said—

... the project will return the investment through jobs, improved efficiency for farmers, transport operators and local residents and importantly enhance safety.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr BAILEY: I endorse the comments of Mayor Springborg, even if those opposite do not. They seem to have disowned him.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Members to my left! Minister, please continue with your ministerial statement.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members to my left, I have called you to order, but you are continuing. The minister has moved on. I ask you to hear the ministerial statement.

Mr BAILEY: The Palaszczuk Labor government knows there is a long road ahead as we unite and recover from this pandemic. That is why we are focused on a Queensland plan for economic recovery with a laser-like focus on infrastructure, jobs, industry and business—not cuts—because, as the Premier said, investing in lasting infrastructure projects now will benefit all Queenslanders in the years to come, strengthening our economy and jobs.

COVID Works for Queensland Program



Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Minister for Local Government, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (10.02 am): I am pleased to provide the House with an update on the COVID Works for Queensland project round, first announced in the House by the Premier on 19 May. The Palaszczuk government's signature Works for Queensland program has a strong track record of delivering jobs in regional Queensland and this round is an important part of the Queensland government's \$6 billion economic recovery strategy, Unite and Recover for Queensland Jobs. In order to see projects up and running and shovels in the ground, we have set some guidelines to ensure a quick turnaround to get money out the door. I want to thank all local governments across the state for their cooperation and, indeed, eagerness to deliver for their communities. The projects funded through this new initiative will help local economies and generate local jobs, not only in regional communities but also in this round throughout the south-east.

I am pleased to advise the House that last Thursday, 9 July, we were able to announce that 520 projects right across the state have been approved. Those 520 projects are expected to support more than 4,600 jobs right across Queensland. There are airport upgrades in Rockhampton, Proserpine, Cooktown, Aurukun, Charleville and Thangool. There are projects that will improve the tourism experience in Birdsville, Lake Moogerah, St George, Barcaldine and many others. There are water and sewerage projects in Thargomindah, Gladstone, Longreach, Ayr, Julia Creek and more. There are community infrastructure works to parks and sporting fields up and down the coast and through the interior—so many that it would be hard to enumerate them all.

Each and every one of the 520 projects will be able to be delivered in full by June 2021. That means an immediate injection of money and jobs into local communities that are doing it tough. It means tradies buying pies at the local bakery. It means local contractors and suppliers being utilised. It means local shops getting money through the till. We know that Works for Queensland delivers for Queensland, and we know that the COVID Works for Queensland program will play its role in Queensland's economic recovery.

Electricity Prices



Hon. AJ LYNHAM (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy) (10.04 am): I have good news for regional Queensland. For the third year in a row, this financial year household power bills are falling. As Queenslanders unite and recover from COVID-19, this is welcome

cost-of-living relief. It has reduced input costs for our small businesses as Queensland's economy tackles harsh global economic headwinds. This is the biggest drop in power prices in 15 years and tops off a range of rebates and relief measures we already have in place to help Queensland unite and recover.


Over the past two years there have been two individual \$50 dividend payments under our Affordable Energy Plan. There has been COVID relief of \$200 off utility bills for power and water costs for households and \$500 for small business. We have locked in another two annual \$50 dividend payments over the next two years. In fact, I encourage all members to keep an eye out for their power bills from September, as from September to November the next \$50 payment will be appearing on every household bill.

Why is this so? It is because we own our power assets! Those \$50 payments are dividends for the proud shareholders in Queensland's energy assets: the people of this state. Our dividends flow straight into the pockets of Queensland families, unlike the policies of those opposite where dividends would flow to overseas boardrooms in China, America and Switzerland. Prices are going down because we have positive, consistent renewable energy policies.

Members should not just take my word for it. The latest Australian Energy Regulator State of the Energy Market report notes that a substantial rise in solar has contributed to Queensland's wholesale electricity prices falling. We committed to the people of Queensland that we would keep power price increases to inflation or lower, but we have done far better than that. We have delivered successive decreases. Queensland has the energy trifecta: lowest average wholesale power prices on the eastern seaboard, a reliable supply and a planned transition to a renewable future.

Like the rest of the world, we face tough economic times ahead, but Queensland has a plan for economic recovery. Our industry, our manufacturing and our resources sectors can rely on the cheapest most reliable supply of power on the network. They can rely on our energy trifecta. This is the backbone, the spine, the solid core that supports Queensland's economic recovery plan in a challenging post-pandemic global environment.


Gladstone Manufacturing Hub

 **Hon. GJ BUTCHER** (Gladstone—ALP) (Minister for Regional Development and Manufacturing) (10.07 am): The Palaszczuk government is committed to backing our state's manufacturing industry and, as we deliver our economic plan to unite and recover from the global coronavirus pandemic, that support is more important than ever. Regional Queensland is a manufacturing powerhouse and having a support network for businesses in regional locations across the state is critical if we are to emerge strongly from these turbulent global economic conditions. That is why last month I was pleased to announce a new manufacturing hub delivered by the Palaszczuk Labor government in Gladstone to strengthen our state's manufacturing sector, boost private sector investment and create more local jobs. Located in Gladstone's Central Queensland University, the hub will function as a centre of expertise for advanced manufacturing, providing initiative, training and advice.

The Gladstone Manufacturing Hub will be an access point for local manufacturers to develop their skills and expertise for advanced manufacturing. We are aiming to take the manufacturing industry to greater heights in Gladstone, which is already one of Queensland's industrial powerhouses, with access to a significant state development area and the port of Gladstone. The hub will focus on delivering for region's growing hydrogen industry, renewable energy and biofuel sectors. The work of the Gladstone hub will complement the work of the Rockhampton hub, focusing on Central Queensland's key manufacturing strengths of rail, metal production and food innovation. Having a strong manufacturing hub presence across the Central Queensland region will allow us to build a network of manufacturers that already show the world what they can do.

With access to our \$13.5 million manufacturing hub grants, the businesses across the regions can go from strength to strength. That is businesses like Berg Engineering in Gladstone, which received \$161,719 from the Manufacturing Hubs Grant Program to purchase advanced line boring equipment that will provide higher accuracy and finer cuts. The funding will allow Berg Engineering to train and put on five new workers, as well as help to drive business development. It is only Labor that supports regional manufacturing as part of a whole-of-government COVID-19 economic recovery plan, and it is only Labor that can help the Queensland manufacturing industry grow and create jobs.

Police Service, Infrastructure

 **Hon. MT RYAN** (Morayfield—ALP) (Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services) (10.10 am): The Palaszczuk government is building Queensland's future. It is Queensland's plan to unite and recover. We know that many people are doing it tough right now. That is why our focus is on jobs for Queenslanders. Right across our state, the Queensland Police Service is building vital infrastructure and creating the jobs our state needs. This year's record \$2.6 billion police budget is supporting significant infrastructure investments. This massive investment is perhaps an explanation for why Toowoomba locals have street parties. Recently I joined—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr Dick interjected.

Mr RYAN: Had to pay it back, didn't he?

Mr SPEAKER: Members, the sniping will stop. Comments will come through the chair. I will be heavy on the trigger finger today in terms of getting members warned and out of this place if you cannot conduct yourselves appropriately.

Mr RYAN: Recently I joined Assistant Commissioner Mike Condon in touring two new police facilities that have just opened in Toowoomba. Under the Newman government, the Newtown police beat was shut down. Under the Palaszczuk government, there is now an increased police presence at the new Newtown police facility and a much larger facility to service that community. When asked by a cameraman, Assistant Commissioner Condon said, 'This is as happy as it gets.' For anyone who knows Assistant Commissioner Condon, that is a big call.

We also toured the new police facility at Highfields. When I visited there, officers showed me the welcome cards that locals had dropped off saying thank you to the Police Service and the government for putting a new police facility in their neighbourhood. I have never seen that before. It speaks volumes about the great relationship that the Queensland Police Service has with local communities.


Also rapidly nearing completion is the state-of-the-art counterterrorism and community training centre at Wacol which I inspected a week or so ago. This facility will be world-class and is already attracting interest from interstate and overseas law enforcement agencies. Construction of the new police facility at Coolool is also well advanced, supporting jobs in that local community. Work is progressing on the new Nambour police facility, and the same goes for police facilities at Beaudesert, Aurukun, Biloela and West End. The new McLeod Street police facility in Cairns has just been completed and a massive refurbishment of the main Cairns police station is underway.

When it comes to delivering jobs it is the Palaszczuk Labor government that delivers, and it is all part of our plan to unite and recover.

TRANSPORT AND OTHER LEGISLATION (ROAD SAFETY, TECHNOLOGY AND OTHER MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL

TRANSPORT LEGISLATION (DISABILITY PARKING AND OTHER MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Cognate Debate; Suspension of Standing and Sessional Orders

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (10.14 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

1. In accordance with standing order 172, that the Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill and the Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill be treated as cognate bills for their remaining stages, with—
 - (a) separate questions being put in regard to the second readings;
 - (b) the consideration of the bills in detail together; and
 - (c) separate questions being put for the third readings and long titles; and
2. Notwithstanding anything contained in standing and sessional orders, that the cognate debate commence with the Minister for Transport and Main Roads to move the second reading to the Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill followed by the Leader of the Opposition (or nominee), 30 minutes each.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Disallowance of Statutory Instrument



Mr PURDIE (Ninderry—LNP) (10.15 am): I give notice that I shall move—

That clause 7 of the Corrective Services (COVID-19 Emergency Response) Regulation 2020, Subordinate Legislation No. 84 of 2020, tabled in the House on 16 June 2020, be disallowed.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr SPEAKER: Question time will conclude today at 11.15 am.

New Acland Coalmine



Mrs FRECKLINGTON (10.15 am): My first question is to the Premier. Labor figures Shayne Neumann, Anthony Chisholm and Joel Fitzgibbon have all called on the Palaszczuk Labor government to approve New Acland stage 3. Joel Fitzgibbon said—

Thousands of jobs right across Queensland will be impacted if this thing goes south.

Will the Premier approve this project right now to protect those jobs?

Ms PALASZCZUK: As has been canvassed countless times in this House—the Leader of the Opposition is well aware of this—this matter is currently before the courts. I cannot be any clearer: it is before the courts. The companies know that; everybody knows that. There is a court process afoot.

Virgin Australia Airlines

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: My second question is also to the Premier. The Treasurer has said that he had a bazooka and was not afraid to use it to save thousands of Virgin jobs in Queensland by spending \$200 million of taxpayers' money. With Bain Capital reportedly considering axing up to 4,000 Queensland Virgin jobs, will the Premier guarantee that not one Queensland Virgin employee will lose their job?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. It was members on the LNP side that were completely opposed to any government getting involved in Virgin.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Let's be very clear: on this side we support Virgin, we support regional jobs and we support having a second carrier. On the other side—

Mr Dick interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is right: we support cheaper airfares and having a second airline, yet those on the other side say, 'Oh, no, have nothing to do with that!' It is very clear that we support jobs and—

Mrs Frecklington: Just not the Virgin ones now?

Ms PALASZCZUK: It is a bit like the borders. I was expecting a border question first up, but there was no border question today. I thought maybe the second question would be a border question, but there was no border question.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will come back to the question.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, cease your interjections.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I want to congratulate the Treasurer for being at the forefront in making sure that QIC was involved in the bid to make sure we secured the headquarters here in Queensland. I was also delighted to see that—

Ms Grace interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: We will get to that in a moment, Minister; there is just so much. We want to see as many jobs as possible retained. There has been a huge hit from COVID-19 to international airlines—worldwide, in case the Leader of the Opposition is unaware. The national cabinet reduced the number of international flights coming into Australia. It was a national cabinet decision—I support the Prime Minister in relation to that—and Queensland will reduce the number of arrivals here as well.

When it comes to Virgin and having a second airline in Queensland, we support the jobs that that brings. We support the regional economies that that airline supports with many people in regional Queensland being flight attendants, pilots and everything else that makes up the airline industry. We will continue to back this. Once again, I put on the public record the work that the Treasurer and the CBRC did in making sure that we were part of that bid. I congratulate them on that.

I will follow up on the interjection of the Minister for Education where she said that the LNP should always be reminded of the jobs they cut when there was no global pandemic. There was no global pandemic and they cut 14,000 Public Service jobs. Every Queenslanders who lost their job never forgets.

School Infrastructure

Mr POWER: My question is to the Premier and Minister for Trade. With the great news today that the Palaszczuk government is further investing in schools, will the Premier update the House on the progress of the new schools opening across Queensland in 2021 and how building them is part of Queensland's plan to unite and recover for jobs?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Logan for that question. My government has always been committed to education and what that means for Queenslanders, whether it is the families, the children, the teachers, the cleaners—everyone who makes up the school community. It is also about the jobs that building these new infrastructure projects create. As we are absolutely committed to unite and recover against the global pandemic, today we have made the crucial decision to invest in more schools in our growing communities across Queensland. I thank the Minister for Education for her great work and that of her department in bringing this forward.

Mr Powell interjected.

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

Ms PALASZCZUK: We build schools; you close schools.

Mr SPEAKER: The Premier will direct her comments through the chair.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Let me be very clear: we on this side of the House build schools and the LNP close schools. We stood up for the Fortitude Valley school site. It was for sale. We had a rally against that and saved that site. At Calliope in Gladstone they had the land up for sale. What is there now? There is a brand-new school there.

The member for Logan will be very pleased to know that he will be getting a brand-new school in North Maclean. I know that it borders the member for Jordan's electorate too. Greenbank is a growing community and we are building for the future. There is only one side of this House that is focused on the future, focused on building jobs and focused on uniting and recovering in the face of the pandemic. We know that on the other side they are good at throwing stones and delivering nothing for Queenslanders. They had their time in government and what a waste of an opportunity that was. No-one will forget the three years of cruel and heartless cuts that resonated throughout Queensland.

We will be building four new schools—another primary school at Caloundra South, a new special school on the Gold Coast and a new primary school in the inner west. We know how much growth is occurring in that area. We look forward to identifying land for that purpose. This will result in 870 jobs. It is a huge investment. Once again, it shows how much our government values education and jobs.

Taxes

Mr MANDER: My question without notice is to the Treasurer. In recent media interviews the Treasurer did not know the amount of Queensland's debt, he did not know the number of Queensland public servants and he did not know one of Treasury's key fiscal principles. Will the Treasurer rule out introducing or raising any new taxes or does the Treasurer not know how he is going to fund Labor's promises?

Dr Miles interjected.

Ms Palaszczuk interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier and the Premier will direct their comments through the chair.

Mr DICK: I am very pleased to respond to the honourable member's question. While not agreeing with the premise of his question, can I indicate to the House that it is not the government's intention at a time when hardworking Queensland families are facing significant fiscal and financial pressure

because of economic circumstances to increase the tax burden faced by families. That is very clear. We do not intend to put burdens on families or businesses when we have seen the most significant downturn since the Great Depression.

The premise of the opposition shadow spokesperson's question allows me to talk about the comprehensive debt and savings plan I announced last week. It was a detailed and comprehensive plan and included the Future Fund that we will introduce into this House to protect Queensland assets from LNP privatisation—

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr DICK: The Leader of the Opposition laughs at the premise.

Mr Mander interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr DICK: We have a comprehensive plan and the time is now, three months from an election, for the Leader of the Opposition and the shadow Treasurer to tell Queenslanders what their plan is and not hide their secret plan until a budget in January 2021. Release your plan about savings and debt now.

Mr SPEAKER: The Treasurer will direct his comments through the chair.

Mr DICK: I say to the shadow Treasurer: we know that there are three LNP fiscal principles that are very clear to every Queenslander. Fiscal principle 1: cut. Fiscal principle 2: sack. Fiscal principle 3: sell. If the Leader of the Opposition and deputy leader do not support our comprehensive plan to remove the number of contractors and consultants in the Public Service, to reduce marketing and advertising and to focus on the front line and not on other unessential work then they need to say publicly now what their plan is.

Mr Mander interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The member for Everton will cease his interjections.

Mr DICK: The reason they do not talk about their plan is that they intend to take an axe to the Public Service. I say to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition: how many public servants will it be this time—14,000, 20,000 or 30,000? What is the plan to reduce debt as you say, Deputy Leader of the Opposition? I do not believe they have no plan. I believe they do have a plan. That plan is to take an axe to the Public Service and to sell public assets that deliver a dividend to the people of Queensland—some of which will now go into a locked box to be offset against our debt—

Mr Mander interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Everton!

Mr DICK: That is what we will do. The question is: what will the shadow Treasurer do? Now is the time for them to come forward and tell Queenslanders the truth about their plan.

(Time expired)

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

Coronavirus, Medical Research

Ms RICHARDS: My question is of the Premier and Minister for Trade. Will the Premier update the House on what measures Queensland researchers are taking to battle the ongoing threat of COVID-19?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Redlands for asking the question. The member for Redlands should be incredibly proud because a constituent from her electorate, Helen, was the first Queenslander to yesterday have the vaccine that is the work of UQ. This is wonderful news for Queensland. It was in March that Minister Jones, the Deputy Premier and I were out at UQ announcing \$10 million in funding for the trial of this vaccine. Professor Young said to us at the time that they would probably start human clinical trials in July of this year. True to their word, that is the case. They have been working night and day. They are absolutely dedicated. I am very proud of the work that UQ has been doing in relation to the vaccine.

Helen was the first person to receive the vaccine. They called for 120 volunteers and there were 4,000 Queenslanders who put their hands up to participate in this trial. I thank each and every one of the 4,000 people who put their hands up. As Helen said, given what is happening with COVID, she

wants to be part of something that is going to restore life to some sort of normality. Hopefully we will see the outcome of the trials over December and January. At the same time, which has been the missing link, if it is proven to be successful, production can occur in Australia with their partners CSL.

This is fantastic news. It is the missing piece of Advance Queensland. It is something that both Minister Jones and Minister Enoch have been advocating for for many years and something that I had noticed on my trade missions to biotechnology conferences overseas—that is, whilst we can make the discoveries here, it is mass manufacturing that has been missing. The fact that UQ has secured that partner and can work here locally is absolutely tremendous news and has been that missing piece of Advance Queensland—not only the trial of the vaccine but also the production of the vaccine.

We wish them all the very best. As we know, the world is battling this worldwide crisis—the twin crisis of the pandemic and the impact on jobs and our economy. On this side of the House, our government is absolutely committed to getting people back into work and to making sure Queenslanders stay as healthy as possible. That is why we have had to take very tough measures during this time, and we will not hesitate to take tougher measures if and when we need to. Everyone would know that the Chief Health Officer has declared those extra hotspots. It is all about keeping Queenslanders safe.

(Time expired)

Unemployment

Ms SIMPSON: My question is to the Premier. Right now a record number of Queenslanders are out of work, with over 200,000 looking for a job. Despite being announced with much fanfare, Labor's Jobs Finder program has delivered only 147 jobs in three months. Why is the Premier giving Queenslanders nothing but false hope in the worst economic period in living history?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Maroochydhore. This week I said very clearly that we were continuing on our path to economic recovery. Queenslanders have done a terrific job. We have been able to ease restrictions ahead of schedule, and that is only because of the great work that Queenslanders have done. As I said this morning, our biggest enemy is complacency. Social distancing is important. We must maintain our social distancing. I urge members to call it out when people are not doing that correctly. It is unfortunate that we have had reports that a member of parliament on the other side—

Ms Simpson interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The member for Maroochydhore will cease her interjections.

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The member for McConnel will also cease her interjections.

Ms Simpson interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The member for Maroochydhore can leave the chamber under standing order 253A. I have been very clear.

Whereupon the honourable member for Maroochydhore withdrew from the chamber at 10.31 am.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is very disappointing—and a former Speaker at that.

That is why we have announced over \$6 billion of measures. We have taken that extraordinary step to make sure that we can get people back into jobs as quickly as possible. We have announced new schools, focusing on education. Our next stage will be looking at skills and training because, unfortunately, we know that a large number of young people have lost their jobs and have been impacted. Our focus is now on getting those young people back into work.

As we unite and recover, all Queenslanders are in this together. That is why we put the small business grants out, and Minister Fentiman has updated the House on those. It is also why we have set up a task force so we have an alliance of key industry stakeholders who are working with government in unison to make sure that we unite and recover in the right way. In fact, many of them have said to me that it should be one of the greatest legacies of this government and something that we continue to have for many years to come—that is, to have all of those stakeholders working with government on plans to make sure that Queensland performs well.

We have also provided payroll tax relief and land tax relief and that has been helping. We also have hardship payments especially for people in the hospitality industry because if they are sick they need to stay home and they can use the special pandemic leave that we have put in place. I note that other states have followed our lead on that as well.

On this side of the House our government has a clear plan. We have a path to recovery. We are getting people back into jobs. In fact, easing stage 3 restrictions could mean an additional 50,000 people coming back into the workforce. As cafes and restaurants and tourism and hospitality open up, it gives more opportunity for more people to get back to work and earn a living.

(Time expired)

Coronavirus, Health Response

Ms HOWARD: My question is of the Deputy Premier and Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services. Will the Deputy Premier update the House on how the Palaszczuk government is keeping Queenslanders safe from COVID-19 and is he aware of any other approaches?

Dr MILES: I thank the member for Ipswich for her important question. It is Queensland's strong health response that has allowed us to open up our economy sooner, getting people back into work. Of the 1,071 cases of COVID-19, just 220 in Queensland were locally acquired. The rest came from overseas or interstate. That underlines just how important our border restrictions have been—first, on those who have travelled from China; second, on those who travelled overseas; and, third, in March when we made the difficult decision to close our domestic borders based on the health advice about community transmission, particularly in New South Wales and Victoria.

It is only because of those restrictions that we are able to put in place our plan to unite and recover and get Queensland back to work. It is only because of those ongoing restrictions, particularly on Victorians and those who travel to Victoria, where there are 35 active outbreaks and now, as of today, those who travel through or come from the cities of Liverpool or Campbelltown in New South Wales—it is thanks to that strong response that we have had no recent cases of community transmission.

Can you imagine if we had listened to those opposite and opened our borders and imported cases from Victoria and New South Wales? We would not be talking about our plan to unite and recover. We would be back to square one like they are in Victoria. Those opposite have been a bit quiet on borders today.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Leader of the Opposition, it is completely disorderly to interject when you are not in your seat. You are warned under the standing orders.

Dr MILES: The member for Nanango is not saying much about borders today. Let us remember what she had to say about them last month. On 20 June she said, 'If I were Premier, I would open the border.' On 21 June: 'State borders should be opened.' On 25 June: 'Queensland must open its interstate borders.' On 25 June on Facebook: 'Interstate tourists must be allowed back.' On 25 June in a media release: 'The LNP is demanding that the borders are opened.' On 27 June on Facebook: 'I have been clear in my calls for the borders to reopen.' In fact, 64 times—64 times—those opposite demanded that we let Victorians with COVID into Queensland.

Mr Hunt interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Nicklin.

Dr MILES: Thank God we did not listen to them. Thank God our Premier was strong, took the health advice and kept our borders in place.

Mr Hunt interjected.

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

Dr MILES: As a result of that, we can get Queenslanders back to work.

Mr SPEAKER: Just to be clear, member for Nicklin, you are warned under the standing orders.

Small Business, Grants

Mr POWELL: My question is to the Premier. On 19 May the Premier announced grants for small businesses 'to provide immediate support' but small businesses have had to wait until the end of this month just to find out if their application was successful. Why is the Palaszczuk government so out of touch with the needs of small business that 'immediate support' means waiting months for paperwork and even longer to actually receive help?

Ms PALASZCZUK: Let me say a couple of things. First and foremost, we announced the first tranche of \$200 million to help the small businesses that were being impacted by COVID. Secondly, it is public money and there has to be a process by which applications are processed. Also, as part of the second tranche of \$200 million that I announced, 50 per cent will be dedicated to regional Queensland.

Mr Powell interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Glass House, you are on a warning. You can leave the chamber under standing order 253A for one hour. Members to my left, the Premier is being responsive to the question asked.

Whereupon the honourable member for Glass House withdrew from the chamber at 10.38 am.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am advised that as of yesterday \$51.4 million in small business grants have been approved and \$40.8 million in grants have been paid to businesses. That means that more than three-quarters—79 per cent—of loans that have been approved have hit bank accounts.

The money is getting out the door. Systems had to be put in place because this program did not exist. It is taxpayers' money, and the last thing I want is for there to be any concerns about that. Because the first round was so popular—it opened one week and closed at the end of that week—and because there was so much demand my government invested another \$200 million. As I said very clearly, I want 50 per cent of that to go to regional Queensland. We are earmarking 50 per cent of that money for that purpose.

We know that our small businesses are doing it tough. It is great to see that Queenslanders have supported Queensland businesses during the month of June, and they continued to do that over the school holidays. From reports that I have received from different places around the state, especially out west, tourism bookings have been going extremely well. When I stayed down the coast last week there was not one vacant room in the building where I was at Kirra. On the weekend I had the opportunity to talk to other operators who run a boutique hotel in Brisbane. They were operating between 80 and 90 per cent occupancy as regional Queenslanders come down to Brisbane. The best way we can help small businesses in this state is to go out there and support them as much as we possibly can during this time, and I commend everyone.

The stories I have just mentioned, which are a snapshot of the Gold Coast, Brisbane and out west, are also being replicated across other parts of our state. Why can Queenslanders go out? Because we have had such a strong health response. We had zero new cases overnight. People heard Dr Swan on the radio this morning. There is no community transmission in Queensland—

(Time expired)

Coronavirus, Economic Response

Ms SCANLON: My question is of the Treasurer, Minister for Infrastructure and Planning. Will the Treasurer update the House on how the government is working to support economic recovery in a safe and sustainable way, and is the Treasurer aware of other approaches?

Mr DICK: I thank the member for Gaven for her question. Our economy was travelling very well and was in a strong position prior to COVID-19 with five budget surpluses, exports setting records and 250,000 jobs created in five years.

Mr Hart: What was the debt level?

Mr DICK: I take the interjection from the honourable member about government debt. General government net debt at MYFER was \$7 billion, which is \$5 billion below their LNP friends in New South Wales, \$31 billion below Victoria and \$385 billion less than the Commonwealth government led by Scott Morrison and the coalition. So, member for Burleigh, I would not be talking about debt if I were you.

Mr SPEAKER: Through the chair, member.

Mr DICK: Of course COVID-19 has set us back. The success of our health response has meant that we have been able to move to reopen the economy. We know what the alternative would have been. We know about the risky, hasty and wrong plan of the Leader of the Opposition to open the borders early. The Leader of the Opposition consistently called for the borders to be opened on 1 July. In the 10 days after 1 July there were 1,300 new cases of COVID-19 in Victoria, all of whom would have had a free pass to enter Queensland under the Leader of the Opposition's reckless plan. They were all into it: the member for Burleigh, the member for Surfers Paradise—who was mocking social distancing on the weekend—the member for Broadwater and the member for Everton were all piling on. Sixty-four times the LNP called for the borders to be opened; 64 times they were wrong. Sixty-four times they put

our economy at risk. Sixty-four times they put small business at risk. Sixty-four times they put jobs at risk, and they have never apologised—like they never apologise for anything. Our Premier stood firm. We kept Queensland safe and we protected Queensland because we kept our borders strong.

The Leader of the Opposition's judgement is fundamentally flawed. She was flawed in her judgement when she took on and personally attacked the Premier for her personal conduct. The Leader of the Opposition was wrong when she attacked us for saving Virgin jobs. The Leader of the Opposition was wrong when she went into a supermarket and touched every single product she could put her hands on at the height of COVID, and she was wrong with regard to the LNP president. She cannot sack him and she cannot back him. The Leader of the Opposition is stuck with Dave Hutchinson because she is weak and has no judgement. Most critically of all, the Leader of the Opposition was wrong about Queensland's borders. She was wrong 64 times, and 64 times the Leader of the Opposition put our state at risk. This is a person with no judgement who is unfit to lead Queensland.

Queensland Rail, Staffing

Mr MINNIKIN: My question is to the Premier. Two and a half years after the Palaszczuk government received the Strachan report, last year Queensland Rail paid train crews \$24 million in overtime, an average of \$75,000 every day. With over 200,000 Queenslanders looking for a job and the state's debt approaching \$100 billion, why does the Premier keep in place the union's closed shop for Queensland Rail?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I can get further details for the member in relation to that. I do not have that information at hand.

Let me say that, in relation to our response to COVID, our transport system has responded remarkably well. I really want to pay tribute to the work Queensland Rail workers have done, the extra cleaning they have been doing on the trains, and making sure that our timetable is reflective to allow even more capacity for people to get to and from work and spread out their travelling times. That is not possible in other states. We have seen issues in Melbourne and Sydney in relation to packed public transport as well as the fact that part of their plan was not to travel on public transport during, from memory, stage 1 and stage 2. We have done a great job and I really want to thank everyone who has been working in the transport industry.

In relation to your specific question, I will ask the Minister for Transport to provide me with some further details.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. As per your previous precedents, the Premier has indicated she will get further details. Is the Premier taking that on notice pursuant to—

Ms Palaszczuk: No, I will respond.

Mr BLEIJIE: If I could finish my point of order, Mr Speaker. Will the Premier be taking that on notice pursuant to standing order 113, as is custom in this place?

Mr SPEAKER: No, that is not what the Premier has indicated.

Queen's Wharf

Mr KELLY: My question is of the Minister for State Development, Tourism and Innovation. Will the minister please update the House on the Palaszczuk government's plan to support the private sector to rebuild Queensland's economy?

Ms JONES: I thank the honourable member for the question. I know he understands how important it is that we work not only as a government but also with the private sector during these tough economic times. One of the great things that has happened here in Australia because of our strong response, both as a nation through the national cabinet but also through the Premier and Deputy Premier's leadership here in Queensland, is that we have enabled construction to continue. Imagine how much tougher the recovery of the Queensland economy would be if major projects like Queen's Wharf and Cross River Rail had to be suspended during the coronavirus. It is because of the hard work of workers on the site who have practised social distancing and implemented health advice and health plans that we have been able to get on with construction.

Today I am very pleased to announce that, as part of our plan to unite and recover for Queensland jobs, landscaping arborists and labourers are the latest who will benefit from the \$3.6 billion investment on the Queen's Wharf site.

Ms Grace: It will be gorgeous!

Ms JONES: It is going to be gorgeous; I take that interjection. Today the Destination Brisbane Consortium has announced that a major contract to landscape more than 12 football fields of public space has now gone out to the world to tender. The contract will include 300 trees and close to 20,000 plants to be put back into the CBD, breathing new life into an area that was seen by most of Brisbane as an eyesore. This includes around \$200 million worth of public assets, including the landing, public parks and playgrounds, an outdoor cinema and of course upgrades to the Bicentennial Bikeway, which are delivering huge benefits to bike riders. I was down there last weekend myself, Mr Speaker.

I want to commend all of the workers who have listened to the very clear advice from the Chief Health Officer about social distancing. This stands in stark contrast to the member for Surfers Paradise who has been exposed for being deliberately in contempt of this—in a direct insult to those workers—by flouting the social distancing rules. We have all got a soft spot for the member for Surfers Paradise, but we know he has form. This is the same man who in 2016 used an unparliamentary and inappropriate gesture while the then leader of the opposition was speaking. Of course in 2017 there was his very infamous and inappropriate Instagram post about a female media adviser, which he got the rounds of the kitchen for from his wife. I have done a sign for him—‘Oops! I did it again’.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, Minister.

Ms JONES: The real question is: what is the Leader of the Opposition doing about this? This is a very senior member of her team—one who she purports will be a minister in only a matter of weeks and one who she thinks will lead her government. What is the Leader of the Opposition doing about one of the most senior members of her team deliberately and mockingly flouting the social distancing rules in our state that are keeping Queenslanders safe?

(Time expired)

Youth Crime

Mr JANETZKI: My question without notice is to the Premier. Will the Premier rule out raising the age of criminal responsibility so that young thugs who commit crimes are held accountable for their actions?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for the question. Can I just correct the record? It is \$100 million for each round of the small business grants. I was talking about \$200 million, but it is \$100 million each round.

In relation to the member's question, there are absolutely no plans by this government to raise that age. What the member is probably referring to is the fact that all of the attorneys-general discussed that matter, including your federal Attorney-General—

Mr SPEAKER: Through the chair please, Premier.

Ms PALASZCZUK:—including the federal Attorney-General. That was a national discussion. Let me make it very clear that we have no plans to do that in Queensland.

Cooler Cleaner Schools Program

Mr McCALLUM: My question is to the Minister for Education and Minister for Industrial Relations. Will the minister update the House on the progress of the Palaszczuk government's cooler cleaner schools air-conditioning program and how it has helped Queensland workers unite and recover through COVID-19?

Ms GRACE: I thank the member for Bundamba for his question. I know that he campaigned strongly for the continuation of this program and he has seen many schools in his electorate gain from this. I have more new good news for the House. We are up to 400 schools that have been air-conditioned since we announced this. I repeat: 400 schools. That is completion of not only the 300 that we announced with the Premier but also an additional 100.

There is even better news, because we are not stopping at classrooms; we are doing staffrooms and libraries as well. Every one of those schools, including those that are in the member for Bundamba's electorate, is gaining from this. As well as that, we now have 290 schools with solar panels on their roofs, which is helping with a greener cooler schools program. I have even more news, because 50 additional schools have had contracts awarded for air conditioning to go in and they will be done in the next few weeks and months.

I feel like there is a little bit of desperation coming from those opposite. They are getting so many things wrong at the moment. How could they be so wrong on borders opening? On 64 occasions the Leader of the Opposition and the LNP came out demanding that we open our borders. I will do

something for the Leader of the Opposition. I am going to bake her and Gladys Berejiklian a beautiful big humble pie and they can share it together because honestly that is what they are eating at the moment—a big lot of humble pie.

I now move to the member for Kawana, who is desperate to raise the LNP's program on air conditioning. What is he doing? He is going out and standing in front of schools and talking about his air-conditioning program. He actually stood in front of three schools but, needless to say, two of them were already air-conditioned. Two of them had already been done and one of them actually happened to be in his own electorate—that is, the Currimundi State School. He did not even know that his own school had already been fully air-conditioned. That is unbelievable, but as the song goes, 'Two out of three ain't bad'.

He went to Bribie Island with the mayor for St George and there they were standing in front of a school, but had he gone to the Banksia Beach State School he would have got the trifecta because that one has been air-conditioned as well. Honestly, we are hearing nothing but desperate stakes from those opposite. They are getting everything wrong. The Palaszczuk Labor government is delivering in all the schools. There have been 400 schools done by the Palaszczuk Labor government.

(Time expired)

Members of Parliament, Remuneration

Ms BOLTON: My question without notice is to the Premier. Would the Premier please advise if there has been any response from the request to the Queensland Independent Remuneration Tribunal to accommodate the freezing of MP wages and whether consideration is being made for MP wage contributions to assist their communities during COVID-19?

Ms PALASZCZUK: On the wages, yes, I have written to the Independent Remuneration Tribunal. I will double-check whether there has been a response back. As soon as the legislation was passed, I wrote again. They were waiting for the legislation, and I am waiting to hear back. We will look at that recommendation from them and I will advise the House.

Gold Coast, Road and Transport Infrastructure

Mrs McMAHON: My question is to the Minister for Transport and Main Roads. Will the minister update the House on the progress of the Palaszczuk government's delivery of major roads and transport projects on the Gold Coast?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the member for Macalister for her question. She is a strong advocate for roads and M1 upgrades. What we have seen is that economies around the world, including Queensland, have taken a hit because of the COVID crisis. We have not been immune, but we do have a plan for Queensland jobs to unite and recover from that.

On top of that, we have got major investments happening on the Gold Coast. There are huge infrastructure investments by this government after not a single new dollar went into the M1 under those opposite in the three years they were in power. I am happy to report that the billion dollar M1 upgrade from Varsity Lakes to Tugun is underway. The landscape has changed massively down there. The early works on the light rail from Broadbeach to Burleigh is underway. A business case for the Coomera Connector is going after we gazetted it. We are getting on with heading in that direction after it was stopped by those opposite. Cross River Rail stations are coming for the Gold Coast.

Of course, we have completed the M1 upgrade. That is already done. The \$200 million M1 upgrade from Mudgeeraba to Varsity Lakes was done under the Palaszczuk Labor government because we care about jobs and we care about infrastructure for the Gold Coast. We actually get it done, unlike those opposite who ignored the Gold Coast for the three years they were in. Not a single new dollar went on the M1 in that entire time.

I am glad to report to the House that we have got a growing fan base for the Palaszczuk government's investments in roads on the Gold Coast and transport infrastructure. We saw the member for Bonney try to come along to the launch of stage 3 of the light rail to Burleigh. He tried to muscle in for the credit there, despite being in opposition and not part of the government. We saw the members for Mudgeeraba and Burleigh on the M1 trying to take credit for our upgrades after they did nothing when they were in government. They were trying to take credit for the work of the Palaszczuk Labor government. I have a new one, and this is an absolute corker. In May this year we saw the member for Mudgeeraba put out a flyer in her electorate claiming a \$3 million upgrade in her electorate. She was claiming credit in May. I table that.

Tabled paper: Flyer, undated, by the member for Mudgeeraba, Ms Ros Bates MP, titled 'People Power delivers \$3 million upgrade to Worongary Road' [\[1140\]](#).

However, in June, the next month, she wrote to my department and said—

As the local Member I would like to know ...

1. Has this funding been allocated—

Ms Bates interjected.

Mr BAILEY: She wrote to her electorate claiming credit for the funding when she actually did not know whether the funding had been allocated. I table that.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 4 June 2020, from the member for Mudgeeraba, Ms Ros Bates MP, to the Regional Director, South Coast, Department of Transport and Main Roads, Mr Paul Noonan, regarding the Mudgeeraba-Advancetown Road (Worongary Road) upgrade [1132].

Ms Bates interjected.

Mr BAILEY: She can interject all she likes.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I cannot hear the minister speak.

Mr SPEAKER: The member for Mudgeeraba will cease her interjections, but I appreciate the fact that there is a great deal of provocation.

Mr BAILEY: The member for Mudgeeraba ignored the M1 for three years when she was in power. We are getting it done. There she was out there claiming credit for our funding of roads, and then the next month she was writing to me asking me if this had been the case. That is smoke and mirrors from the LNP. This is political games and political grandstanding, but they do not invest in roads. They cut, they sack and they sell. That is what they did last time and that is what they would do again.

(Time expired)

Mr Bailey: That one hurt, didn't it?

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, Minister.

Crime and Corruption Commission, Report

Mr BLEIJIE: My question without notice is to the Minister for Education. The Crime and Corruption Commission found serious cultural problems inside the minister's department, including silent obedience to wrongdoing, unethical acts, corruption risks, arguably dishonest behaviour, deleted emails, falsified documents and a failure to be accountable and transparent. Does the minister take responsibility for these actions in her department under her watch and will she do the honourable thing and resign?

Ms GRACE: The answer to the second part of the question is no. I noticed the member for Kawana showed that document as a prop, which, Mr Speaker, is not what you do in this House. I notice it is all colour coded and marked et cetera. However, if he read that report he would find that I have been completely and utterly cleared by the CCC. Why someone would want to resign when they have been completely cleared is beyond me.

I say to the member for Kawana that the report is there to read. The member for South Brisbane and I have been cleared by the CCC. The matters are now with the Public Service Commissioner and I will let the Public Service Commissioner do their job, as he should.

Law and Order

Mr HARPER: My question is of the Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services. Will the minister update the House on how the Palaszczuk government is keeping Queenslanders safe?

Mr RYAN: I thank the member for Thuringowa for the question and for a great visit last week when we were able to catch up with the local police and the local community. We were able to hear all the good work that is happening within that community with the police and of course the Palaszczuk government. We are doing some great things when it comes to being serious about youth offenders and holding young people to account and breaking that cycle of criminal offending.

That is why we announced in March this year a five-point action plan, which is already delivering results. In terms of tougher action and a police blitz on bail, I have to say we were successful in another two appeals on bail just yesterday. Another two appeals were successfully carried out by police prosecutors. That is a 100 per cent strike rate when it comes to appealing bail conditions. Our police prosecutors are doing a great job.

Our police strike teams are rolling out right across the state and delivering great outcomes. Anecdotally, we heard from people in Townsville about the difference that those strike teams are making. On the subject of culture based rehabilitation for First Nation peoples, again, we are rolling those out right across the state, and I acknowledge the great work done by Minister Farmer and her department in rolling out those programs. There is also \$2 million for community based organisations to work on grassroots solutions.

As I said, we are already seeing results on the ground. Anecdotally, we are hearing from police and youth justice workers that our strategy is working. They are having great success targeting and prosecuting young offenders. We know that it is a complex issue and we will continue to work hard to ensure that we hold young people to account and we break the cycle of criminal offending.

Mr Mickelberg interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The member for Buderim will cease his interjections.

Mr RYAN: That is why it is baffling to see that the LNP were dusting off Campbell Newman's playbook last week. We always knew that the Leader of the Opposition was very proud to be the apprentice to Campbell Newman, but we never thought she would stoop so low as to steal his homework. She has stolen everything from Campbell Newman except the pink jumpsuits, but let us wait and see what comes of that.

What did some of the key stakeholders say? The Police Union said that the plan is sketchy and that some of the details sound like they are straight out of Campbell Newman's era. That is because the plan is straight out of Campbell Newman's era. They have rebranded their boot camps as remote farms, a policy so bad an LNP dominated parliamentary committee trashed it. However, the Leader of the Opposition cannot maintain the same position from day one when it comes to that plan. When asked by a journalist, 'How would you staff these facilities and what experience would they have?', she said, 'With people.' The journalist said, 'With what kind of professional experience?' She said, 'Someone that is experienced, with real-life experience,' and, 'You know, they might be someone who might like to teach fencing.' Now she wants to give them swords!

(Time expired)

Crime and Corruption Commission, Report

Mrs WILSON: My question is to the Premier. The Crime and Corruption Commission found unethical behaviour, corruption risk, deleted emails, arguably dishonest acts, eroded integrity and a failure to be accountable and transparent in the education department. Why has the Premier washed her hands, leaving it to others to clean up the corruption risk exposed by the CCC investigation into the Inner City South State Secondary College principal recruitment affair?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Pumicestone for the question. My understanding is that the CCC has provided a report and other evidence it gathered to the Public Service Commissioner so that it may consider whether disciplinary action is appropriate against any Public Service officer. That is a fact. Secondly, the Public Service Commissioner is considering the CCC report and it would not be appropriate to comment further at this stage in order to comply with the requirements of the Crime and Corruption Act 2001 and the Public Service Act 2008 and principles of natural justice.

Small Business

Ms PUGH: My question is of the Minister for Employment and Small Business and Minister for Training and Skills Development. Will the minister update the House on the support that is available for small businesses as we recover, and is the minister aware of any other approaches?

Ms FENTIMAN: I thank the member for Mount Ommaney for the question. She is a tremendous advocate for small businesses in her electorate and understands the challenges they face having worked in small businesses before entering parliament.

We know that our small businesses have been doing it incredibly tough. That is why I am so incredibly proud of the support that we have provided for small businesses. We are the only state in the country that, on top of \$200 million in small business grants, has also offered a billion dollars in no-interest loans. We have had electricity rebates. We have had payroll tax relief. We have provided online, free skills training for our small businesses. So far we have had over 18,000 enrolments in our free online TAFE courses, which include wonderful skills for our small businesses such as digital literacy and data security.

While we have been singularly focused on the economic recovery and supporting our small businesses because we have managed the health crisis so well, it is clear that those opposite have no plan for Queensland's economic recovery. Those opposite cannot even follow basic health advice from our Chief Health Officer.

Of course, last time we were in this chamber the Leader of the Opposition was saying, 'Open the borders, open the borders.' She said it 64 times. She would not be able to follow health advice, and we know that her team is unable to follow health advice, whether it is going to the shopping centre and picking up all the things and putting them back again, whether it is not social distancing at street parties in Toowoomba or whether it is completely flouting social distancing laws in social media posts. Not only are those opposite completely unable to follow basic health advice; they are also unable to actually pay respect to our hardworking public servants and the Chief Health Officer. When it was clear they could not follow her advice, the member for Everton criticised the Chief Health Officer, calling her advice inconsistent. The member for Broadwater went so far as to call Jeannette Young, our hardworking Chief Health Officer, power hungry. The member for Broadwater knows all about that.

Those opposite are completely unable to follow any health advice. Imagine what would happen if the LNP were in power. They have been completely consistent in criticising our Premier and those on this side of the House for following health advice and for making sure that Queenslanders' health comes first by being firm on the borders. We are following basic health advice like social distancing.

We have a plan for Queensland's economic recovery. We are backing small businesses. We are investing in futureproofing infrastructure like schools. Those opposite have no plan and are unable to follow the advice.

(Time expired)

Coronavirus, Hotel Quarantine

Ms BATES: My question without notice is to the Premier. All travellers entering Queensland from overseas must quarantine at their expense in a hotel. However, it has been reported that celebrity Dannii Minogue has been granted an exemption to quarantine in a private home. Will the Premier explain why there is one rule for celebrities and another one for everyone else?

Ms PALASZCZUK: If the member for Mudgeeraba had listened to the press conference of the Deputy Premier and Dr Young, she would know that Dr Young went through that in quite some detail. The fact is that industry groups have COVID-safe plans that must be adhered to whereby I understand that the person is responsible for the payment of their security and testing. This is not dissimilar to what is done, for example, with the ADF, the Consular Corps and the mining and gas industry. The Chief Health Officer discussed that at length today at the press conference. I am happy to provide the member with a transcript.

Agriculture and Fisheries Industries, Exports

Mr SAUNDERS: My question is to the Minister for Agricultural Industry Development and Fisheries. Will the minister update the House on actions taken by the Palaszczuk government to promote Queensland exports?

Mr FURNER: I thank the member for Maryborough for his question and for his ongoing support for the fisheries sector, both recreational and commercial. The Palaszczuk government's \$500,000 Market Diversification and Resilience Grants program supports businesses to purchase equipment with grants up to \$7,500 and to have projects backed in with this grant for up to \$50,000. Over the next 18 months, this program will assist Queensland's agriculture and fisheries exporters become more resilient as they diversify into new markets. Businesses co-invest 50 per cent of the total cost of equipment purchases and project activities. With strong program interest, over 100 applications have been received for equipment and over 50 applications received for the project grants.

Today I am proud to announce five successful Queensland businesses—businesses like Ocean Pacific Seafoods, based in Bundaberg port, that has been operating for over 25 years. This exporting and wholesale spanner crab business was highly reliant on the export markets of China and Taiwan. Approximately 55 per cent of its catch was exported. The business is now shifting its focus from whole frozen products to live crab for a much higher margin.

Tuna Australia, a not-for-profit formed in 2016, represents the statutory fishing rights of owners, holders and fish processors and sellers of the Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery. These fishers will benefit from the funding to develop a road map for premium tuna products for domestic and export markets.

Over the coming weeks I will be highlighting some of the businesses that have benefited from this program. The tremendous success of the MDRG program is due to the support of Queensland agricultural businesses in assisting them to better understand new markets. This program assists growers to achieve sustainable long-term growth, in turn driving regional economy growth and jobs through export opportunities and also to innovate and grow. As we unite and recover from the COVID-19 pandemic, these exciting new ventures will lead to a brighter export future. The Palaszczuk government is always proud to stand shoulder to shoulder with businesses as we create jobs and trade.

I had the pleasure of personally calling the successful applicants. Overwhelmingly, they thanked the Palaszczuk government for its support in creating and supporting jobs and for the resilience that this Palaszczuk government has provided not only through this pandemic but before this pandemic hit in terms of its ongoing support for the economy and the agriculture sector. This will be a pillar as we come out of COVID-19 now and into the future. It is about growth for the resilience of this industry.

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Integrity

Mr MICKELBERG: My question without notice is to the Premier. The standards displayed by this government are the actions of the Premier's former chief of staff David Barbagallo, the member for South Brisbane and the Minister for Employment holidaying with a government contractor for free, just to name a few. Does the Premier understand that the standard that she walks past is the standard that she accepts?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I expect the highest standards of this government. The standards that those on the other side accepted were rejected by the Queensland public. Those standards included the sacking of workers when there was no COVID pandemic. The standards of this government in terms of responding to the COVID pandemic I believe have been—

Mrs Wilson: Don't hide behind that.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am sorry; it is a worldwide pandemic, member for Pumicestone. The member for Pumicestone is part of an opposition that called for the borders to be opened.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members to my left!

Mr Mickelberg interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Buderim!

Ms PALASZCZUK: We debated in this House at the last sitting to open the borders. Heaven knows what would have happened if we had accepted the advice of those opposite. Thank God I did not.

Mrs Gerber interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The member for Currumbin will cease her interjections.

Ms Bates interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I do not know what is wrong with the member for Mudgeeraba today; it is like a broken record.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The members for Mudgeeraba, Burleigh and Buderim are warned under the standing orders.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I expect everyone on this side of the House and on my team to be focused on the health response and the economic recovery that has stood Queensland in good stead in terms of protecting the health of Queenslanders and fundamentally getting people back into work. The standard on this side is our record of getting people into work—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock.

Ms PALASZCZUK:—and the record on your side is—

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, resume your seat. Member for—

Mr Mickelberg interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Buderim, you know the routine—sadly. You can leave the chamber, under standing order 253A, for one hour.

Whereupon the honourable member for Buderim withdrew from the chamber at 11.15 am.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is the standard that we on this side of the House do not accept.

Ms Grace interjected.

Ms Leahy interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The members for McConnel and Warrego are warned under the standing orders. The period for question time has expired.

MOTION

Business Program



Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (11.16 am): 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 Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill and the Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill, a maximum of 2.5 hours to complete all stages;
 - (b) the Building Industry Fairness (Security of Payment) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, a maximum of 3.5 hours to complete all stages;
 - (c) the Corrective Services and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, a maximum of 3.5 hours to complete all stages;
 - (d) the Ministerial and Other Office Holder Staff and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, a maximum of one hour to complete all stages.
2. The following time limits for the bills listed in 1. apply:
 - (a) consideration in detail to be completed by three minutes before the expiry of the maximum hours;
 - (b) question on third reading to be put by two minutes before the expiry of the maximum hours;
 - (c) question on long title to be put by one minute before the expiry of the maximum hours.
3. If the nominated stage of each bill has not been completed by the allocated time specified in 2., or by 5.55 pm on Thursday, 16 July 2020, Mr Speaker:
 - (a) shall call on a minister to table any explanatory notes to their circulated amendments, any statement of compatibility with human rights or any statement relating to an override declaration;
 - (b) shall put all remaining questions necessary to either pass that stage or pass the bill without further debate;
 - (c) may interrupt non-specified business or debate on a bill or motion to complete the requirements of the motion;
 - (d) will complete all stages required by this motion notwithstanding anything contained in standing and sessional orders.

I thank the members of the Business Committee for their attendance at the meeting last night. I do not think I would be verballing the Manager of Opposition Business in saying that there will be strong opposition to this motion. That was expressed at the meeting last night and certainly has continued to be expressed for the entire time the business program has been in place. Although those opposite are critical about this system, the fact is that the figures show time and again that more bills are debated, more members are speaking and more time is being spent speaking on bills. This is a positive thing for all Queenslanders.

We know that there is much business to be done in this House and that, due to COVID and the restrictions that had to be put in place for a period of time, this House was not able to deal with general government business while we dealt with urgent COVID legislation. We now have important bills that we seek to finalise. There are nine sitting days between now and the election. We want to make sure that these important pieces of legislation are debated by members in this House. That is why this week we will be debating the Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill as well as the Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill, which earlier I moved a motion to cognate. We also will be debating the Building Industry Fairness (Security of Payment) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, the Corrective Services and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the Ministerial and Other Office Holder Staff and Other Legislation Amendment Bill.


Despite the comments made by the Manager of Opposition Business in the Business Committee meeting last night, I hope that in the last two sitting weeks we can come together and genuinely have a discussion about how these matters are progressed. I have said this before and I will say it again: we should not need to allocate set time for any of these bills. The way that the business program operates

in Victoria—it has successfully operated for more than a decade—is that the bills are listed and whatever is not completed by the end of the sitting week is put. They do not have a situation where they spend the entire week on one bill and the remainder of the bills have to be put en bloc. They actually regulate and manage themselves. Members put their names down to speak to the bills they are genuinely interested in debating. That is the way this House used to operate. You would see a short list of speakers on a purely technical, simple bill and for more complex bills a lot more members would put their names down to speak. That is not the case anymore.

What we see are very long lists of every single member in the opposition putting their names down on the list. We have also seen the habit of those opposite circulating the committee report and just verbatim reading out of the committee report because they have nothing else to say to the bill because they actually have not read it, but they have been told to stand up and speak to these bills because they are trying to prove a point. But what is the point? That they know how to waste time? Yes, members have the right to speak, but it has never been the case that everyone has the right to speak on absolutely everything for as long as they want.

There are rules and standing orders in place in this parliament, like every other parliament. When it comes to our actual sitting hours, we were one of the last jurisdictions in the country to have fixed sitting times. The general public thought it was absurd that we were still debating important legislation at three o'clock in the morning and it believes the hours are sensible and that we can debate these bills within those time frames if we work cooperatively together. On that basis, I would welcome the support of the opposition for this motion today. I look forward to hearing the Leader of the Opposition's contribution.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Before I call the member for Kawana, members, I just wish to remind those people who have already been given warnings. They are the members for Kawana, Everton, Nanango, Nicklin, Burleigh, Mudgeeraba, McConnel and Warrego.

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (11.20 am): The Leader of the House may look forward to some time in the future getting agreement and support for this motion, but I can tell her that it is never going to happen. It is never going to happen because of the arrogance we saw displayed in the last sitting particularly. It led me to last night telephone in to the Business Committee meeting and essentially say, 'All bets are off.' The government will do what it needs to do for the next nine sitting days until the election. We will do what we need to do. We are not going to consult. We are not going to cooperate. We are not going to negotiate any bills because what the government wants the government has always got through this business program motion.

The Leader of the House talks about the other jurisdictions. There is a fundamental difference between the other jurisdictions and this House: they have a second House. They have an upper house. They have a Legislative Council. When bills get debated through a committee and this House, that is it. It is done. The government has the majority. It is its way. In those other jurisdictions that the Leader of the House talks about, they then have a second form of accountability, and that is the Legislative Council. So it is not the same situation. In the meeting last night the Leader of the House asked, 'What's your advice on how many hours we should be debating it?' I said, 'I don't care. I don't care anymore how many hours you're going to debate it because whatever I say doesn't mean jack. It doesn't mean jack,' because we had a contribution last week—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order! Pause the clock please. Member for Kawana, I deem that to be unparliamentary language. I ask you to withdraw.

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw. Mr Deputy Speaker, thank you for your guidance.

Mr Nicholls: He mentioned Dempsey!

Mr BLEIJIE: My good friend Mr Dempsey; yes, exactly. At our last sitting the Minister for Education rose in this place and moved 170 pages of amendments without notice. I was told at that Business Committee meeting that there would be an amendment to the Ekka show holiday, and I suspect that the Ekka show holiday did not take 170 pages of amendments. That is what we got. In the last sitting the Leader of the House got up and introduced hundreds of amendments to her own legislation, but she still wants everyone to believe that we are all this one, big happy family and we are all negotiating and it is cooperative. It is not, and I can tell the members of the public that the government is not cooperating. What the government wants the government is getting and the Independents, the crossbench and the opposition are not having any worthwhile input into those discussions because the government will not allow it. The government will not even allow time for amendments to be moved by the opposition to important bills like the electoral bill last week.

We have seen a sitting week cut from this year. This week five bills are being debated. Last night we found out that we are now going to have two of the bills cognated. We have already started the debate on the disability parking bill. After having that debate started, we are now cognating the debate. Did the government just wake up yesterday morning and say, 'Geez, we've only got nine days sittings. We've got to cram it all in'? We are going to debate five bills this week. I suspect that is a record for this government—five bills in one week—but of course it can only do it by curtailing the time limits and guillotining all of the debates. As I raised yesterday in the meeting, we have issues with the CCC report into the school principal appointment process of the Inner City South State Secondary College. I wanted a separate motion of debate on that this week. I raised that in the meeting yesterday. Do members think the government gave us that opportunity out of government business? No, it was rejected. This rouse that this Business Committee is a happy place where we can all get together and work on these things for the benefit of Queenslanders is wrong.

I said in that Business Committee meeting that the only way we are going to fix it is to have an LNP government elected and we will work harder after 31 October. We will sit later and we will work harder because that is what we are paid to do. Members of the Queensland public are not worried about 2 am sittings; they are worried about the lazy Labor government which they have at the moment. Why are we not this week having time set aside to debate the member for Redlands where we have members of the Redlands branch of the ALP writing to the CCC about fraud and donation fraud? Why are we not debating those important issues this week?

The former treasurer of the Redlands Labor Party branch has written to the CCC saying that there are inconsistencies with donations and functions that were organised. Why are we not debating all of those important issues this week? Why are we not debating separately the Crime and Corruption Commission report that found unbelievable unethical behaviour in the Department of Education—cultural issues, corruption risks? Why are we not debating those separately this week? I will tell members why. Because the government does not want to talk about any of those issues. It does not want to talk about those issues, yet those issues—corruption risks in the education department—I would suspect are pretty important to the people of Queensland.

Who could forget last sitting when the Premier was on her feet talking about the electoral laws and she was guillotined by her own motion? The Speaker had to sit the Premier down and the Premier stood there like a deer in the headlights thinking, 'What's going on? I'm on my feet. How dare anyone stop me speaking. I'm the Premier!' It was the Premier's government's own motion that stopped the Premier from allowing her—denied the Premier—the opportunity to speak on her own government's bill, and she stood here wondering what on earth had happened. Oops!

Mr Mander: She didn't realise there were limits.

Mr BLEIJIE: She did not realise. Did the Premier not realise there were limits—government limits—on her own bills? This is the arrogance and weak leadership of the Palaszczuk Labor government we have seen.

(Time expired)




Hon. MC BAILEY (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (11.26 am): This is the usual amateur thespian waste of time by the member for Kawana. He gets up here and trots out the same speech every time. He wastes the time of this parliament that we could be using in debate. He is clearly not across his brief. The meeting last night started off with him saying that a cognate debate on the transport bills would mean that people who had spoken could not speak again and it would deny people their right. That was quickly admonished by the Clerk, so the member for Kawana is not even aware of basic standing orders. He is very good at amateur thespian theatrical little efforts in this place, but when it comes to it he really does not know what his job is. He is not very effective at it.

This parliament is focused on the bills and the business that we need to be. We are not here to run a parliamentary agenda that is geared around an opposition's desire to make headlines and desire to look at issues. Those opposite have ample opportunity to raise issues in all kinds of ways—matters of public importance, adjournments. There are a lot of different mechanisms for members of the opposition to get their points across, but this is the normal way of business for many parliaments throughout many jurisdictions. We have modernised the standing orders to ensure that that is the case.

We are saving members of the opposition who turned up at 2.45 in the morning in all states of dress from themselves—some of them already asleep before the parliament had even closed. We are saving them from themselves. We do not get any credit for that from them, but that is okay. I can roll with that. What we see is the same old speech from the same old member for Kawana who does not

know what he is talking about and the opposition trying to position itself, as oppositions do, before an election. Good luck to it, but it is pretty tedious and I absolutely endorse the Leader of the House's motion. It is sensible and we need to get on with business.

 **Mr MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11.28 am): I rise to speak on this motion once again. What I have said often during this debate that we have had through this whole parliament is what we have been missing since the government changed the standing orders. One of the things that is missing now from an opposition's point of view is an opportunity to respond to things that are said. For example, in ministerial statements we had the opportunity in a previous parliament to respond with three-minute speeches or five-minute speeches. I cannot remember what it was, but there was an opportunity. Today there were issues that needed to be responded to and we require time allocated in the agenda of the parliament to be able to do that.

The classic one today is the talk about borders. We are very, very open and proud to talk about our debate on borders.

Government members interjected.

Mr MANDER: I will take the interjections from the government because we did mention 64 times that the borders should be opened as per the program that the Premier originally put out. What did the Premier do? The Premier listened to our advice—eventually. The Premier listened to our advice and opened the borders on 10 July as their business principles actually stated. What did the opposition respond to? The opposition responded to the uncertainty that the Premier brought to this state by talking about the borders reopening in September or maybe beyond. That is what we responded to. The Premier eventually heeded our advice. The Premier eventually stuck to her original plan that she abandoned for a number of weeks causing incredible angst in our community, particularly the business community.

What happened in the days leading up to that announcement? The day before the Premier made the announcement to stick with the 10 July date, the Minister for Main Roads said it would be irresponsible to open up the borders. The Treasurer said the same thing a few days beforehand. The Minister for Health said the same thing a few days beforehand. The coup de grace was the whip who on the day the announcement was made was reported on the front page of his local paper saying that it would be irresponsible to open up the borders now. He did not get the memo, because this Premier consults with nobody whatsoever.

Mr BAILEY: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member may be trying to get away from the fact that he wanted the borders open to Victoria, but that was not the point. He is misrepresenting words being said in this place and I ask him to withdraw.

Mr MANDER: Write to the Premier!

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order! Member for Everton, we do not need your comments. Member for Everton, the member for Miller has taken offence. I ask you to withdraw.

Mr MANDER: Can you clarify that? Did he take offence?

Mr BAILEY: Absolutely. The honourable member misrepresented what I had said. I take personal offence to that.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Miller. He has asked you to withdraw.

Mr MANDER: I withdraw.

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

Mr MANDER: Oh, here we go. Up you come.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Everton, before you make any further comments I remind you that you are warned under the standing orders.

Mr BROWN: I take personal offence and ask the member to withdraw.

Mr MANDER: I withdraw. I wonder what that was on the front page of the *Redland City Bulletin*. I thought it was a picture of the member for Capalaba. I thought I read the statement below that said—

Mrs D'ATH: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. We are debating the business program motion before the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Everton, I was just about to interrupt you and ask you to come back to the motion. Can you please take my guidance.

Mr MANDER: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. The point I was making is what has changed since the last parliament. With the changing of standing orders and the fact that debate needs to be truncated, it eliminates our opportunity to do what we could do in the previous parliament where we had speeches to be able to respond to the ministerial statements. That was one example, the borders. The other one this morning was when the Treasurer talked about his so-called economic recovery plan. This Treasurer can now be known as the Sergeant Schultz of the Queensland parliament because he knows nothing. He knows no details whatsoever. He was an embarrassment during the week in making that so-called economic statement.

Mr DICK: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I am happy to debate the economic statement. I thought this was about the business program motion before the House.

Mr Minnikin: What is your point of order?

Mr DICK: Thank you, member for Chatsworth, for your advice. Two points: relevance and, secondly, I take personal offence at the words used by the member for Everton and I ask him to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Everton, the Treasurer has taken offence. I ask you to withdraw.

Mr MANDER: I withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: And move on to the business motion.

Mr MANDER: As I said, there are so many things to be talked about.

An honourable member interjected.

Mr MANDER: I will mention that a bit later on this afternoon when I will get an opportunity through matters of public interest. It is astonishing that this government has not allowed the opposition the opportunities to debate those issues that concern Queenslanders so much. Over the last two and a half years of this parliament we have not been given opportunities to talk about substantial shortcomings in this government, whether it is economic management, whether it is integrity, whether it is a lack of a plan for the future, whether it is all the failures with regards to service delivery, whether it is in public transport, whether it is in health, whether it is in education, whether it is in crime and law and order. All those things warrant and deserve extra time given to the opposition to be able to keep this government accountable. Thankfully 31 October is now only 109 days away. We cannot wait for that day of reckoning.

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

AYES, 44:

ALP, 44—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Miles, Mullen, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszczyk, Pease, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

NOES, 39:

LNP, 34—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Gerber, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McDonald, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Pairs: Lauga, Last; Mellish, Boyce; Pegg, McArdle.

Resolved in the affirmative.

QUEENSLAND FUTURE FUND BILL

Message from Governor



Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Treasurer, Minister for Infrastructure and Planning) (11.40 am): I present a message from His Excellency the Governor.

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

MESSAGE

QUEENSLAND FUTURE FUND BILL 2020

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 establish a fund for reducing the State's debt, and to amend this Act, the Financial Accountability Act 2009 and the Superannuation (State Public Sector) Act 1990 for particular purposes

GOVERNOR

Date: 14 July 2020

Tabled paper: Message, dated 14 July 2020, from His Excellency the Governor, recommending the Queensland Future Fund Bill 2020 [\[1133\]](#).

Introduction

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Treasurer, Minister for Infrastructure and Planning) (11.41 am): I present a bill for an act to establish a fund for reducing the state's debt, and to amend this act, the Financial Accountability Act 2009 and the Superannuation (State Public Sector) Act 1990 for particular purposes. I table the bill, the explanatory notes and a statement of compatibility with human rights. I nominate the Economics and Governance Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Queensland Future Fund Bill 2020 [\[1134\]](#).

Tabled paper: Queensland Future Fund Bill 2020, explanatory notes [\[1135\]](#).

Tabled paper: Queensland Future Fund Bill 2020, statement of compatibility with human rights [\[1136\]](#).

While we are in very uncertain times as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic continues to unfold, this government is determined to continue to deliver on its commitments. The Queensland Future Fund Bill 2020 delivers on two government commitments. First, the bill delivers on the government's commitment to establish a Queensland Future Fund. Second, the bill delivers on the government's commitment to provide a legislated guarantee that the state's defined benefit superannuation liabilities will remain fully funded.

To support Queensland's current economic plan and the state's future economic success, the 2019-20 Mid Year Fiscal and Economic Review announced the establishment of a Queensland Future Fund. This fund will be vital in helping Queensland navigate through these uncertain times. The Future Fund will provide funding to assist in reducing state debt. The bill will ring fence the Future Fund so withdrawals can only be used to reduce the state's borrowings and pay administrative expenses associated with its establishment and operation. Ring fencing will be achieved by establishing the Future Fund as a special purpose account, separate to the consolidated fund and departmental accounts. The Future Fund will be administered by me as the Treasurer and set up by my department.

Setting up this special purpose account will require amendments to the Financial Accountability Act 2009 as such accounts are not currently provided for in this act. This bill will provide for the transparency, openness and accountability of any Future Fund movements, including deposits and withdrawals from the fund. These movements will be recorded and disclosed in Treasury's audited financial statements that form part of Treasury's annual report, which I table in this House. In addition, the bill will ensure all interest and investment returns from investments held in the Future Fund will be returned to the fund and quarantined to reduce debt.

One of the most significant provisions of the bill is the manner in which it strengthens the public ownership of our strategic assets. In requiring that public assets transferred into the Future Fund can only be owned by a state entity, the bill adds a further legislative protection to ensure that public assets remain in public hands. The purpose of the Future Fund is to ensure that the Queensland people get maximum benefit from the assets they own. This bill puts the strength of the state's balance sheet, including the fact that we have Australia's only fully funded defined benefit superannuation scheme, to work for the Queensland people.

It is important to note that the utilisation of these assets in the debt-reducing Future Fund is only possible because the government has retained them in public hands. Under the LNP's discredited Strong Choices agenda, these assets would have been privatised, delivering a one-off sugar hit to the

budget that, once eroded, would have been lost forever. Under this bill, these assets will continue to deliver a dividend year after year that will be fully allocated to reduce state debt. Further, because the assets in the Future Fund can only be utilised for debt reduction, ratings agencies will accept the book value of the assets as a direct offset to debt. In other words, Queensland will harvest the financial benefit of the assets being transferred to the fund, whilst retaining public ownership and the ongoing dividends of the investment returns generated by the fund.

While the government is implementing all possible measures to mitigate the health impacts and economic fallout from the COVID-19 pandemic, this bill demonstrates that the government is also planning for the future—a future when our economy recovers from the current crisis. The government has a strong plan, a credible strategy and a solid commitment to reduce the state's debt burden.

Under existing superannuation legislation, the government already guarantees underlying benefits payable to defined benefit members. However, in line with a government commitment to provide a guarantee that the state's defined benefit liabilities will continue to be fully funded, an amendment to the Superannuation (State Public Sector) Act 1990 will be made to require the state to hold assets at least equal in value to the state's accrued defined benefit liabilities, measured at least once every three years.

In summary, this bill will provide the government the opportunity to ensure the defined benefit superannuation liabilities are guaranteed to remain fully funded. At the same time, we are creating a fund to deliver a measured and responsible plan to address the state's debt. It will help us prepare for the future and assist us with recovery following COVID-19. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Treasurer, Minister for Infrastructure and Planning) (11.46 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.

Declared Urgent; Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Treasurer, Minister for Infrastructure and Planning) (11.46 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

That, under the provisions of standing order 137, the Queensland Future Fund Bill be declared an urgent bill and the Economics and Governance Committee report to the House on the bill by 7 August 2020.

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

AYES, 45:

ALP, 44—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Miles, Mullen, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszcuk, Pease, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

NOES, 38:

LNP, 34—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Gerber, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Pairs: Lauga, Last; Mellish, Boyce; Pegg, McArdle.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Referral to Economics and Governance Committee

Mr SPEAKER: In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Economics and Governance Committee.

NATURE CONSERVATION AND OTHER LEGISLATION (INDIGENOUS JOINT MANAGEMENT—MORETON ISLAND) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction



Hon. SM FENTIMAN (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Small Business and Minister for Training and Skills Development) (11.53 am): I present a bill for an act to amend the Aboriginal Land Act 1991, the Nature Conservation Act 1992, the Recreation Areas Management Act 2006 and the Torres Strait Islander Land Act 1991 for particular purposes. I table the bill, the explanatory notes and a statement of compatibility with human rights. I nominate the Natural Resources, Agricultural Industry Development and Environment Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Nature Conservation and Other Legislation (Indigenous Joint Management—Moreton Island) Amendment Bill 2020 [1137].

Tabled paper: Nature Conservation and Other Legislation (Indigenous Joint Management—Moreton Island) Amendment Bill 2020, explanatory notes [1138].

Tabled paper: Nature Conservation and Other Legislation (Indigenous Joint Management—Moreton Island) Amendment Bill 2020, statement of compatibility with human rights [1139].

I am pleased to introduce the Nature Conservation and Other Legislation (Indigenous Joint Management—Moreton Island) Amendment Bill 2020. On 27 November 2019, the Federal Court of Australia made a native title consent determination recognising the Quandamooka people's native title rights on Moreton Island, or Mulgumpin as it is known to the Quandamooka people. As part of the consent determination process, a number of settlement outcomes were negotiated between the state of Queensland and representatives of the Quandamooka people. These are recorded in the Quandamooka people 10-year resolution Indigenous land use agreement for Mulgumpin which was registered with the National Native Title Tribunal on 29 May 2020.

The bill will amend the Aboriginal Land Act 1991, the Nature Conservation Act 1992 and the Recreation Areas Management Act 2006 to allow this government to meet the commitments it has made to work towards the joint management of protected areas on Mulgumpin. Amendments through this bill will also make a small number of minor amendments to the Nature Conservation Act and Aboriginal Land Act to provide clarification about the operation of existing provisions. It also amends the Torres Strait Islander Land Act 1991 to provide consistency with an amendment being made to the Aboriginal Land Act.

Mulgumpin is a beautiful part of the world, and many Queenslanders enjoy staying, camping and spending time on the island with their families. Protecting the beautiful environment and monitoring its ongoing use, hand in hand with the traditional owners, will mean that the island is protected for all Queenslanders to enjoy for generations to come. Our experiences with joint management across Queensland, be it in Cape York Peninsula or on Minjerribah, have shown that the intergenerational knowledge and skills of traditional owners creates better visitor experiences and increases community awareness of the significant connection First Nation peoples have to their country.

A key government commitment through the consent determination process was to work towards the joint management of protected areas on Mulgumpin between the state and the Quandamooka Yoolooburrabee Aboriginal Corporation, known as QYAC, similar to existing joint management arrangements with QYAC on Minjerribah, or North Stradbroke Island.

Joint management is a specific model of protected area management under the Nature Conservation Act that provides for the management of national parks, Cape York Peninsula Aboriginal land in the Cape York Peninsula region and Indigenous joint management areas in the North Stradbroke Island region to occur jointly between Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service and the Indigenous landholder, the trustee for the land granted under the Aboriginal Land Act. Land management decisions made by the two parties occur consistent with an Indigenous management agreement entered into between the state and the trustee before the land is declared a national park, Cape York Peninsula Aboriginal land or and Indigenous joint management area.

Amendments to the Aboriginal Land Act, the Nature Conservation Act and the Recreation Areas Management Act are required to support joint management on Mulgumpin. Amendments to the Aboriginal Land Act will designate prescribed protected areas on Mulgumpin as transferrable land. Apart from some small areas used by Maritime Safety Queensland and the Australian Maritime Safety Authority for navigation infrastructure, prescribed protected areas will include most of the Moreton Island National Park and Cape Moreton Conservation Park, as well as some additional unallocated state land proposed to be added to the protected area estate in the near future.

Work is already underway on Mulgumpin to survey these lands to allow the relevant areas to become transferrable land under the Aboriginal Land Act and protected area under the Nature Conservation Act. Subject to the passage of this bill, subsequent processes will be able to occur to seek Governor in Council approval to facilitate the land being granted to QYAC, the registered native title body corporate representing the Quandamooka people, in the form of Aboriginal freehold land. Upon such grant, the land will be held in trust for the Quandamooka people and continue to be managed as part of Queensland's protected area estate. This will facilitate greater self-determination for the Quandamooka people and provide opportunities for the economic, social and cultural aspirations of the traditional owners of Mulgumpin to be achieved.

Amendments to the Aboriginal Land Act will also provide that an Indigenous management agreement, prepared between the state and QYAC, for the joint management of protected areas on Mulgumpin through the consent determination process, is formally recognised under the Aboriginal Land Act. Subject to the land being granted to QYAC and formal recognition of the Indigenous management agreement, amendments to the Nature Conservation Act in this bill will allow the declaration of an Indigenous joint management area. This outcome will deliver joint management arrangements between Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service and QYAC, consistent with commitments recorded in the Indigenous land use agreement and Indigenous management agreement.

Joint management on Mulgumpin will reflect similar joint management arrangements that have been in place between the Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service and QYAC on Minjerribah following a previous native title determination and declaration of an Indigenous joint management area over Minjerribah in 2011. The declaration of an Indigenous joint management area on Mulgumpin will promote the cultural rights of the Quandamooka people by providing for continued connection to country and access to cultural sites for cultural practice.

Funding provided by the state for joint management will allow QYAC to employ six full-time staff and a number of rangers on a project basis. This will provide an opportunity for traditional skills and knowledge to be incorporated into the management of protected areas on Mulgumpin and the recording of Aboriginal cultural sites and values to provide for the further protection of areas of high cultural and spiritual significance and enhancement of the island's natural and cultural resources and values. The Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service will also work closely with QYAC on a research and monitoring program, reviewing existing management plans and maximising local employment and skills development associated with the construction of a new ranger base, workshops and accommodation.

The transition to formal joint management has already begun. Earlier this year, the purchase of camping and vehicle access permits for Mulgumpin was transitioned from the Department of Environment and Science to a booking system operated by QYAC called Mulgumpin camping. I encourage everyone to have a look at the information available on the Mulgumpin camping website and plan your next trip to Mulgumpin. It is anticipated that joint management will provide opportunities for the Quandamooka community to increase their involvement with tourism and the development of ecotourism products on Mulgumpin. It will allow appropriate Indigenous cultural heritage information to be provided in signage and interpretative information, and also be presented to visitors by representatives of the First Nation people of the island.

Amendments will also be made to the Recreation Areas Management Act to ensure that consultation occurs with QYAC on certain permit applications for activities within the Indigenous joint management area. Depending on the type of activity, the Department of Environment and Science will seek comment or consent from QYAC before granting permits for activities. This will align with similar requirements that already exist for permit applications made in relation to jointly managed national parks in the cape and on North Stradbroke Island under the Nature Conservation Act. The amendments will provide consistency across the Nature Conservation Act and Recreation Areas Management Act.

The bill will also make a number of minor amendments to provide clarification about the relationship between several sections of the Nature Conservation Act that relate to the grant of a lease, agreement, licence, permit or other authority over state land protected areas, Indigenous joint management areas, national parks and special wildlife reserves. These aim to remove a risk that would adversely impact on permission holders if the permissions were found to be invalid by an interpretation contrary to the intent of the legislation. Technical amendments will also be made to the Aboriginal Land Act and Torres Strait Islander Land Act to clarify the preservation of certain existing interests on land granted as Aboriginal land and Torres Strait Islander land and provide consistency across this related legislation.

In 2011, the Federal Court determination provided land justice to the Quandamooka people, recognising the enduring connection with the land and sea of Minjerribah. Following that decision, joint management has provided local employment opportunities for the Quandamooka people, ensuring that the traditional owners are at the forefront of the protection and management of significant conservation and cultural values. We now have an opportunity to continue the positive work with the Quandamooka people on Mulgumpin.

Working side by side with the Quandamooka people will help in bringing the diverse and rich cultural history of the Quandamooka people to the many visitors to Mulgumpin each year. The work with QYAC at Minjerribah has demonstrated that joint management leads to better outcomes for all Queenslanders—with the knowledge of the Quandamooka people playing a large role in the development of the fire management strategies, approaches to land management and conservation.

The bill delivers on this government's commitments in relation to the historic determination of native title over Mulgumpin last year and represents a continuing commitment to work with First Nation peoples to facilitate greater self-determination and provide opportunities for the economic, social and cultural aspirations of traditional owners to be achieved over their lands. I commend the bills to the House.

First Reading

Hon. SM FENTIMAN (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Small Business and Minister for Training and Skills Development) (12.04 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.

Referral to Natural Resources, Agricultural Industry Development and Environment Committee

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stevens): In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Natural Resources, Agricultural Industry Development and Environment Committee.

TRANSPORT AND OTHER LEGISLATION (ROAD SAFETY, TECHNOLOGY AND OTHER MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL

TRANSPORT LEGISLATION (DISABILITY PARKING AND OTHER MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading (Cognate Debate)

Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill resumed from 17 March (see p. 621) and Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill resumed from 17 March (see p. 636), on motion of Mr Bailey—

That the Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill be now read a second time.



Hon. MC BAILEY (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (12.04 pm): I move—

That the Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill be now read a second time.

I begin by thanking the Transport and Public Works Committee for its consideration of the Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2020 and for its report tabled on 29 May 2020. I now table the government's response to the committee's report.

Tabled paper: Transport and Public Works Committee: Report No. 39, 56th Parliament—Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2020, government response [\[1141\]](#).

I acknowledge the role of the committee chair, the member for Kurwongbah, in leading the parliamentary committee's scrutiny of these reforms and the committee secretariat for its support to the committee in reviewing this bill. In addition, I thank everybody who made a submission for the time they

have taken to comment on the bill. The report recommended that the bill be passed and included two recommendations for consideration. The government supports the committee's recommendations. I will address them in more detail during this speech.

This bill first came before the House on 16 March 2020. It is fair to say that a lot has changed in the intervening period. We now debate the bill in the midst of the global coronavirus pandemic. Australia is not immune and Queensland is not immune. Indeed, we are currently watching closely the recent turn of events in Victoria and New South Wales. The pandemic has impacted every aspect of our daily life and the issues dealt with in this bill are not isolated from the impacts of the pandemic. We have had to alter our approach to the digital licence app trial which commenced on the Fraser Coast in March this year. The trial has had to be extended because of that. Our plan to begin a trial of mobile phone distraction cameras was delayed because neither the equipment nor the personnel were able to travel to Queensland from the southern states. I have been deeply saddened by the slippage in road safety progress since we began dealing with the global pandemic. Early indications are that more people were speeding and using riskier behaviours on our roads, including using mobile phones more often.

Given Queensland is continuing to manage well the health impacts, we are now able to begin returning to business as usual in a phased approach. We have started delivering our plan to unite and recover for Queensland jobs. In my portfolio we have announced \$1 billion in road and transport stimulus funding over the last three months which will create more jobs right across Queensland over the next year or so. Queensland's plan for recovery is a plan for Queensland's future. The initiatives in this bill are future focused and timely. The main initiatives in this bill will legislate for the use of a digital licence and support the introduction and ongoing operation of a digital licence app and also enable camera enforcement of seatbelt and mobile phone distraction offences. Clearly, both of these initiatives will bring benefits to the people of Queensland.

Changes to licensing legislation will provide Queenslanders with the option, for the first time, of a digital driver's licence for personal and business transactions. The digital licence app will enable the use of a digital driver's licence and will enable a person to have up-to-date information about their credentials via dynamic updates, facilitate secure access to online services, including vehicle registration renewals, and allow a person to receive notifications such as vehicle registration reminders.

COVID-19 has also seen the Palaszczuk government working on ways to help Queenslanders stay healthy and safe, whether it be engaging with government or showing their ID to businesses in different ways. The digital licence app will support contactless transactions and verification of a person's identity. I am aware that there are many Queenslanders who only carry their wallet or purse because they want or need to carry their physical driver's licence with them. The digital licence app will mean that people can conveniently have their driver's licence on their mobile phone. Initially, the digital licence app amendments in this bill will ensure digital products administered by the department such as drivers' licences, recreational marine licences and photograph identification cards can be accepted in the same way as physical cards. For example, a person will be able to display their digital licence to a police officer if required to, or a person will be able to use their phone to prove their identity when renting a house or prove that they are over 18 to enter a pub or a nightclub.

I think we would all agree that we live in a fast-changing world in terms of technology, so the provisions in this bill will allow the app to include a range of government digital products and services into the future. This makes sense from a whole-of-government perspective because the Department of Transport and Main Roads already holds biometric data for more than 3.7 million licence holders. Other government issued authorities could easily be added to the digital licence app over time. For example, the app may in the future include non-transport authorities such as yellow cards for working with people with disabilities or high-risk work licences.

I note that the committee has recommended a thorough review be undertaken before the digital licence app is expanded to include other authorities. I can assure the House that expansion to include other authorities will not occur until the technology is well established and a thorough review has been undertaken. It must be, and will be, extremely secure and protect Queenslanders' privacy. Queenslanders can have confidence in the app.

My department has completed a privacy impact assessment as part of its due diligence in understanding any risks and mitigations relating to the app. The privacy impact assessment has not identified any significant concerns, and all recommendations in that assessment will be fully implemented. However, the privacy impact assessment would need to be updated prior to the addition of any future authorities.

The revised privacy impact assessment would help to ensure that any privacy risks have been identified and addressed before the inclusion of other products was considered. The committee also recommended a review of the provisions that limit law enforcement officers from requiring an individual to hand over a device that displays a digital licence to ensure the intent is clear.

I note that the committee's recommendation relates to comments from the Office of the Information Commissioner that were supported by the Queensland Law Society. These submissions sought clearer provisions prohibiting police or authorised officers from requiring individuals to hand over their devices when requested to produce a digital driver's licence, digital proof of age or digital proof of identity.

I want to reassure Queenslanders that, as a result of the recommendation, my department has reviewed the provisions to ensure that they work as intended. That explanation is outlined in the response to the committee that I have tabled. However, I will also take this opportunity to reinforce the intended operations of the provisions.

There are various provisions allowing police or other authorised officers to require the production of a driver's licence or proof of age or proof of identity. For physical products, this usually involves the person handing the officer their physical driver's licence or other identity document. However, we all understand that a mobile phone is not just a driver's licence or proof of ID. As a result, this bill ensures that appropriate privacy measures are adopted.

If a person is required to give or provide an officer with their driver's licence or other proof of identity or proof of age and the person wants to display a digital version through the digital licence app, the person will not have to hand over their device. Requirements to give or provide a driver's licence or proof of age or proof of identity will be met if the person displays their digital version on the device and it is able to be read, copied, downloaded, photographed or scanned by the officer.

As officers are equipped with their own devices, any copying, downloading, photographing or scanning will be able to be conducted device to device and contactless. There will be no need for a police officer to touch someone's phone. I note that that is particularly pertinent given the health situation that we all find ourselves in, not just in this state but across the globe.

I note that police officers have existing powers under their legislation to seize evidence of criminal offences which could include a mobile phone, and this bill does not change those existing powers. I also want to assure Queenslanders that it is intended that use of a digital licence and the digital licence app will be optional. People will still have a physical licence which will remain valid.

Camera enforcement of seatbelt and mobile phone offences is the second significant issue in this bill. This provision will also benefit Queenslanders by improving road safety and deterring unsafe behaviours on our roads. The reason for the amendments in this bill are simple: distracted driving is an escalating road safety issue that affects all of us. Every year distracted driving kills and injures far too many people. In fact, it accounts for approximately 20 per cent of lives lost each year. Research shows that using a mobile phone while driving is as dangerous as drink-driving with a blood and breath alcohol reading of .07 to .10. Despite this, irresponsible drivers continue to pick up their phone while driving.

A significant factor is that drivers who engage in unsafe behaviour do not think they will be caught. Some drivers even try to hide their phone to avoid being detected by police. New camera technology is now available that is effective at detecting illegal mobile phone use. This technology will increase the rate of detection, enhance roadside enforcement and help shift the public perception that drivers will not be caught. I note that it is a mobile technology that can be used anywhere. I think that is a significant thing to highlight. It is a very flexible mode.

It will also ensure that the deterrent effect of the mobile phone penalties introduced on 1 February this year are realised. Drivers disobeying the mobile phone rules now face a fine of \$1,000 and four demerit points. These penalties, together with increased enforcement and driver education, will work together to bring about behavioural change and reduce the lives lost on our roads.

Cameras have been used for over two decades to address other unsafe driving behaviours such as speeding and red-light traffic offences. They have been very effective at saving lives on our roads in Queensland. The provisions in this bill will ultimately save more lives. It is not just about mobile phones. It is very disappointing to see that failing to wear a seatbelt is still a significant contributor to road deaths and injuries across our state. This is despite the well-established benefits of wearing seatbelts in a crash.

Again, by supporting camera enforcement of seatbelt offences, this bill will help to save lives by encouraging behavioural change. This will include our rural and regional communities. I note that this is a provision that New South Wales does not currently have, but the technology is there. I am a very strong supporter of the idea that, if the technology is there to increase compliance and reduce fatalities, we need to take advantage of it—and that is what we are doing with this bill. It is not just about mobile phone offences. It is also about people not wearing a seatbelt because, as the last line of defence, it is critical to people surviving a crash.

The processes for enforcement of camera detected mobile phone and seatbelt offences will be consistent with the long-established processes in Queensland's Camera Detected Defence Program. This includes robust privacy and security measures to protect personal information. A key element in protecting privacy is that images from the cameras that do not contain an offence will be deleted automatically. This means that the data will not be used or transferred to a person for adjudication unless the system detects an offence. It also means that where a driver is obeying the road rules by wearing a seatbelt and not using a hand-held mobile phone, their data will not be stored.

Where a potential offence has occurred, information will be securely transmitted to the Queensland Police Service. The Queensland Police Service will then undertake a review of the image and adjudicate on whether an offence has taken place before any infringement is issued. This two-step process means that only those people caught doing the wrong thing will be issued an infringement. Images from the cameras will only be used for enforcement purposes. They will not be given to third parties or used beyond existing police powers.

Like other camera detected offences, there will be the opportunity for a person to seek a review of an infringement outside of the court system. A person will also be able to provide evidence beforehand if they have an exemption from the seatbelt rules such as those provided for vintage or classic vehicles or medical exemptions from wearing a seatbelt. To help build public confidence in the system, information regarding privacy, the image capture process and use of data will be available on the Queensland government website.

Information on the process for challenging an infringement will also be published. An online portal will make it easier for people to advise if they were not the driver or if they have a seatbelt exemption. Importantly, a person who wishes to challenge an infringement can elect to proceed to court. The provisions in the bill support efficient processes by ensuring that all relevant information has been considered before a matter proceeds to court.

The bill allows for video evidence collected from a detection device to be used where it is available. This will allow for future technological advances and may also help to improve the quality of the evidence available when enforcement action is instigated and when a matter proceeds to court.

The overall objective of these amendments in the bill is to support efforts to improve road safety through behavioural change. This can only occur if the public perceives that offences can be enforced and prosecuted. This is critical to maintaining public confidence in the Camera Detected Offence Program and for deterring high-risk driving behaviours.

I would like to acknowledge the issues raised by stakeholders in relation to amendments in the bill. Important issues such as privacy, reverse onus of proof, accuracy of the technology, the deletion of images and the prescription of offences in subordinate legislation will continue to be examined throughout the implementation of the camera program in Queensland. After a delay due to COVID-19, a trial of the technology will commence later this year.

The bill includes a number of amendments to transport legislation in order to improve processes or streamline regulatory requirements. This is part of my department's ongoing work to ensure that transport legislation is effective, relevant and supports business. Amendments to the Transport Infrastructure Act 1994 include enabling my department to more efficiently meet its mandatory environmental duties that arise as a result of acquiring and holding land for a transport purpose.

My department undertakes environmental activities across the state which require it, on occasion, to access land. For example, sometimes a department needs to access private land to complete a flora survey when clearing vegetation in a mapped high-risk area. The flora survey must be undertaken within a clearing impact area which includes the area to be cleared and an additional 100 metres around that area. This often means that surveys must be undertaken on land outside of the road corridor. The current legislation does not allow the department to enter land next to the road corridor to undertake these mandatory regulated environmental activities as it already does for roadworks and accommodation works. The bill corrects this to allow this important work to be undertaken.

Importantly, the bill strengthens the current rights that provide landowners and occupiers a right to make a submission to the chief executive officer about the proposed activity. The bill provides that the chief executive officer is compelled to consider any submission made by a landowner or occupier, and the current legislation does not prescribe this condition on the chief executive. Of equal importance, the amendments do not alter, remove or change landowners' rights to compensation.

I would like to specifically address the concerns raised by opposition members of the committee. These amendments do not enable my department to carry out unlimited land management activities on private land. The amendments will provide access to private land so that the department can better manage transport land and reduce the impact of that management on adjacent private landholders. For example, section 23 of the Biosecurity Act 2014 requires the department to take all reasonable steps to minimise biosecurity risks. These risks include declared invasive weed species such as fireweed which, if not controlled in a transport corridor, can spread rapidly to private land. In some cases, treatment of the invasive species within the road corridor can be difficult, especially when access is restricted. In these situations, access to land adjacent to the road corridor enables my department to produce a better pest treatment outcome and significantly reduce the risk of transmission of invasive species onto adjacent land. This also reduces future compliance costs for the landowner.


Weed management currently costs the state government an estimated \$600 million per year. My department has established processes and procedures for entering land to undertake authorised activities, and these will continue to apply. My department must give at least seven days notice to the owner-occupier of the property adjacent to the road corridor of its intention to enter the land and undertake activity. As I said earlier, the owner-occupier is entitled to make a submission within the seven-day notice period to the CEO in response to the notice of intention to occupy. This amendment provides transparency and clarity to legislative land management activities that my department undertakes.

The bill also preserves existing secondary legal interests such as easements when declaring a transport corridor. These amendments will allow uninterrupted benefit to interest holders when a railway corridor or busway land is declared. This is an important amendment that will result in significant savings to the department and multiple stakeholders. Currently when rail and busway land is declared, secondary interest holders—for example, easement holders—are required to renegotiate their interest. The re-establishment of easements is lengthy, expensive, time-consuming and can involve up to three government agencies. It often results in significant legal costs to all parties. The current process can also mean that parties incur the cost of obtaining new survey plans.

In addition, the current arrangements may expose the department to compensation for the loss of legal rights previously held. This is a sensible amendment that ensures the existing legal rights of interest holders are protected and will save significant costs for all parties by not having to engage legal representation for the reinstatement of interests. The amendment removes a complex administrative process and includes a compensation safeguard. In the extremely unlikely event that an interest must be removed, the bill puts in place a process that ensures interest holders will be compensated.

In relation to some minor administrative amendments, the bill also makes amendments to passenger transport legislation. Amendments will facilitate court proceedings relating to fare evasion for the use or hire of a public passenger vehicle by allowing the chief executive to certify particular matters; for example, allowing the chief executive to certify the fare for the use of a public passenger vehicle. This will simplify proceedings by not having to rely on expert witnesses to testify on matters which are considered administrative, factual and non-contentious.

The bill makes some minor amendments to passenger transport legislation to allow for information to be published on any website administered by the department and to support proceedings relating to vehicle requirements and make minor amendments to update legislation or clarify existing policy. This bill ensures that legislation supports the use of technology to improve road safety, provides Queenslanders with the option of a digital licence and facilitates more efficient access to government services in-house. I commend the bills to the House.

 **Mr MINNIKIN** (Chatsworth—LNP) (12.26 pm): It gives me a great deal of pride to rise today to speak on the Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill. The minister will be aware that I spoke to the first part of this cognate debate in relation to disability parking several months ago, so my comments today will be limited to this particular bill.

I also want to place on record that, like many members in this chamber, I too am going through the process of teaching my 17- soon-to-be 18-year-old son how to drive. I have to concur from the get-go it absolutely amazes me that in this year, 2020, when you are teaching someone to drive and you observe firsthand other drivers on the road, the number of people you come across who still use mobile phones and who still drive without a seatbelt is truly amazing.

In relation to where the opposition sits, I made it very clear that our role is to scrutinise every bill on a shadow-by-shadow basis. It is not our role to simply go, 'Yes, done' or 'no' for the sake of saying no. It is our responsibility to go through the legislation that is brought to committees and then to the relevant shadow ministers and analyse it pretty much clause by clause. There are some things I was going to say in my contribution in relation to land access. I was waiting to hear the minister's contribution before we on this side of the chamber determined our position, but I will touch on that a bit later.

Overall, the LNP appreciates that advances in technology have helped make the delivery of a more convenient and efficient way for people to interact with government easier. In addition, we recognise that many benefits will flow from targeted road safety measures. These are the two main features of the bill, and I will say right now that we do not oppose them. However, as strong supporters of an individual's land rights the LNP will remain vigilant with regard to any effort by the Labor government to impinge on such rights. From the get-go, while we will not oppose the bill, we will highlight our concerns in relation to the government's proposal to extend existing powers that will enable TMR access to temporarily occupy land. Having only literally minutes ago listened to the minister's contribution, I think it makes perfect sense why those particular powers are being sought, so we will not oppose them. We will support the bill.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Transport and Public Works Committee for the work they have done. The committee made three recommendations, the first of which was that the bill be passed. The second recommendation suggested that a review be undertaken subsequent to the implementation of the digital licence app and prior to its expansion to other authorities. The third recommendation, which I have alluded to, related to a review to ensure the intent of the provisions as they relate to prohibiting law enforcement and other authorised officers requiring an individual to hand over their digital device is clear; however, in a statement of reservation the LNP committee members expressed concerns about the minor amendments to the Transport Infrastructure Act 1994. As I said earlier, that related to the temporary access and occupation of land adjacent to TMR land and road corridors.

The objectives of the bill are as follows: to support the introduction and ongoing operation of a digital licence app, which will be music to the ears of anyone aged 18 to 35 and beyond in many instances; to facilitate camera enforcement of seatbelt and mobile phone offences—as I have said already, it is flabbergasting that we still see on the roads every day in 2020 people risking their lives by tapping away at their mobile phone or bizarrely not wearing a seatbelt; and to make minor and technical improvements to clarify the operation of some drug- and drink-driving provisions, to preserve existing secondary legal interests in TMR land, to allow access to land for environmental activities and to clarify evidentiary provisions for smart ticketing.

In terms of the specific details of the bill, I will refer first of all to the digital licence app. The development of a digital licence for use in Queensland follows their successful implementation in New South Wales and South Australia. These products are becoming more prevalent throughout society. The proposed amendments in the bill will facilitate the introduction of a digital licence app.

The bill relates to camera detection of seatbelt and mobile phone offences. To lift the level of enforcement relating to both mobile phones and the wearing of seatbelts, it is proposed that these offences be included in an expanded Camera Detected Offence Program. We all love our acronyms in this chamber so that is the CDOP. By way of explanation, unsafe mobile phone use whilst driving is one of the most prevalent behaviours associated with driver distraction. Furthermore, despite extensive public education campaigns, the failure to wear a seatbelt continues to be a significant contributor to road trauma in Queensland. The proposal's aim to increase the rate of detection of these offences is to be encouraged.

In relation to some of the minor and technical amendments, the proposed amendments to sections 35 and 36 of the Transport Infrastructure Act 1994 aim to establish a framework that enables TMR to access and temporarily occupy land, including private land but not dwellings, adjacent to the

land/road corridor. The amendments proposed to the Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act 1994, TOPTA, aim to improve the operation and enforceability of TOPTA as well as to ensure evidentiary provisions support the new smart ticketing system.

We all know that technological advances have led to the development of a new suite of digital products that will make it easier and more convenient for people to transact business with the government in general. These products, including licence apps and the digitisation of services, have also got the capability to provide secure and immediate access to credentials, including drivers' licences. A digital driver's licence is simply the first of many potential business opportunities that can flow from a digital licence app. It offers the potential for the following: electronic validation; instant communication including updates and reminders, which are important to many people; immediate access to credentials such as proof of age; transacting a range of business; and the sharing of information.

These opportunities will be embraced by many as they offer efficient and convenient ways to conduct business in our everyday lives. However, it must be recognised that some people will be hesitant to take up digital products or may not want them at all for a variety of legitimate reasons, including privacy and security concerns. With the rollout of digital licences, Queenslanders need to be assured that participation is completely optional and that physical licensing products will continue to be issued. Furthermore, a range of consumer protections relating to privacy and technical matters must be thoroughly investigated as part of the initial Fraser Coast pilot and before any broader rollout. We acknowledge that that would have been made considerably more difficult over the last two or three months because of the COVID-19 situation that we have faced.

It was of concern to read in the committee's report that, while the Queensland Law Society acknowledged that TMR had afforded them the opportunity to provide feedback on the digital licence app, there was little information as to what the functional and non-functional requirements of the app would look like. As such it was difficult for the QLS to offer a fully informed view on the legal position.

The digital licence app is a mobile application that allows access to a consumer's digital credentials which they can choose to share with a third party, such as demonstration of proof of age. However, given the reliance which individuals place on their devices for a whole range of uses, for many people their digital phone is indeed their wallet, their purse, their life. It is essential, therefore, that it be made clear that at no time under the proposed arrangements does the holder need to hand their mobile phone over to a third party.


While the LNP welcomes the many benefits that flow from the use of digital technology, we are also mindful that these devices can be a major and potentially deadly distraction while driving. To put this into context, it has been estimated that distracted-driving related crashes cost the Queensland economy more than \$1½ billion each and every year. That is astonishing. Of further concern, despite extensive road safety campaigns from all sides of government over many years, some people are still not wearing seatbelts. I stand to be corrected but I believe seatbelt wearing was mandated in the late seventies yet to this day people are driving without using a seatbelt and that is truly astonishing. Obviously that can have a dire consequence when accidents occur. Investigations undertaken by the transport authorities in Queensland and New South Wales confirmed that increased detection of these offences can be achieved by expanding the Camera Detected Offence Program, the CDOP.

However, before this new camera equipment is deployed, it must be thoroughly tested to make sure it is fit for the intended purpose. There needs to be a clear public education campaign which sets out the capabilities of the camera equipment and the way in which it will be applied. As a result, from a road safety perspective, people can then better understand that the likelihood of detection will increase as well as, importantly, the consequences for noncompliance. We would also call on the government to take all necessary steps to ensure that the practices associated with camera detected offences before infringement notices are issued have been carefully examined. Importantly, should individuals have circumstances they feel need to be considered in the infringement process, they must still be able to seek a review of the penalty notice or challenge it in court. I believe the minister did go some way to answering that.

The proposed amendments to sections 35 and 36 of the Transport Infrastructure Act are for the extension of an existing power to enable TMR as a land manager to undertake mandatory regulated land management and environmental activities. By its nature, this could involve access and temporary occupation of land, including private land, and it was considered at first glance that this could have been

an intrusion and a step too far. However, I said at the very outset of my contribution that our role on this side of the chamber is to disagree when we vehemently disagree but to listen to considered legislation that will actually have demonstrable benefits. After the explanation by the minister, we believe this will. It is no secret that the minister and I differ on many things in this chamber, but I do believe we need to get back to the situation where at the end of the day our role is to make sure that the bills that are passed actually withstand the scrutiny of a well-read opposition.

I take this opportunity to also state that there is no mortgage when it comes to who has got it all over the other side when it comes to overall safety on the roads. The LNP have been strong advocates for sensible road safety measures that can help motorists be safe as they travel around the state. We have over 33,000 kilometres of state controlled roads. However, we also want to make sure, in relation to anything that we support, that we do not have an overreliance on any one form of technology. We are now in 2020 and we acknowledge that many people have mobile phones—and I will not reach for mine now—and that we need to move to digitise and give people options. One of the principles that we on this side of the chamber believe in is the word 'choice'—to give people choice in the way they go about their everyday lives and activities. We believe that now is the time to facilitate a digital licence app. We fully support it. I am pleased to have made a contribution.

 **Mr KING** (Kurwongbah—ALP) (12.39 pm): I rise today to make a contribution to the Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2019 and the Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2020 being debated today in cognate. I will start by thanking the members of the committee and parliamentary staff for their work on these two important pieces of legislation.

I would also like to thank those who made submissions to our inquiries and gave evidence at the hearings on both pieces of legislation, particularly Elisha Matthews, who is a long-term advocate in the area of disability parking and a former constituent of mine who certainly educated me on the topic. I also thank the Department of Transport and Main Roads for their cooperation. I would also like to thank the member for Hinchinbrook for bringing us part of the way here on disability parking and for his ongoing contribution to the debate on the significant issues faced by Queenslanders with a disability, in particular, the vision-impaired.

I will first address the Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill. The objectives of the bill are to: extend the disability parking eligibility criteria to include vision-impaired persons who are temporarily or permanently blind; increase the penalty that applies for using a disability parking area without a permit; admit the Queensland specific definitions of level crossing and road or rail crossing; and provide that grounds to amend, suspend or cancel approval for permits can be specified in a regulation under the Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act.

Our committee made four recommendations on this bill. Recommendation 1 was that the bill be passed, and that is with good reason. This is good and fair legislation. Currently the disability parking permit scheme has an eligibility criteria for a permit exclusively based on the applicant's functional ability to walk. After a review was conducted to assess the viability of expanding the eligibility criteria to include people with vision impairment, it was very clearly shown that there was a strong desire to expand this criteria. This bill recognises the unique mobility challenges faced by people who have been diagnosed as legally blind. It expands the eligibility criteria for a disability parking permit to include people who are diagnosed as legally blind whether on a temporary or permanent basis. To deter the socially unacceptable behaviour of illegally parking in a disability parking space and ensure disability parking bays are left available for permit holders, the bill increases the state based infringement notice penalty for illegally parking in a disability bay from a fine of \$266 to \$533.

Our second recommendation was that the Minister for Transport and Main Roads works with other Australian jurisdictions to undertake a review of the definitions contained in the Australian Disability Permit Scheme to include vision-impaired persons who are legally blind in its eligibility criteria. I was pleased to see the minister was seeking to have the issue of disability parking added to the agenda of the next Transport and Infrastructure Council for discussion.

Our third recommendation asked the Minister for Transport and Main Roads to undertake a review of the amendments to the disability parking scheme 12 months after commencement. We recommended the review include whether the amendments have had an impact on the accessibility of disability parking spaces and whether alternative measures, including demerit points, should be implemented. I understand that was agreed to as well, which is great.

Our final recommendation was that legislative amendments be considered to authorise council officers to have access to areas where disability parking spaces are situated for enforcement purposes. The bill recognises that local governments do issue most parking fines across Queensland and they play an important role in enforcing the misuse of disability parking bays. Local government parking inspectors currently enforce their local laws on public roads and parking bays administered by themselves. Under existing transport legislation, owners of private properties such as car parks and shopping centres may enter into an agreement with councils to allow council inspectors to access private land and issue parking infringement notices. Council and property owners are free to have these arrangements suit their own purposes and some councils do utilise this. The minister will work with councils across Queensland to encourage them to adopt the higher penalty of \$533 for the illegal misuse of disability parking and to enter into arrangements with car park operators to ensure spaces remain available for those who need them.

I turn now to the Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill. The Palaszczuk government is committed to road safety. Every life lost on our roads is one life too many, so we make no apology for cracking down on distracted driving and enforcing our road safety laws. We applaud innovation and we are moving with the times. Through this bill we are making it possible to keep a licence or proof-of-identity document in digital form on a smartphone or mobile device. In an Australian first, we propose to use technology to enforce the law when it comes to wearing seatbelts. We heard in the minister's speech that one in four people killed in vehicle accidents is not wearing a seatbelt. This is a sad and shocking number and a potentially preventable loss of lives.

I fully support this bill and its objectives, which are: to introduce a digital licence mobile app; to facilitate camera enforcement of seatbelt and mobile phone offences; and to make some minor and technical improvements to clarify, preserve and update operation, intent and legal rights in various other pieces of existing transport legislation.

Our committee, as stated, made three recommendations. Recommendation 1 was that the bill be passed. Recommendations 2 and 3 relate specifically to the digital licence app provisions in the bill. This digital licence mobile application—app—will bring our over-100-year-old system of paper and, more recently, plastic licensing into this century, allowing users to store credentials issued by the Queensland government such as their driver's licence in a new digital format. It will not be compulsory to use a digital licence. People can absolutely continue to use their hard copy licence or proof-of-identity documents if they prefer. I understand that a pilot of the app, initially used as an electronic licence and proof-of-identity tools, has already commenced on the Fraser Coast, and I thank my colleague the member for Maryborough for his support of this trial.

With the passage of this bill, the app will become widely available. As it becomes more advanced, the Transport and Public Works Committee want to make sure we get it right. That is why recommendation 2 in our report is that a thorough review be undertaken subsequent to the implementation of the digital licence app prior to the expansion of the project to include other authorities.


Our third and final recommendation relates to whether an individual will be required to physically hand over a phone to display their digital licence or proof-of-identity document. As it stands, this legislation prohibits the seizure or confiscation of a mobile device as it relates to the app except by police; that is a good first step. The committee recommended that a review of the provisions relating to the legislative provision prohibiting law enforcement and other authorised officers from requiring an individual to hand over their device be undertaken to ensure the intent is clear. We came to this recommendation from the perspective of protection of privacy, but stopping the spread of COVID-19 could be added as an incentive to commence this review.

The Office of the Information Commissioner reiterated a need for a comprehensive education program to earn public trust about government handling of private information, transparency and the security features of this app. Therefore, I was pleased to see that this bill builds in a number of privacy protections and security features, and the department will certainly be undertaking a comprehensive communication strategy as the app rolls out.

Before I finish, I want to touch briefly on the provisions of the seatbelt and mobile phone offence enforcement. The bill proposes to add detection of these offences to the existing Camera Detected Offence Program, which currently detects speeding, running red lights, driving unregistered and uninsured vehicles, as well as some truck and vehicle load restrictions. It is estimated that this program helps prevent around 2,500 crashes, translating to annual savings to the community of \$1½ billion per

year. While some concerns have been raised about privacy, automated decision-making and reverse onus of proof—the latter as it relates particularly to potential court proceedings—there was broad support for the intent of the legislation. The committee suggested the department take the time to reconsider the issues raised by stakeholders with regard to any additional operational improvements that could be made to address the concerns raised.

In the beginning I said that we make no apologies for introducing these tough new measures as every life lost on our roads is one too many. It is time to end the heartbreak endured by so many families who lose their partners, children, parents and friends too soon. The Palaszczuk government is committed to providing a helping hand to the most vulnerable in our society. We know they need our help more than ever right now as we unite and recover from the COVID-19 pandemic. I commend the bills to the House.

 **Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (12.50 pm): As the Liberal National Party's shadow minister for communities and shadow minister for disability services and seniors, I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2019 and the Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2020.

In July 2018, I joined my colleague the Liberal National Party state member for Bundaberg, Mr David Batt MP, in his electorate as we launched a petition calling for legislative change to enable visually-impaired people to obtain a disability parking scheme permit in Queensland. It was a terrific visit during which I met some wonderful Queenslanders and advocates who were championing this important change. I take this opportunity to thank the Liberal National Party member for Bundaberg for his hospitality during that visit and for his passion and strong advocacy from day one on this important reform.

Whilst it is pleasing to finally have this bill before the Queensland parliament, it must be said that unfortunately it has taken a considerable length of time to get here, thanks to the inaction of the Palaszczuk Labor government well before the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic. As reported in the Bundaberg *NewsMail* at the time of the member for Bundaberg's petition launch, the member for Bundaberg was referenced as saying—

I wrote to the Minister for Transport Mark Bailey to see if the current government has plans to come into line with the ACT and NSW, where people who are legally blind are able to apply for and obtain the permits, but he advised me there are no plans in place to make any changes, which is very disappointing.

The Liberal National Party member for Bundaberg continued—

I'm calling on Labor's Minister for Disabilities and Minister for Transport to work with Queenslanders with vision impairments and grant them disability parking permits.

I table a copy of that article for the benefit of the House.

Tabled paper: Article from *NewsMail*, dated 17 July 2018, titled 'Blind Justice: Bundy MP's petition for disability parking' [[1142](#)].

By the conclusion of the petition—a petition which garnered thousands of signatures from across the state—the Labor Minister for Transport and Main Roads finally began the process leading to the legislative changes we are seeing today.

Before turning to the specifics of this bill, it is worth noting the current and soon-to-be former arrangements in place under the disability parking permit scheme here in Queensland. Under the current scheme, eligibility for a disability parking permit is based on an applicant's functional ability to walk. As such, people with a vision impairment are not eligible unless they have an impairment that impacts on their ability to walk. Accordingly, the intent of the bill is to expand the criteria of this scheme to include visually-impaired persons who are legally blind.

At this point I would like to emphasise the words of those who have already contributed to this debate. Whilst it is estimated that there will be upwards of 14,000 new applications for a permit, representing only a 7.5 per cent increase on the current scheme membership, the expansion of this scheme is not expected to have a substantial impact on the availability of disability parking spaces. Importantly, the amendments in this legislation will ensure Queensland has consistency with schemes in New South Wales, the Australian Capital Territory, South Australia and Tasmania—just as was petitioned for when this process commenced approximately two years ago.

It is a great privilege to be the Liberal National Party shadow minister for disability services and to regularly meet so many of our great state's disability advocates, stakeholders, organisations and service providers. I take this opportunity to pay tribute to Queensland's disability services organisations, advocates and service providers for the outstanding work they have done in supporting Queenslanders throughout the COVID-19 novel coronavirus pandemic. In particular, I thank the Queenslanders with Disability Network for its initiative in developing and distributing a suite of resources and tools for people with a disability, including a range of tailored COVID-19 information sheets, essential items, checklists and individual planning tools. They also made an important contribution in submissions to the committee in relation to this legislation. It has unquestionably been an incredibly challenging time for all as we have had to adjust to various measures and restrictions. We must ensure that all supports continue to be provided to Queenslanders with a disability.

In the lead-up to the disability parking scheme's changes, the feedback I received from stakeholders and individuals certainly mirrored the sentiments and support expressed by submitters to the Queensland parliament's Transport and Public Works Committee, including Guide Dogs Queensland, the Queensland Blind Association, Spinal Life Australia and Physical Disabilities Australia.

The Liberal National Party will always stand up for stronger communities and will support individuals and representative organisations to ensure better opportunities are available for all Queenslanders. That is why we support this bill before the parliament today. As the Liberal National Party shadow minister for disability services, I recently visited Carmel Crouch, the managing director and chief executive officer of STEPS Group Australia, along with Stuart Coward, the LNP's candidate for Caloundra. While visiting STEPS Group Australia, I took the opportunity to talk to them about this legislation and what it would mean when it comes to the clients of this service. Certainly, they were very appreciative of those discussions and the opportunity to meet with them.

I had the opportunity to join Janet Wishart for a visit to Wesley Mission Queensland's Opportunities, Readiness, Community and Abilities project. This ORCA project is a fantastic post-school option for young adults, providing an integrated training, work experience and employment program for older teenagers with a disability. At the very heart of this program, it is enabling young people to gain the skills and opportunities for greater inclusion and participation in the broader community. On the visit with the local LNP candidate for Mansfield, Janet Wishart, we spoke about this legislation as well. I also note in the committee's report on this bill that submissions were received that specifically identified the provision of and access to disability parking as not just a parking issue but also an access and inclusion issue.

I also recently joined Henry Pike, the LNP's candidate for Redlands, and had the opportunity to tour the terrific care and respite facilities of service provider Joy2Care. As the LNP shadow minister for communities, disability services and seniors, it was a privilege for me to meet some of the clients of Joy2Care, including one gentleman with significant vision impairment, and to see firsthand the important work being done to assist not only him but also many others so that they can live their lives as independently as possible. As chance would have it, during this visit I also spoke with a representative from Guide Dogs Queensland. I take this opportunity to note in particular its support for this legislation and the intent to expand the eligibility criteria for the disability parking scheme to include legal blindness.

Turning to the Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2020, there are a number of objectives of this bill: to support the introduction and ongoing operation of a digital licence app; to facilitate camera enforcement of seatbelt and mobile phone offences; and to make minor and technical improvements to clarify the operation of certain drug- and drink-driving provisions, preserve certain existing secondary legal interests in Transport and Main Roads land, allow access to land for environmental activities, and clarify evidentiary provisions for smart ticketing.


Specifically in relation to the introduction of camera detection for mobile phone and seatbelt offences, I note that, as per the Transport and Public Works Committee's report No. 39, the aim of this introduction is to save lives and to reduce road trauma and the impact these events have on families and communities. Sadly, through the western suburbs of Brisbane, including my electorate of Moggill, our communities have witnessed some truly tragic road incidents in recent years. Anything that can be done to minimise or eliminate such accidents certainly deserves to be considered. Apart from the human and emotional toll, such incidents, particularly in the western suburbs, have significant flow-on effects through the broader road network, especially the state controlled network, resulting in significant delays, increased congestion and potential safety hazards.

Still on the western suburbs, one of the major issues is the resolution of the Moggill Road corridor planning study to improve local cyclists' safety. I take this opportunity again, given that there has been a three-year delay in that study being finalised and funding solutions being announced by the government, to ask the government to look at that to ensure not only that local cyclists have safety but also that future fatalities are prevented.

Ensuring better and safer roads for our communities is a key priority for the Liberal National Party and one that I have been consistently advocating for since first being elected in 2015. Unlike the Labor Party, the Liberal National Party has the plans to bust traffic congestion, to enhance our public transport and to improve safety for all road users in the western suburbs. We will continue to announce policies which will be in the best interests of not only motorists and cyclists but also those who use public transport in the western suburbs of Brisbane and right across Queensland.

In conclusion, I thank all submitters for their contribution to the consideration of these bills by the Transport and Public Works Committee. I know that members from both sides of the House who sit on committees make a vital contribution to our parliamentary democracy and to ensuring the scrutiny of legislation. Finally, I acknowledge again the member for Bundaberg.

(Time expired)


 **Hon. MT RYAN** (Morayfield—ALP) (Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services) (12.58 pm): Community safety is paramount. This principle is at the forefront of everything this government does. I am very pleased to speak in support of the bill before the House today. One of the greatest obstacles to safer roads in this age is distraction. Experts say that using a mobile phone while driving is akin to drink driving. To help ensure this practice is minimised, cameras now will be used for enforcement purposes, as foreshadowed in this bill. We want to ensure there is a clear understanding in the community as to how mobile phone and seatbelt offences will be enforced. Processes will be consistent with those used in the existing Camera Detected Offence Program. This robust program has been in place for speeding and red traffic light offences for more than two decades and is well understood and accepted by the community. The cameras will only be set up to cover lanes of traffic where vehicles cannot be legally parked. Vehicles parked on the side of the road will not be a focus of the cameras. The cameras will take images of vehicles in the lane of the traffic that pass. Artificial intelligence will detect whether an offence has possibly taken place. To enforce mobile phone and seatbelt offences using cameras, there is no alternative to the camera taking images inside the vehicle's front cabin or the artificial intelligence reviewing images looking for prescribed unlawful action.

Debate, on motion of Mr Ryan, adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 1.01 pm to 2.00 pm.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Liberal National Party, Commitments

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.00 pm): Only the LNP has a plan to stimulate the economy, only the LNP has a plan to create a decade of secure jobs and it is only the LNP that has the ability to drag Queensland out of this recession. Our vision is to make Queensland an economic powerhouse once again. Our vision is also to make Queensland the best place to raise a family, to get a job and to get ahead. The foundations of the LNP's plan for a stronger economy and decades long of secure jobs are all around investing for growth, supercharging our region, unleashing Queensland's industry and securing our children's futures. An LNP government that I lead will build the New Bradfield Scheme, will build the second M1, will slash elective surgery wait times and will improve our kids' education. It is only the LNP that has a plan to secure Queensland's future for the next generation.

Queenslanders do need secure jobs now more than ever, but Queenslanders also deserve the right to feel safe when they are in their own homes. The right to safety has been removed by the Palaszczuk Labor government. For the last five years the Palaszczuk government has got softer and softer on crime. As a result, the crime rates have climbed higher and higher. Crimes like robbery, car theft and assaults have gone through the roof, and let me give the House some stats. In Townsville robbery is up by 165 per cent under Labor. In Cairns car theft is up 80 per cent. On the Gold Coast assaults are up 127 per cent. In Mackay car theft is up 144 per cent. In Caboolture and Deception Bay

robbery is up 260 per cent since the Palaszczuk Labor government came to power. The Queenslanders that I talk to have simply had enough. They want action on crime, and that is exactly what an LNP government will deliver.

A week ago I was in Townsville and I announced that the LNP will make sweeping changes to Labor's broken youth justice system. The LNP will protect the community and we will back our police. There will be no more slaps on the wrist under a government I lead. Instead, there will be mandatory detention for young offenders on a third conviction. The LNP will send a very clear message to those offenders: if you do the crime, you will do the time. If you break the law, there will be consequences.

The LNP will scrap Labor's catch-and-release laws and bring back breach of bail as an offence. We will scrap Labor's \$70 million failed youth bail house experiment. We will introduce 24/7 monitoring of juvenile offenders who are on bail. We will let the courts recognise the youth offending history of adult offenders. We will be tough on crime, but the LNP is also committed to supporting vulnerable children and families. Our \$7 million justice reinvestment program will improve the physical, social and emotional wellbeing of young children in Townsville and Cairns. The community payback farms will give offenders the physical and mental skills they need to turn their lives around. The LNP's plan is a comprehensive strategy to fight youth crime, to protect our community and to rehabilitate young offenders. It is time to make Queensland safe again.

The LNP also has a plan to get hoons off our streets. It was about two weeks ago that I joined the member for Mudgeeraba, the member for Coomera, the member for Bonney and the LNP's candidate for Gaven, Kirsten Jackson, at one of Queensland's worst hooning hotspots. Queenslanders are sick of seeing hoons using our streets as a racetrack. They are sick of seeing hoons mock the police on social media. The LNP's plan will take our streets back. We will give police the resources and the laws that they need to deal with this problem.

Under the LNP's plan we will provide 100 new CCTV cameras to give police 24/7 vision of our worst hooning hotspots. We will roll out tyre-shredding road surfaces that will literally stop hoons in their tracks and we will introduce new laws that will target the members of those hooning gangs. Repeat offenders will be banned from driving for up to five years. The LNP will put the brakes on hooning, we will back our police and we will make our streets safe for Queenslanders.

I want every Queensland child to have a good start in life. In fact, I want every Queensland child to have the best start in life, and that means giving them the best education. Standards in our schools should be going up year after year, but they are not. The Palaszczuk Labor government has a record, and let us look at our NAPLAN results. They are going backwards. Queensland must do better and we will do better under an LNP government.

Two weeks ago I announced the LNP's plan to improve literacy in our schools. Reading and writing are foundation skills that kids must have to get a job and to succeed in life, so an LNP government will trial phonics screening in our schools next year. The trial will test around 12,000 Queensland kids who are in year 1. It will identify if they are struggling with reading or have a reading difficulty like dyslexia. The LNP's plan will find the kids who need help and we will make sure they get it, and this policy has been overwhelmingly received by parents and kids across Queensland.


As members can tell, my team has been very busy. I have even more policy updates for the House. Roads in South-East Queensland are grinding to a halt, so it is time to take bold action to bust congestion. I can announce that an LNP government will make off-peak rail journeys completely free for our seniors. From Gympie to the Gold Coast or Ascot to Ipswich, seniors will get free rail travel with the LNP. Free off-peak travel for seniors will mean less traffic on our roads, more seats on our peak-hour trains and more money in our seniors' pockets. The LNP's plan will save drivers time and save seniors money. The LNP will also encourage our young people to use public transport. We will provide \$500 public transport vouchers to full-time university and TAFE students in their first year of study. We will get students back into the classrooms and out of their cars. Only the LNP has a plan to bust congestion.

I have another announcement that will help Queensland get working again. Private investors have put 164 market-led proposals to the Palaszczuk Labor government, but only one of them has been delivered. What was that one? It was a toll road! The LNP will create Queensland investment partnerships to develop more projects with the private sector. My aim is simple: creating secure jobs for Queenslanders. We will work with investors because we on this side of the House know that investment means jobs. There will be less obstruction and more construction under the LNP.

Every child deserves to be brought into a safe and loving home. The brutal death of Mason Jett Lee, and many others like him, has shown that the child protection system in Queensland is broken. Four weeks ago I announced an LNP government will overhaul the child safety system from the top down. We will create the child protection force to save our children from abuse, from neglect and from violence. Our kids must be protected at all costs. Leaving vulnerable children in dangerous homes can be a death sentence and I will never accept that outcome.

The Palaszczuk Labor government has no plan, it has no budget. Only the LNP has a plan to drag Queensland out of this recession, a plan to stimulate the economy, a plan to create a decade of secure jobs. Only the LNP will get Queensland working again.

Liberal National Party, Performance

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Treasurer, Minister for Infrastructure and Planning) (2.10 pm): What a nonstop spend-a-thon we have just heard from the Leader of the Opposition. She says the LNP has a plan, but there is one plan they will not talk about.

Mr Minnikin: It's a dollar bill! Dollar bills!

Mrs Frecklington: No budget and no plan!

Mr DICK: Can I say to members of the opposition that I sat in silence and respectfully listened to you. I have a few things to say this afternoon on the public record. The Leader of the Opposition did not talk about their debt and deficit plan. She did not talk about what they are going to do to address debt and deficit in this state. We have made it very clear what we are going to do in a detailed and comprehensive plan that we released yesterday.

We have heard absolutely nothing from the opposition—actually, that is not correct. I withdraw that. What we have heard is a misleading and dishonest statement by the Leader of the Opposition. Forest Wind is one single private sector proposal with a \$2 billion investment in this state; one of many that we have delivered as a government. The Leader of the Opposition did not recognise that. She misled the House by saying there was only one MLP that had gone forward. That is absolutely dishonest.

The Leader of the Opposition would have done better had she had actually come into the House and apologised for her reckless plan to put Queensland at risk by opening the borders early. Sixty-four times the LNP put our state at risk. They put small business, senior citizens, the economy and jobs at risk. They were all piling on—the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the member for Everton; all the members on the Gold Coast; all of the members on the Sunshine Coast—all demanding that the borders be opened early. It is like making 'getting it wrong' your default setting as a government.

One would think question time this morning would have given those opposite time to reflect on their lack of judgement. No, they did not do that. This morning the member for Everton misled the House when he claimed that all the LNP wanted was for the Premier to stick to her original timetable. That was completely dishonest and misleading. Consistently they said, 64 times, open the borders on 1 July. Do not take my word for it, look at the opinion piece written by the Leader of the Opposition in the *Courier-Mail* on 25 June, member for Everton. That will demonstrate to you how you misled the House today.

The Premier stuck to her plan and opened the borders—to everyone except those from Victoria—on 10 July, which is what we said all along. In those 10 days between 1 July and 10 July there were 1,303 new cases of COVID in Victoria, every one of them who would have had a free pass to Queensland if the member for Nanango's reckless plan had got up. Has she apologised? No. Will the Deputy Leader of the Opposition apologise? No. What is now happening in Victoria is a reminder of the dangers when you open borders too early.


The desperation of the Leader of the Opposition is absolutely palpable. No wonder when you look at the trifecta of challenges she has had to deal with: the ego of Peter Dutton, the plotting of the member for Broadwater and the support of the member for Everton. Why would you not want that? With friends like the member for Everton you would not want enemies. The member for Everton, leadership aspirant. That has not gone away. The field marshal's baton is still there. He is not qualified to be higher than deputy whinger of the opposition.

There are two things that are at least consistent about the member for Everton: a complete lack of judgement and the unerring ability to get it wrong. The member for Everton was wrong when he said there were too many women on the Parole Board. He was wrong when he said it was irresponsible to have a debt plan. When before COVID he said manufacturing jobs had gone down under our

government he was wrong again. When he said Virgin was not worth saving he was wrong again. He is wrong about the budget. He is wrong about government savings. Time and time again he has been wrong on protecting Queensland's borders. At least he is absolutely consistent in being wrong. That is what we get from the member for Everton.

This is symptomatic of the leadership of the LNP. It is symptomatic of the member for Nanango and the member for Everton. At a time when we are facing the greatest public health threat in living memory, the greatest economic challenge in a century, we have seen their judgement demonstrated to be flawed time and time again. They crow arrogantly about 1 November, but Queenslanders know deep down the judgement of the Leader of the Opposition is deeply flawed and has been consistently shown to be deeply flawed.

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance

 **Mr MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (2.15 pm): I rise to speak specifically about the Treasurer's announcement last week of new savings measures for Queensland. The statement made by the Treasurer was basically admitting the failures of the government over the last five years. He started the announcement by saying, 'Guess what, folks? Now every dollar matters.' Does that mean that for the last five years every dollar of Queensland taxpayers given to the Queensland government did not matter because this government has been reckless and irresponsible with its economic management—if you can call it management? It has been mismanagement.

Let us look at some of the announcements made by the Treasurer. He said we are going to maintain Public Service positions, that we are going to keep them in line with our priorities, we are going to have internal recruitment only to fill non-frontline roles. What the Treasurer is admitting is that the figures of the Public Service and the non front line are too high. What the deputy premier—sorry, the Treasurer; he wants to be the deputy premier—was also admitting was that he has not kept one of the key fiscal principles of this government and that is that the Public Service would not increase beyond the rate of population growth.

Over the last five years the Public Service has increased 16.7 per cent. The population increase has been 7.8 per cent. Bong, bong! Wrong! Straight off he failed to keep a key fiscal principle—a principle that he was not aware of when he was asked about it by Steve Austin on ABC Radio. The Treasurer also said in his so-called economic statement that we are going to have a natural reduction in senior executive service roles. Does that mean we have too many senior executives? They appointed people who were not needed? He said we were going to stop IT projects. Why? Because they are \$500 million over budget. They have blown out by \$500 million.

Dr Rowan: And failed!

Mr MANDER: I will take that interjection. They are failing. Then we come to the real beauties, the real big savers: we are going to stop social media pages. The Treasurer has the tenacity to come in here and insult the intelligence of the people of Queensland by saying they are reducing social media pages and that will make a major contribution. Not only that, there is also an admission that they have too many glossy magazines, too many photos, too many annual reports. We have wasted taxpayers' money on selling the government's very limited achievements, if they have any achievements at all. At the same time as he talks about that, we hear about the daily overtime rate of train drivers—\$75,000 a day; \$24 million a year. That is where Queenslanders want to see savings. At the moment up on the Sunshine Coast about every minute on TV there is some sort of ad about Cross River Rail. They could not give two hoots about Cross River Rail. It is a waste of taxpayers' money.

One of my major motivations to come into the parliament was to stop wasteful spending. If you have been in private enterprise or you have been the CEO of a not-for-profit organisation that has to run on the smell of an oily rag, you see this blatant waste of \$75,000 a day. Then we have a Treasurer who does not know any detail. How can we know the number at which public servants are to be capped when he does not know how many public servants there are? How can we stop consultants when he does not know how many consultants there are? We have had consultants doing jobs that public servants should have been doing over the past five years. The list goes on and on.

I said it this morning and I will say it again: this Treasurer is the Sergeant Schultz of Queensland politics. He knows nothing and he has proven that over the past few weeks. This is his dream job, but he is failing miserably. It does not matter who from the Labor Party controls the treasury benches, whether it is the member for South Brisbane or the current Treasurer: they have no idea when it comes to economic management. That is why we have the highest unemployment rate, the highest number of bankruptcies, the lowest level of business confidence and no future under this government.

(Time expired)

Coronavirus, Queensland Border Closure



Hon. SJ MILES (Murrumba—ALP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (2.20 pm): It is often said that a week is a long time in Queensland politics, so what a difference a few weeks make. The last time we were here, the member for Everton and the member for Nanango could not talk about anything but the borders. Today, they will talk about everything but the borders. We have had question time and we have just heard the speeches of some members opposite, but there was no mention at all of the 64 little faux pas over the border.

Mr Mander interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Order! Pause the clock. Member for Everton, you are warned. You have been interjecting repeatedly. You have had your opportunity to make a contribution.

Dr MILES: In March, the Palaszczuk government made the incredibly difficult decision to close Queensland's borders to the other states and territories. We saw the community transmission of COVID-19 in New South Wales and Victoria. Closing our borders was a necessary measure to keep Queenslanders safe. Our strong health response was the first step toward Queensland's plan to unite and recover. If, like our friends down south, we were experiencing hundreds of new cases a day here in Queensland, we would not be able to start opening our economy again. In fact, Queenslanders would be facing going back into lockdown as Melbournians are. That is not something we want to see.

We on this side of the chamber have stood behind Queensland's plan to unite and recover. We stood by our plan even as the Prime Minister and the Premier of New South Wales were banging at the door, begging to be let in. We stood by our plan as the Leader of the Opposition called for the opening of our borders. We stood by our plan when the member for Currumbin said that the borders needed to be opened in every sense of the word. We did that when the member for Burleigh put up a billboard calling for the borders to be opened and when the LNP put up a billboard in Townsville calling for the borders to be opened. In fact, 64 times they called on us to give up on the health of Queenslanders and open the borders. Those opposite demanded, they moved motions, they asked questions, they made private members' statements and adjournment speeches. It was on their Facebook pages, on Sky News and in op-eds in the *Courier-Mail* and the *Gold Coast Bulletin*. Back then it was all about borders, but not so much today. What a lot can change in just a few weeks!

It must be nice to be able to say whatever you want and never care about the consequences. You never have to lie awake worrying about Queenslanders who might get sick or die because of your bad decisions. It must be nice to be able to be that reckless and to take those risks for political gain. However, that is not leadership. Queenslanders see that that is not leadership. We even stood by our plan when those opposite sided with Pauline Hanson and Clive Palmer. I cannot say I am surprised, considering that half of their party executive are paid for by Clive Palmer. The second that New South Wales closed its border with Victoria, those opposite went very quiet and the Prime Minister started talking about how important it was to keep the people of New South Wales safe. That was in stark contrast to the time when they did not care about keeping the people of Queensland safe.

It has been months since our last case of community transmission. Queenslanders have worked hard to ensure that we continue to have zero days. There is no way we would be in such an enviable position if we had listened to those opposite and opened our borders to the southern states earlier or, indeed, opened our borders to Victoria now. Thanks to our hard work, we were able to open our borders for tourists while ensuring they have stayed closed to hotspots and, in particular, to Victoria. We have backed in those decisions by ensuring there are strong penalties for breaching our orders and for lying. Police have turned people around at the border to keep Queenslanders safe. We have a plan to unite and recover, to invest in Queensland jobs and to keep Queenslanders safe.

We have continued to stand by our plan. We will not be bullied by those opposite into putting Queensland lives at risk, because we know that the first stage to our economic plan and our economic recovery is implementing our health plan and our health recovery.

Crime and Corruption Commission, Report



Mr BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (2.25 pm): This morning the education minister was complaining when I was waving around the Crime and Corruption Commission investigation into the allegations relating to the appointment of a school principal. She said, 'Read the report.' She said, 'I have been cleared.' I have read the report and I have put lots of tabs on it, because I want to read into the record

a few things from that Crime and Corruption Committee report. I will start at page 20. The Minister for Education was interviewed by the CCC. Paragraph 132 of the report states—

The Deputy Premier stated she asked Minister Grace why the principal was not at Executive Principal ...

The report goes on at paragraph 133—

The Deputy Premier recalls Minister Grace saying she thought it would be at Executive level ... and "*let me get back to you*".

The report further states—

When interviewed, Minister Grace stated that she did not recall giving an undertaking to the Deputy Premier ...

The report is a whole lot of she-said, she-said and he-said, she-said. The Crime and Corruption Commission saying that no criminal offence has been committed by the Minister for Education or the member for South Brisbane does not make what they did right. At paragraph 166 the report states—

Each panel member, including the Panel Chair, signed the selection report recommending the appointment of Principal A.

Paragraph 168 states—

The panel recommended Principal A for this position. By signing the selection report, each of the panel members recommended Principal A be appointed as the only meritorious candidate for the position.

According to the report, on 12 March the then deputy premier sent a text message to her electorate office staff, stating—

I thing [sic] that would be good. I also want a briefing on the principal recruitment ...

The member for South Brisbane was the first person to start asking about the recruitment process—not the Department of Education but the member for South Brisbane. Paragraph 177 states—

At 2:39pm, the Principal Advisor advised Minister Grace's office of the meeting to be held between—

Ms TRAD: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. That is not an accurate representation of what is in the report. I take personal offence at it and I ask for it to be withdrawn.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Member for Kawana, I ask for that to be withdrawn.

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw. Paragraph 177 states—

At 2:39pm, the Principal Advisor advised Minister Grace's office of the meeting to be held between DoE staff and the Deputy Premier on 14 March 2019.

The Minister for Education said that she knew nothing about any of the recruitment processes. Her office was being advised about the meeting—

Ms GRACE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member is misleading the House. I take personal offence and I ask that he withdraw.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There will be no quarrelling across the chamber while I deal with a point of order. Member for McConnel, there is no point of order for misleading the House. There is a process for you to follow if you believe that has occurred. I encourage you to follow that. If you take personal offence at the statements being made, I will ask that they be withdrawn.

Ms GRACE: I do take personal offence and I ask that they be withdrawn.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Kawana, I ask you to withdraw those statements.

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw. At page 28 of the CCC report, a text message from the DDG states—

Has [Panel Chair] taken the recommended principal to be 'interviewed' that is meet the dp Before appointing or recommending appointing.

The Department of Education was talking about taking Principal A, who was meritoriously appointed, to meet or be interviewed by the then deputy premier. At page 29 of the report, paragraph 207 states—

The Vice-Chancellor stated during examination by the CCC that he was surprised to receive the telephone call from the Deputy Premier to the extent that he thought the process was run by the DoE ...

Paragraph 208 states—

The Deputy Premier stated she had no recollection of what the Vice-Chancellor stated was discussed during the telephone call on 15 March 2019.

As I said, there is a lot of he-said, she-said in the report. At page 30 the report states that on 15 March—
The Executive Director, Human Resources, DoE approved the selection report recommending the appointment of Principal A.
Paragraph 222 states—

It may be the case that no offer was made because the DG, the DDG and the Panel Chair had already determined, the previous day, that it would not be inappropriate for Principal A to be 'interviewed' by the Deputy Premier.

That involves the director-general in this sorry saga. Paragraph 224 states—

The events that follow demonstrate a complete failure by the DoE to ensure that the recruitment process was free from the perception of political influence.

Those are not my words; they are the words of the Crime and Corruption Commission of Queensland.
At page 34 the report states—

The DDG proceeds with the plan that Principal A should meet with the Deputy Premier

In his evidence to the CCC he said that it would be good for her 'to hold her own' as 'the Deputy Premier is not the most easiest personality', as evidenced in the CCC report. I go on to page 36.

Mr Stevens interjected.

Ms TRAD: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take offence at the interjection from the member for Mermaid Beach when he referred to me as 'dodgy'. I ask for it to be withdrawn.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I heard that interjection, member for Mermaid Beach. I ask you to withdraw.

Mr STEVENS: I withdraw.

Ms Grace: And apologise.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not need your assistance, member for McConnel. You will have your opportunity to address the House in just a moment.

Mr BLEIJIE: Paragraph 250 of the CCC's report states—

The CCC considers that it is more than unusual. The CCC considers it completely inappropriate and in opposition to the principles of an apolitical public service which is free from political influence.

At page 39 the report states—

Attendees at the meeting variously described the Deputy Premier's mood as 'lacking in warmth', 'brusque', 'curt or terse', 'cold', 'unhappy' and 'in a bad mood'.

It should not be the mood of a politician that determines whether you get a job in the Queensland Public Service.

Ms TRAD: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence at that. That was not the conclusion reached by the CCC. I was completely exonerated. The CCC chair said in his press conference that I had been misled every step of the way. The inference is—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Taking a point of order is not an opportunity to debate the matter. If you have taken personal offence I will ask that it be withdrawn. I ask the member to withdraw.

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw. Paragraph 316 states—

DDG (12:44pm): I'm out. That wasn't too good was it.

Panel Chair (1:50pm): No it wasn't. I thought she didn't like Principal A.

DDG (1:50pm): We need to talk I think. I haven't heard from JT but it will come.

The reality is that Principal A was successfully appointed through a merit—

Mr Stevens interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Mermaid Beach, you were just asked—

Mr Stevens interjected.


Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Mermaid Beach, I am going to place you on—

Mr STEVENS: I apologise, but I said 'a dodgy saga'.

Mr BLEIJIE: What we have here is a public servant not given a position because of meetings. The CCC conclude in their evidence, and the panel chair said, that they believed Principal A would be the principal of that school had the meeting with the former deputy premier not taken place.

(Time expired)

Crime and Corruption Commission, Report; Coronavirus, Queensland Border Closure

 **Hon. G GRACE** (McConnel—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Industrial Relations) (2.33 pm): In response to the member for Kawana, we have made substantial announcements in regard to new schools, education, what we are doing out there, our unite and recover plan for Queensland, air conditioning, solar panels, extra teachers, extra teacher aides, extra cleaning in schools due to COVID-19 and a remarkable return to school by our students here in Queensland that led the nation. What do we get from those opposite? Nothing but throwing mud, muckraking and using the CCC as their political plaything. The CCC is not the political plaything of the member for Kawana. The CCC report is a public report—anybody can get it—yet to fill in time the member for Kawana needs to read it into *Hansard*.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Pause the clock. Minister, resume your seat. Member for Nicklin, you have been interjecting repeatedly and I have asked you to stop. You are on a warning.

Ms GRACE: This absolutely reeks of desperation. It was part of the thinking of those opposite this morning in question time that if they shouted loud enough they would get themselves into government. I tell the House that they are not fit for government. All we hear from them is whingeing, whining, complaining, muckraking, throwing mud and using words like 'dodgy', as the member for Mermaid Beach did. Those opposite think that yelling out these words is going to win them government. I inform them that it will take more than that to win government and to be fit for government.

We see in this place time and time again that those opposite are not fit to occupy this side of the House. At the last sittings the Leader of the Opposition and all members opposite called for the opening of the borders. Haven't they got egg on their faces now! When we talk about it now their heads go down. No-one is talking about border opening anymore. Our COVID-19 plan always had 10 July as the date for the opening of borders and said that the decision would be made at the end of the month. That is exactly what the Premier did. Thank God for our Premier. She has steered Queensland and has kept it safe—in spite of all of the harassment that went on during the last sitting by those opposite about 'opening the borders right now!' Even the motion was about opening the borders. It was relentless.

Look at those opposite now. I tell them all: the humble pie is in the oven and I will deliver it for them to eat. The Premier of New South Wales also needs to have a big slice. As soon as New South Wales was threatened, the first thing she did was to close the borders. Isn't it interesting? There was not a peep from those opposite. I have not heard a peep from them about opening the borders to international travellers. Has anyone in here heard members opposite talk about the economic disadvantage due to international travel restrictions? Have they been putting the hard word on the federal government to open up international travel? I have not heard one thing about it. Have members heard those opposite ask about the national debt due to COVID-19 and the expenditure of the federal government? We have not heard about it.

Opposition members come into this House and talk about economic pain due to COVID-19, but they act as if COVID-19 has not happened in this state. It is absolutely extraordinary to hear them. The Premier and this government, with a nice and steady hand, have been putting Queensland first at every opportunity—not playing politics. All those opposite do is play politics. It is going to come back to bite them, because they have no plans and no policy. We hear nothing but whingeing and whining from those opposite.

Even Karl Stefanovic from *Today* had the good sense to apologise to the Premier. He did the right thing and gave her a bunch of flowers or whatever. I have not heard any apologies from those opposite for the manner in which this government has handled COVID-19—not one. They should be apologising to the Premier because she has done an amazing job, together with government members. What do we hear from them? They say, 'We are going to do this about phonics teaching.' We have the Autism Hub and Reading Centre. It is desperate stuff, dusting off Campbell Newman policy and pretending it is new.

(Time expired)

Cross River Rail



Mr MINNIKIN (Chatsworth—LNP) (2.38 pm): There is a complete lack of transparency by the Labor government around the Cross River Rail project. It leads to the conclusion that the stated cost of delivery has been significantly understated. Key elements have been removed from financial scrutiny and so there is a great deal about the project costs we do not know. What is the full cost of delivering the Cross River Rail project? Quite simply, we do not know.

Let us try and develop a more complete picture of the full costs than the answer provided to question on notice No. 101 earlier this year which asked for the current estimated cost of delivering the entire project. The minister went on to indicate that the Palaszczuk government's commitment was \$5.4 billion. This figure seems to be significantly understated when we consider all the ancillary parts needed for it to deliver the stated objective of simply allowing more trains to run more often. Just like the state budget, disclosure of the full costs involved to deliver Cross River Rail continue to be hidden away.

Cross River Rail clearly involves much more than 10 kilometres of new rail lines and a couple of tunnels. These are simply the foundations of the project, if you like—just like the foundations for a new house. We all understand that a new house needs a frame, a roof, electrical wiring, insulation and landscaping to make it fit for purpose. Similarly, to be fit for purpose and to activate the network, the Cross River Rail project will require new rolling stock, a signalling and train control system, an upgraded automatic train protection system, new underground stations as well as upgrades to existing stations, additional station/portal work, servicing the public-private partnership costs for operations—without even mentioning the provision for general cost overruns.

I do not have the resources that the responsible minister and the Cross River Rail Delivery Authority have available. Nevertheless, given my business background, I have endeavoured to assign some indicative costings to the ancillary works required to enable more trains to run more often. For more trains to run, it is patently clear that we need to purchase more trains. New rolling stock of up to 40 new NGR train sets would cost in the vicinity of \$3 billion.

With the new train sets operating on the CRR, a new signalling and control system will be required. This is essential for signalling and rail traffic management. The European Train Control System, ETCS, will initially be rolled out between the Milton and Northgate and the Northgate to Salisbury track sections which incorporates the CBD surface and underground stations. The ETCS is estimated to cost \$2 billion.

To ensure the integration and safety of the system, an automatic train protection, ATP, system will still be required for the legacy QR fleet to continually check that the speed of a train is compatible with the permitted speed allowed by signalling, including automatic stop. The cost to bring all this up to speed and to be compatible with the ETCS will involve a further \$1 billion. The estimated cost of \$2 billion for the PPP operations over the life of the tunnel have not been factored into the project cost, it would appear.

The reason behind the need for CRR was to free up the network, particularly the bottleneck created on the Gold Coast line between Kuraby and Beenleigh. Without this upgrade, it is not possible to get above the current number of trains crossing this side of the river. The cost of the major upgrades for this section is estimated at up to \$2.8 billion.

It is not apparent that specific provision has been made for general cost overruns, estimated to be in the order of \$2 billion. Beyond this, upgrades to many other stations will also be required to ensure their compliance. There will be more trains with more impact. Without the removal of these level crossings, motorists will obviously be stuck at these crossings for much longer than is presently the case. Assigning a cost for these would again be in the billions of dollars.


Whilst I would be happy for the government to challenge or correct these figures, it would seem the Cross River Rail project could end up being closer to \$20 billion rather than the \$5.4 billion as stated. Queensland is the only state to cancel its budget. This means the Palaszczuk Labor government has no economic plan. With no budget it means Labor is flying blind through the biggest economic crisis in almost a century. This can equally be ascribed to the financial situation of the Cross River Rail project.

In Auditor-General's report No. 11, it says at page 1 that the financial performance of the Queensland government has been reduced over the last two financial years. The taxpayers of Queensland have the right to know the true cost of the CRR project. It is time for this Labor

administration to come clean on the project costs to avoid a Cross River Rail fail. Today, I have written to the Queensland Auditor-General and requested he arrange for an urgent performance audit of the project so that Queenslanders will know how much of their money is to be spent. I now table a copy of this letter for the benefit of the House.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 14 July 2020, from the member for Chatsworth, Mr Steve Minnikin MP, to the Auditor-General, Mr Brendan Worrall, regarding Cross River Rail [\[1143\]](#).

Liberal National Party, Public Transport

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (2.44 pm): It is always an absolute pleasure to follow the member for Chatsworth—the member who is my shadow in this place and has not asked me a question since 2018. He comes in here and waxes lyrical. He waves around big figures. He ignores the facts. The facts are that the Cross River Rail project in its first iteration could have been built by Campbell Newman for \$115 million a year over six years—in its full iteration a \$8 billion project—and he said no. He said, 'I do not want to embarrass Tony Abbott, my mate.' He sold out Queensland to cut the Cross River Rail project.

We saw nothing under the LNP government other than cuts. There was \$600 million worth of cuts to road transport. They cut the Cross River Rail project. They cut people's jobs. They cut infrastructure. That is all we saw from them. The economy nosedived to 0.7 per cent growth. Unemployment skyrocketed into the sevens because they mismanaged the economy. They mismanaged public transport.

Let us look at the history of the LNP when it comes to Cross River Rail. They opposed it. They cut it when they were in government. In opposition under the leadership of the member for Clayfield they still opposed it and railed against it all over the state. Then they kind of supported it. Then they opposed it again. Only 20 minutes ago we heard the member for Everton say that Cross River Rail is a waste of money. Now they oppose the project. It is difficult to keep up with the opposition. It depends on what day it is and on who is speaking.

We know that we cannot get public transport infrastructure built under the LNP because we know that they do not believe in it. They cut it when they were in government. They did not duplicate the rail line to the Sunshine Coast like we did. They did not build light rail on the Gold Coast like we did. They did not duplicate the rail line to Helensvale and Coomera like we did. They are not investing in Cross River Rail like this government does.

If we want to bust congestion we have to deal with rail. That is what this government is doing. We will not be lectured to and have laughable figures bandied around by the member for Chatsworth who was the assistant minister for public transport under Campbell Newman. He was certainly responsible in part for ordering trains from overseas that were not compliant and led the then leader of the opposition to say that it would be 36 years before we got back to full timetable and then six weeks later we were back to full timetable. When it comes to the post-election shadow front bench I wish the member for Chatsworth good luck.

We cannot trust the LNP with public transport. What we saw under them was that no Queensland Rail train drivers started training for an entire year—2014. There was a net reduction of 48 drivers when they were in power. Knowing full well that they had six new stations and a whole new line starting in 2016 and we were holding the Commonwealth Games, they reduced the number of train drivers by 48. That is absolute incompetence.

We have seen record recruitment under this government. At this point there has been a net increase of 168 drivers and 213 qualified guards. That is a net figure. In terms of a gross figure, we have absolutely met the targets of 200 each as outlined in the Strachan report. What we have seen are 462 extra weekly services come into play between May and July 2019. We have added services multiple times throughout this term.

Queensland Rail is now delivering 740 more weekly services than ever before in South-East Queensland. That has only been possible because of our record train crew recruitment. A total of 78 external candidates from the August 2017 campaign commenced driver training between the middle of last year and January this year. Nineteen ex-QR drivers have graduated and are out working on the network. We love their work. A total of 144 external applicants were also offered positions as guards. We will continue to recruit and manage the rail system in a way that is competent, unlike those opposite.

In relation to overtime, I inform the House of a few facts rather than a few furbies put forward by those opposite. In 2018-19 the average hours of overtime worked by an average train driver decreased by 18.09 per cent compared with 2016-17. In fact, overtime increased by 25 per cent in the last year of the Newman government. Why? That is because they were not training any train drivers. We saw a reduction of 48 drivers. It is not too difficult to work out.

This government believes in transport infrastructure. We are undertaking the road upgrades that are needed. We are building the heavy rail projects that are absolutely critical for the whole of South-East Queensland, including on the Sunshine Coast and the Gold Coast. We are building light rail on the Gold Coast. This government invests in jobs and invests in infrastructure for a growing South-East Queensland population. We cannot take a risk on those opposite who do not understand public transport, only know how to cut, only know how to sack and only know how to sell. Whatever promises they make, we know that that is in their DNA and that is what they will do if they get half a chance.

Maiwar Electorate, Planning Laws



Mr BERKMAN (Maiwar—Grn) (2.49 pm): Today I would like to talk about an issue in Toowong in my electorate that has highlighted a major problem with our planning system. The old Woolworths site, as it is known, in the middle of Toowong is long overdue for redevelopment to revitalise this centre, and interest has been growing for years about what would be built to replace it.

The most recent proposal that has been announced just this year is a massive and really significant project apparently inspired by a shopping complex in LA. It is worth \$450 million and stands at 25 storeys, but locals do not have any rights to have a say in the final outcome and they will have no rights to appeal any council decision on it.

Like so much other development across our suburbs in our state, this project is code assessable, not impact assessable, which means it does not require any community consultation under Queensland's Planning Act. To put it simply, our planning laws allow this \$450 million development to be treated as a tick-and-flick job.

Before it starts, I want to make it abundantly clear that the Greens and I are not simply anti development and that this is not an exercise in nimbyism. It makes sense for growth to happen around this area. It is a growing transport and business hub. We have room for new neighbours, and I know that my community overwhelmingly recognises this. That does not change the fact that residents deserve a voice in decisions about their community.

In a residents' survey I conducted last year, only 21 per cent of respondents said they feel like they get enough of a say in decisions about their city—which I would say is a pretty damning indictment of the planning system as it stands. In relation to this development in Toowong, despite the systemic barriers, I am doing the best I can to make sure that local voices are heard.

I recently launched a local survey just to give people a chance to have their say on this redevelopment, and the response has been really quite overwhelming. So far we have received 560 detailed written responses and there are more coming in daily. It is clear that locals want to have their say on development like this.

The biggest issue that residents have consistently raised about the proposal is the need for proper traffic management, and the community has emphatically restated its support for a public park at the old ABC site down the road. People are also concerned about the height of these two towers, protecting Toowong's historical character and car parking.

I will be taking these responses—many hundreds of them—and using them as the basis to advocate directly to council about what the community wants to see in this development, but it is clear that beyond this we need systemic change for residents to really have a say. The Greens and I are pushing for reforms to our planning system that would make all major developments like this impact assessable. I am the only one in parliament who is making the case for this reform.

The last time the LNP had the chance under Campbell Newman they tipped the balance even further in favour of developers, and this government still has not bothered to fix all of the changes the LNP made before 2015. In fact, while I am calling for communities to have a greater say in these proposals, the government appears to be resolute in its view that the current system is good enough. Well, it is not.

Across Queensland, residents have lost the ability to have a say in how their neighbourhoods should grow and change. We know it is possible to create well-designed, medium density developments with adequate new public infrastructure, but to do that our planning system needs to value the voice of the community more than the profits of the development industry.


I have seen the failures of our planning system time and again in Maiwar. When over 3,500 residents formally objected to the Mount Coot-tha Zipline, Brisbane's lord mayor could blithely dismiss these submissions and effectively rule them out of council's assessment of the development application. Despite widespread support and a growing need for greenspace on the west side, the Brisbane City Council is refusing to use its powers to buy back the former ABC site and plan for adequate new public space in Toowong. The grossly inappropriate TriCare high-rise development in Taringa is still going ahead despite having been initially refused by council and a local community group challenging the developer in court. The planning system does not even allow council to defend its decisions on the rare occasion that it does listen to the community.

Community consultation on 'infrastructure designations' for really important infrastructure like local schools is rushed, opaque and inadequate and countless apartment blocks and commercial spaces are routinely approved with little or no meaningful consultation with the community.

Although I no longer work as a planning and environment lawyer, I spend a lot of my time as Maiwar's local representative advocating on the community's behalf about development matters. The Planning Act needs an overhaul. Our planning system needs to work for people, not profit. Ensuring that major developments like this are impact assessable, not just waved through code assessment, would be a really good start.

The people of Maiwar, my electorate, are ready to be involved in decisions about their own suburbs, and the huge response to the project proposed for central Toowong has shown that. We desperately need reform to make space for the community's voice in our planning system.

Health Services

 **Mr McCALLUM** (Bundamba—ALP) (2.54 pm): We cannot put a price on the health and wellbeing of Queenslanders. We are in the middle of an unprecedented global health pandemic. Now, more than ever, free, world-class health care is vital. That is why the Palaszczuk government continues to invest in the rapidly expanding West Moreton Hospital and Health Service, committing \$25 million for a new 26-bed ward at Ipswich Hospital. This is the first new ward at the hospital for about six years. It will help meet demand in our state's fastest growing healthcare region.

We have also delivered a new MRI suite—a state-of-the-art machine that is expected to provide more than 3,700 services a year. While the LNP when they were last in government sacked 124 frontline health workers in Ipswich, these investments by the Palaszczuk government will deliver more doctors and nurses for our local community, as will the hospital's new \$91 million, 50-bed acute mental health unit, supporting over 100 jobs during construction as we unite and recover.

Frontline health staff continue their outstanding work at the Ipswich Hospital Fever Clinic, and as of today the West Moreton region has no active COVID cases and has had only 39 since the start of March. Can you imagine what those numbers might be had our borders been opened too early? That is the real-world impact on Queenslanders of irresponsible calls and decisions.

I want to acknowledge the outstanding work of the West Moreton health team, led by CEO Dr Kerrie Freeman and chair Michael Willis. Thank you to all the frontline health staff who are playing such a vital role in leading Queensland forward.

Our commitment to unite and recover for Queensland jobs extends well beyond the health sector. It is on full display right across the Bundamba community. On the weekend I was proud to attend the official reopening of the Goodna Services Club. The near \$2 million refurbishment gives the historic club a new look inside and out. Like many pubs, clubs, cafes and restaurants across Queensland, president Russell Dewar and his team got to work during the COVID closure, supporting local tradies and contractors with refurbs, refits and renovations. Now their hard work is being rewarded with renewed community support.

Locally we also have major industry leaders like Progress Rail and TAE Aerospace—world-class organisations that continue to innovate and maintain operations during the COVID pandemic. Recently I had the pleasure of meeting workers at both facilities. I am proud to say that they are keeping locals in jobs while exploring new ways to expand and diversify.

Our \$6 billion Works for Queensland economic recovery strategy will deliver \$2 million in upgrades to local facilities—a new playground, car park, lighting and landscaping at Redbank Plains Recreation Reserve; improved drainage and water quality at Bellbird Park’s Moodai Reserve; and upgraded change rooms at Richardson Park in Goodna.

The Redbank Plains project is the centrepiece of a \$4.4 million investment in Ipswich. This is a great asset for the Bundamba community, and the upgrade will further broaden its appeal as we all work towards a healthier and more active Queensland. This reserve continues to be a destination for locals and visitors alike, and this is a welcome investment in our youth, our families and our greenspaces that will support local jobs.

We continue to manage our health response. Our success has been recognised around the world, and it is being balanced with unprecedented levels of infrastructure and economic investment. I want to acknowledge the work of the Premier, the Deputy Premier and Minister for Health, and our Chief Health Officer for their careful and considered management of Queensland’s COVID health response.

While we all must remain responsible and respect social distancing—and that includes the member for Surfers Paradise—we are moving forward with a determined sense of Queensland spirit as we unite and recover.

CHILD PROTECTION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction



Hon. DE FARMER (Bulimba—ALP) (Minister for Child Safety, Youth and Women and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (2.59 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Adoption Act 2009 and the Child Protection Act 1999 for particular purposes. I table the bill, explanatory notes and statement of compatibility with human rights. I nominate the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Child Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020 [\[1144\]](#).

Tabled paper: Child Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020, explanatory notes [\[1145\]](#).

Tabled paper: Child Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020, statement of compatibility with human rights [\[1146\]](#).

The Queensland government is committed to making the child protection and family support system as strong as it can possibly be to support children and families now and into the future. Sadly, some Queensland homes are not safe places for children. Issues including domestic and family violence, mental health and drug and alcohol addiction, including the use of ice, can create extreme levels of risk for the children in our state. More than one in three children who came into the care of the department during the 12 months to September 2019 had a parent with current or previous methamphetamine use recorded.

The demand and complexity of such issues presenting to Child Safety increases by the year. On 2 June 2020 the Deputy State Coroner released the inquest findings into the tragic death of Mason Jett Lee. Every Queenslander was shocked and horrified by the awful circumstances of Mason’s death and of his short life. No child should experience the pain and suffering he endured.

The Queensland government has implemented significant reforms since Mason’s death and the Deputy State Coroner’s findings recognise this; however, the Deputy State Coroner also made it clear that we can do more. The Queensland government’s response to the Deputy State Coroner’s report was tabled 17 June 2020, accepting all six recommendations. These included that the government consider amendments to Queensland legislation based on the legislative framework in New South Wales related to adoption for children in care.

This bill implements recommendation 6(b) by proposing amendments to the Child Protection Act 1999 and implements recommendation 6 in general by ensuring that adoption is routinely and genuinely considered as an option for achieving permanency. The bill also proposes unrelated minor and technical amendments to the Adoption Act 2009 to enable an application for a final intercountry adoption order to be made for a number of children placed with prospective adoptive parents by the Commonwealth minister.

Major reforms to improve stability and permanency for children in care in Queensland came into effect in Queensland in 2018 after Mason Jett Lee’s tragic death. We know that providing permanency for children is the right thing to do for the safety, wellbeing and best interests of our children. Every child

deserves a 'forever' family; however, permanency is about more than legal status. Young people in care tell us that it is also about their connection to important people in their lives such as their siblings, grandparents and friends. It is also about stable living arrangements, connection to community and school, and meeting their health and developmental needs.

The Child Protection Act currently defines permanency to include three elements: legal arrangements, stable living arrangements and ongoing positive relationships with significant people. The act includes a permanency framework to promote positive, long-term outcomes for children through timely decision-making and action to either safely reunify children with their families or provide them with alternative long-term care in line with the child's best interests. The act also promotes the safe care and connection of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children with their families, communities and cultures.

We were the first state to legislate all five elements of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle, which are: prevention, partnership, placement, participation and connection. My department takes these elements very seriously in the work that they do and will continue to do so. This bill as proposed will not change how we apply those principles. This bill builds on our strong track record to improve permanency outcomes for children who cannot be cared for by their parents and who require a long-term care arrangement. Put simply, if the department suspects a child is in need of protection, the department will take all the action considered necessary to protect the child from harm.

The bill proposes amendments to the hierarchy of preferences for achieving permanency in section 5BA of the act by providing that adoption is the third preference for children other than Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander children. For Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children, the bill proposes that adoption is the last preference for achieving permanency. Permanency planning occurs as part of a case plan for each individual child, taking into consideration their particular needs and how they can best be met. Although adoption is currently included in the permanency options, the proposed amendments clearly and separately articulate adoption as an option to be routinely and genuinely considered.

Consistent with our obligations under the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, the best interests of the child will remain the paramount consideration. The Adoption Act 2009 recognises that adoption, as provided for under that act, is not part of First Nation custom and should only be considered to meet the needs of a First Nation child if there is no better available option. Any decisions made under the amendments will also need to be compatible with the Human Rights Act 2019, which recognises and protects the distinct cultural rights held by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. The bill does not change these safeguards. Any decision we make under this framework must also reflect all elements of the child placement principle for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children.

I am extremely humbled, grateful and proud of the partnerships we have built with our Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander stakeholders. These partnerships are critical to achieving the best possible outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children so they can be safely cared for by their families and kin. The Queensland government remains committed to the partnership and progress made to date, including the significant changes made as part of the Our Way Strategy and Changing Tracks Action Plan—a transformational 20-year generational strategy to address the over-representation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children and families in the child protection system. As a result of that commitment, and for the eighth consecutive quarter, the proportion of children in care who are Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander has remained steady. Although this is a very pleasing achievement, there remains an enormous amount of work to be done. Monitoring of the implementation of our permanency reforms will be critical to our success. This bill also includes a new requirement for the chief executive to review the case plan for a child who is subject to a child protection order granting long-term guardianship to the chief executive 24 months after the order is made.

As part of the broader implementation of today's amendments there will be some practice changes in the delivery of child safety services. These will include: a review of the implementation of permanency reforms to date, including the implementation of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle; the establishment of a new senior position in the Department of Child Safety, Youth and Women dedicated to overseeing improved permanency outcomes across the department; case plan audits for all children in care under three years old to assess whether further permanency planning is required; targeted work with current foster and kinship carers to assess improvements to stability for children who have been in their care for more than two years; and quarterly reporting on the status of permanency planning for children in care, including the numbers of children on permanent care orders or other long-term orders.

All decisions recommending that adoption be pursued as an option for an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander child in care will be personally reviewed by the director-general of the Department of Child Safety, Youth and Women, and this responsibility will not be delegated. Speaker, we want the best outcomes for children now and throughout their lives. When a child is in need of protection, Child Safety will step in. I commend the bills to the House.

First Reading

Hon. DE FARMER (Bulimba—ALP) (Minister for Child Safety, Youth and Women and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (3.08 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.

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

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


TRANSPORT AND OTHER LEGISLATION (ROAD SAFETY, TECHNOLOGY AND OTHER MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL

TRANSPORT LEGISLATION (DISABILITY PARKING AND OTHER MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading (Cognate Debate)

Resumed from p. 1542, on motion of Mr Bailey—


That the bills be now read a second time.

 **Hon. MT RYAN** (Morayfield—ALP) (Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services) (3.09 pm), continuing: As I was saying before the lunchbreak, to enforce mobile phone and seatbelt offences using these cameras, there is no other alternative to the camera taking images inside the vehicle's front cabin or to the artificial intelligence reviewing images looking for prescribed unlawful action. The cameras are not designed to capture or analyse the biometric data of a person. While a person's face, or part thereof, or another part of their body may be included in an image, a person will not be identified through the image.

The artificial intelligence will only pass an image to the Queensland Police Service where it has detected a possible offence. The Queensland Police Service will then review the image and adjudicate on whether an offence actually has occurred. If the Queensland Police Service determines that an offence has taken place, an infringement will be sent to the registered owner of the vehicle. The infringement notice will include an image of the offence. A person can choose to have the infringement reviewed where they believe an offence has not taken place. If they choose to have the infringement reviewed, the image will be, firstly, administratively reviewed by the Queensland Police Service. If upheld, a person can still challenge the infringement through the court process. It is intended that the Queensland government website will provide clear information as to how the new camera detection of mobile phone and seatbelt offences will work. Information will also be included on the infringement notice detailing how the administrative review and court election processes can be accessed.

As I said, community safety is paramount, and I can say that no-one takes that more seriously on our roads than Queensland's road policing units. As I speak, our police are out and about conducting Operation Cold Snap. This road safety campaign has been operating since the start of the school holidays. This week the focus has been on urging people to drive safely around schools. It is just one of the many operations that the road policing units conduct that is specifically designed to keep people

safe by reinforcing those messages of safety on our roads. Like so many teams that make up the Queensland Police Service, the road policing units are dedicated to community safety and serve the Queensland community with honour. The bill before the House will enhance road safety and save lives. Most importantly, it will create a safer Queensland. I commend the bills to the House.

 **Mr SORENSEN** (Hervey Bay—LNP) (3.12 pm): I rise to speak on the cognate bills, especially the Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill. First of all, I would like to thank the committee that has worked hard on this legislation. It has taken a long time to get here from when the member for Bundaberg, David Batt, approached the minister about blind people and people with poor sight being able to use disability car parks. We often see blind people hop out of their cars with their white cane or their seeing eye dog. These people have a disability and I could never understand why they were not accepted into those car parks in the first place.

The member for Bundaberg originally raised the issue with the Minister for Transport and Main Roads and it looked as though the eligible criteria was not going to be expanded. The member launched a petition which was tabled on 19 February with 3,200 signatures. I would like to thank all of those people who signed that petition because it was the beginning of getting this legislation through. We had one of the members of the Katter party introduce a private member's bill and the committee advertised for public submissions and had public hearings, but then along came Anna, the Premier, who introduced the Labor Party's bill. What did we have to do then? We had to go back and ask for public submissions again and have more public hearings. What a waste of money. All they had to do was—

Mr Power interjected.

Mr SORENSEN: No, why couldn't they have put their bill in with the private member's bill? If that had happened, it would have all been done by the committee without any further costs. I would like to thank all of those people who did give evidence, especially the Queensland Blind Association. They do a great job with the guide dogs, they do a lot of work in the community and they raise a lot of money because it is not cheap to train those dogs to be able to help people with a disability.


I do not know why we had to go through that whole process just so that blind people and their carers could park in a disability car park. It was ridiculous. Why couldn't it just go in with another bill? I do not understand that. We took the long way around just to get to where we are today. We are now just before an election. This sounded good a couple of years ago but the Labor Party did not want to do it. Why? It was a simple idea. Why didn't the government do it a couple of years ago when the member for Bundaberg, David Batt, raised it?

I thank David for doing what he did. He did a great job and I would like to pat him on the back for that and thank him on behalf of those people around Hervey Bay who have a disability. There are a number of seeing eye dogs in Hervey Bay. I know some of those people have problems getting across some of the intersections, especially the vision-impaired people. Why couldn't we have done this the simple way? Why did such a simple thing have to take two years, two committee hearings and two lots of public submissions? It is so simple yet we had to go through all of that. I just do not understand it.

In relation to the other bill, the way that technology is advancing in the world today we will have something else in a couple of years that will be able to save people's lives on the road. I agree with everybody in this House who has said that mobile phones cause deaths on the roads. We only have to look at some of the crosses on the road and realise who has died, and we know that some of those deaths were due to mobile phones, especially in the younger generation. We have 16- and 17-year-old kids dying on the roads because of mobile phones, and that is pretty tough to take. I do not know how they do it, but they text on their mobile phone at the same time as they drive. It will be good to be able to use cameras to identify some of those people who are doing that. We have the speeding cameras on major highways, but I think this will be good because it will save people's lives on the roads.

Clauses 33 and 34 mean that TMR can go on to private land for land management activities including surveys et cetera. Biosecurity is an issue on a lot of farms now. I hope the Department of Transport and Main Roads understands that we do not want vehicles that have been up and down the road spreading the likes of rat's-tail grass across people's paddocks. There are a lot of signs around the place to do with biosecurity, but this bill did not really touch on that. If TMR can come on to your property like that, it could mean a lot to farmers and it could cost them a lot of money with biosecurity. We only have to look at the banana farmers and some of the diseases that could be brought onto their land, especially on heavy machinery. There was a time when the harvesters that were going from property to property had to be washed down. TMR use big machinery and different vehicles, and I think

we have to look at the biosecurity in this legislation. The minister said today in his speech that the farmer gets seven days notice and that is better than having them walking in off the road and going onto the properties with no thought about biosecurity, especially in today's climate.

 **Mrs McMAHON** (Macalister—ALP) (3.20 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill. I commend the work of the committee in considering this bill and the multitude of organisations and people who have brought this issue to the table. The objectives of the bill I wish to speak to today and lend my support to are the extension of the disability parking eligibility criteria to include vision-impaired persons who are temporarily blind or permanently blind and the increase in the penalty that applies for the misuse of a disability parking area.

The Australian Disability Parking Scheme was implemented in 2010 as a Commonwealth arrangement to consider national eligibility criteria. At the time the consideration was for the scheme to be a mobility scheme and the criteria was to focus on the applicant's ability to walk. It should be noted that when the states adopted this approach some states did incorporate their already existing criteria that extended to vision-impaired persons so as not to reduce eligibility in those states. Now in Queensland expanding the eligibility criteria to those with vision impairment is a game changer for these community members.

While the intent of the original Australian Disability Parking Scheme was commendable in terms of focusing on mobility, Guide Dogs Queensland advise that a person's ability to walk is determined by more than their functional movement. It includes the ability to walk safely, free from harm and for orientation and obstacle avoidance. Understandably, car park environments are a major source of risk for those with vision impairment. Having the ability to park in a space that affords more room can make a big difference to those who are vision-impaired. Those who use guide dogs, for example, need to harness their dogs in a zonal corridor of safety that is best provided by the space afforded by disability parking spots. Those people who require aided walking with a partner—side by side—are best suited to a space afforded by disability parking spots.

Individuals who are permanently blind will be eligible to apply for a permit. Individuals who have temporary blindness will also be eligible to apply, provided that their condition is of at least six months duration or certified by a treating doctor, ophthalmologist or optometrist. In terms of the application process, those who already have a vision-impaired travel pass will be able to provide a copy of their card as eligibility for the disability parking permit scheme. This means applicants will not have to go back to their doctors to get another assessment.

The other aspect of this bill is the increase in the penalty for those who are not eligible and continue to park in disability parking spaces. Currently, the fine under the traffic regulations is two penalty units, which currently is \$266. The proposed increase to four penalty units, bringing the maximum fine to \$533, will deliver a strong deterrent to those who misuse disability parking spaces. The current fine is one of the lowest in Australia, and over the last five years police officers have issued over 7½ thousand fines to people who have illegally parked in these spaces. This, however, represents only a small fraction of the offences detected as the vast majority are issued by councils.

Councils do set their own fines up to the maximum amount, and many are already in line with the current state set amount. While police have the ability to issue fines to people who illegally park in disability spots on roads and road related areas, which does include shopping centres and other places available for the public to park, the reality is it is primarily the councils that conduct enforcement in those areas. In my city of Logan the council has entered into arrangements with individual shopping centres to allow the enforcement on private property. In my electorate this includes the Beenleigh Mall, Beenleigh Marketplace, Eagleby Plaza, Riverlakes Village and Logan Shopping Village.

I would outline to the House that this is about a strong deterrent. The impact on those who rely on disability car parks when those spaces are occupied cannot be understated. For many people when those parks are unavailable they have to abandon their day out. This has flow-on effects for their lifestyle, particularly in relation to missing medical appointments. This is a bill that will increase inclusion in our communities and that is why I support this bill.

I now turn to the Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2020. Two key highlights of the bill are the introduction of the digital licence app and legislation to support the introduction of camera enforcement for seatbelt and mobile phone offences. A digital licence app will allow users to provide digital evidence of age and identity. It will include data

from Queensland drivers' licences, photo ID cards such as the old 18+ card and recreational marine licences. The presentation of the digital information from the app will meet many legal requirements for people who are required to produce legal forms of identification.

The introduction of the digital app will reduce the number of cards people need to carry, provide greater security and protection of information, and provide a simple interface for updating personal details. This will deliver a secure platform for businesses and regulatory and enforcement agencies to authenticate someone's identity as well as a simple, real-time method of receiving updates and reminders for renewals and payments. It should be noted that the digital app will not replace the issuing of conventional, traditional licences. The app will not be mandatory; they are both complementary.

To date, the detection of mobile phone and seatbelt offences has been the purview of our police officers working to reduce road trauma. Patrolling officers are constantly scanning traffic, watching vehicles observing drivers and looking for the telltale signs: where are the hands of the driver; where is the driver looking; what other lights are emanating from within the vehicle; and looking at the angle over a driver's shoulder that indicates whether a seatbelt is present.

In 2018 there were 9,607 tickets issued for seatbelt offences in Queensland and in the year 2018-19 there were over 27,000 tickets issued for mobile phone offences in Queensland. This is quite staggering when we consider that in Queensland on average 31 people are killed each year in crashes whilst not wearing seatbelts and that 14 per cent of road fatalities and 20 per cent of serious injuries from crashes are attributed to distracted driving. What is not seen in these statistics is the number of these offences that go undetected. Given that the nature of traffic enforcement in these areas requires police to be at the right place at the right time, a large number of these offences go undetected. Police can only be in so many places at one time, so I do look forward to seeing trials commence on the use of camera detection of seatbelt and mobile phone offences.

Camera enforcement has been successful in reducing road trauma for other serious driving offences like speeding and running red lights. I welcome any initiatives that will reduce the road trauma from distracted driving and seatbelt offences. I am comfortable with the processes to be introduced relating to human oversight once these offences have been detected and I look forward to seeing the evaluation of the trial. I commend these bills to the House.



Mr DAMESTO (Hinchinbrook—KAP) (3.28 pm): I rise to make my contribution to the Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2019, which is being debated in cognate with the Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2020. It seems like everyone has had a bit of a part to play in the Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill prior to it coming before the House today. Personally, I would like to thank the Transport and Public Works Committee for the work they have done in looking at not only this bill but also the private member's bill I introduced to the House some time ago. I would like to step through the journey of what brought me to introduce my bill to the parliament and push for these legislative changes to happen to allow people living with a vision impairment to one day have access to a disability parking permit.

I received a message from a young gentleman who lives in my electorate, Mr Justin Huggett. He has family friends, Hailey and Chayd Brown, whose two young daughters, Arliyah and Mackenzie, were born with albinism. They always have to park all the way down the back of the car park, because their mother, as their carer, does not qualify to apply for a disability parking permit. These two little girls are legally blind. They have a younger brother who is not legally blind. What happens when their mother tries to help them to the front door of Woolworths, Coles or one of the bigger shopping centres? We can imagine what it must be like to do that with three children with all the abilities in the world, let alone with two young girls who cannot see properly. As I looked into this situation I realised that they did not qualify. I thought, 'How is it possible that people who cannot see what is in front of them do not apply for a disability parking permit?' That started me on my journey.

I spoke to the member for Hill to see where the Katter party would sit on this subject. He said, 'Nick, I asked the minister some time ago, on 15 February 2018, in a question on notice.' He asked the minister what could be done to expand the eligibility criteria to allow people living with a permanent disability—blindness—to access the permit system. The minister's answer stated—

National eligibility criteria for permits were also created. This is known as the Australian Disability Parking Scheme. It is a mobility scheme and assessment for permits focuses on an applicant's functional ability to walk. Therefore, currently, people with intellectual, psychiatric, cognitive and sensory impairments do not meet the eligibility criteria ...

The answer also stated—

As with schemes of this nature, unfortunately, there will always be some members of the community that fall outside the eligibility guidelines.

That really hit me. I thought, 'Something needs to be done for people who have an inability to move safely through a car park because they have a sensory impairment.' I acknowledge the petition the member for Bundaberg put to the state government asking for the eligibility criteria to be expanded. That petition had over 2,000 signatories, which is absolutely brilliant. That shows that out in the public space there was a large call for this.

The more that the Katter party and I shone the light on this, the more we realised that people did not even realise that this was the situation. We went to the drawing board and decided that we would draft amendments to legislation. Last year I introduced those amendments into the House in my first private member's bill.

With the current scheme criteria in Queensland, if you are visually-impaired or legally blind you cannot apply for a permit. If you reside in New South Wales, Tasmania, the Northern Territory or the Australian Capital Territory, you can apply for this permit. If this bill passes the House, we will align with other states and give over 5,000 people in Queensland living with permanent or semi-permanent blindness an ability to feel safer and more dignified when they pull up to a shopping centre.

We worked well with Guide Dogs Queensland in putting together the bill that we introduced to the House. Matthew Barwick, who works in their communications team, said, 'Nick, the more light we can shine on this, the more we can bring this to people's attention and to the attention of people in parliament, the better chance we have of getting this legislation through.' I could not agree more. The KAP hosted Guide Dogs Queensland at parliament and they set up on the green out the front. They introduced us to some of their guide dogs in training as well as to a gentleman named Rhett, who lives with a guide dog and who has a permanent disability. While on the green the members for Cairns and Noosa and a couple of others put on blindfolds and were led around by the guide dog. This was to show us what it would be like to live with permanent blindness or vision impairment and for us to see how hard it was to walk through the course they had laid out for us. I already understood this, but the members who were there understood there and then that when you have a sensory impairment you cannot move safely through a car park and, therefore, the criteria needed to be changed.


We were able to introduce our bill into the House, and it was good to see that the Labor members understood what we had tried to achieve. There was some betterment, I guess, to our bill as the government introduced its own bill into the House. The minister has proposed a couple of measures that we may have missed, one of which is an increase in fines from \$266 to \$533. I believe that will work as a good deterrent. I think the minister has done some good work in increasing those fines as a deterrent to stop people parking in spaces set aside for those who need them the most.

I table a couple of news reports and stories about Arliyah and Mackenzie Brown and the struggle they went through to get to this point.

Tabled paper: Bundle of media articles relating to the issues experienced by families with children with disability and the Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2019 [\[1147\]](#).

I refer to another family in North Queensland. Taylor Blennerhassett and her lovely daughter were dealing with some pretty tragic stuff in Townsville when trying to use a disability parking spot. Their story was particularly sad. They had actually talked to the school about using a car park on private property so that their daughter, who was living with blindness, could access the school in a safer way. While legally they were not allowed to do that, really horrible notes were being left on their windscreen—the kinds of words you would not say to your worst enemy. That people were leaving nasty notes for a mother trying to get her daughter safely to the classroom was absolutely disgusting behaviour. Introducing legislation into the House was close to my heart. I sought to stop some of this.

Finally, I have received a letter from the Clerk's office indicating that if this bill passes today, due to the same question rule my bill will basically die a slow death. I do not mind that, as long as we achieve the right outcome for people living with this disability. Hopefully after this bill is passed, the vision-impaired will be able to rest easy knowing that they, too, will be able to apply for a disability parking permit. I commend the bills to the House.

 **Ms PEASE** (Lytton—ALP) (3.38 pm): I rise to speak to the Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2019 and the Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2020, which are being debated cognately today. I acknowledge the work of the member for Traeger and thank him for his passion and commitment.

For my constituent Anthony, the Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2019 will mean independence and an opportunity to participate in the life of the community in a way that he never could before. Anthony is legally blind and has unique mobility challenges, as do all those in our communities who are either permanently or temporarily legally blind. Currently, the disability parking permit scheme provides permit holders with parking concessions that offer convenient access to facilities in wide parking bays. In Queensland, the eligibility criteria for a permit has been exclusively based on the applicant's functional ability to walk.

There are approximately 206,000 disability parking permits issued in Queensland consisting of 196,000 permits issued to individuals and 10,000 permits issued to just under 1,000 organisations. Following community feedback, a review was conducted to assess the feasibility of expanding the eligibility criteria for the scheme to include people with vision impairment so that people like Anthony could have access to the scheme. This means that permit holders have access to disability parking bays in commercial and private car parks as well as those provided on the street by local governments and they are permitted to park free of charge in regulated and metered council parking bays for longer than the time stated on the sign. Where the sign shows less than 30 minutes, parking is allowed for 30 minutes. Where the sign shows 30 minutes or more, parking is allowed for an unlimited time and loading zones may be used for dropping off and picking up a person with a disability.

This bill will, as a result of the review, expand the eligibility criteria for a disability parking permit to include people who are diagnosed as legally blind, whether on a temporary or permanent basis. For people like Anthony and his carers, it will mean that they will have greater flexibility and more capacity to engage and participate in community life like never before. Further, the offence for illegally parking in disability parking bays without a valid parking permit is provided in the Queensland Road Rules and this bill increases the police issued infringement penalty in the State Penalties Enforcement Regulation 2014 from \$266 to \$533. This may make my council colleague Councillor Ryan Murphy a little bit more hesitant to parking illegally in disabled parking bays. Setting a higher penalty recognises the seriousness of illegally parking in a disability parking bay and, as I have said, I hope and I know that it will discourage illegal use of the disabled parking bays.

The Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill will amend various acts to support the introduction and ongoing operation of a digital licence app and facilitate camera enforcement of seatbelt and mobile phone offences. The introduction of a digital licence app will provide Queenslanders the opportunity to engage digitally with Queensland government services. It will provide secure and immediate access to credentials including their drivers' licences, provide customers with greater control in sharing their information, and facilitate reminder and payment notifications.

The app will be optional and in addition to the physical product and the amendments in this bill will ensure that products such as a driver's licence, recreational marine licences, industry authorisations and proof-of-age photo identification cards can be issued as a digital product and that a person can hold the same version of the product both digitally and physically and on multiple devices. Privacy, data security and practicability were key considerations during the development of the app and the legislation does not alter existing privacy protections. The app will improve an individual's ability to manage their personal information.

Distracted driving is an increasing concern on Queensland roads. In 2018 in Queensland, 33 people lost their lives and 1,359 were hospitalised with serious injuries as a result of crashes where distraction was a contributing factor. The introduction of camera detection for mobile phone and seatbelt offences in Queensland aims to save lives and reduce road trauma and the impact it has on families and communities. Nyree Mannion from Make it Home knows firsthand the impact of road trauma on families. Her beloved sister Sharon was involved in a serious car accident over 30 years ago and sustained catastrophic injuries. Nyree and her family support Sharon and now also educate and support young drivers, particularly around the Fatal Five. I know that Nyree will be delighted with these amendments in the Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2020. I also know that Anthony and the other vision-impaired people in my community are delighted with the Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2019. I commend both bills to the House.



Mr BATT (Bundaberg—LNP) (3.43 pm): Today I rise to speak on the Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill as part of this cognate debate. I rise to voice my wholehearted support of the changes to the disability parking scheme in Queensland to allow

visually-impaired Queenslanders to obtain a disability parking permit for their carer's vehicle. I have been dedicated to fighting for this change for two years and so proud to see the changes finally being put through this House today.

Before going into the details of why this change to the scheme's eligibility criteria is so important, I would like everyone in the room just to picture themselves in this following situation: you have extremely limited vision. You are heavily dependent on your white cane and your carer wherever you go. Today you have a very important appointment. You are worried about getting there on time, so you arrive early but are forced to park two blocks away because it is busy and there are no parking spaces any closer. As your carer turns off the car you open the passenger door very carefully, trying desperately not to hit the car parked beside you. You extend your cane and scope out the uneven ground beneath you.

Slowly, you pull yourself up out of the vehicle, clinging on to the doorframe for balance until you find your feet. You wait for the sound of your carer's voice, using your hearing to try to figure out where they are. You wait for them to grab your belongings out of the car and then you start to walk through the car park, anxiously listening for moving cars, shopping trolleys, nearby pedestrians, all while using your cane to try to figure out if it is safe to take each step forward. After manoeuvring your way through the packed car park at midday in the 35 degree heat of summer, you get to the edge of the bitumen and your cane detects a step up onto the path. You move to get up on the path but you trip, your right foot clipping the edge of a car park stopper, sending you down on to the ground. Being visually impaired, falling over unforeseen objects and hazards is not unusual for you, so you try not to get upset or frustrated. You take a minute to gather yourself and you get back up, thankfully this time without injury. You continue on your journey and get on with your day because it is the only choice you have.

That is just a snippet of the life of approximately 18,000 Queenslanders who are visually impaired and one of many similar stories I have heard from my constituents in Bundaberg in the last two years. For them, finding their way through a car park is extremely intimidating, as are many other everyday tasks like getting the groceries or going to the post office. You might think, 'Why don't they go get a permit for their carer's vehicle so they can park in a disability parking space,' which is much wider and closer to the entries? Because they are not currently able to do so.

Two years ago in March 2018, very soon after I began my role as Bundaberg's MP, Bundy residents Cheryl and Kevin Callaghan visited my office. During our meeting Cheryl told me that, despite being legally blind, she was unable to get a disability parking permit to display on their vehicle. Kevin is also Cheryl's primary carer, so I thought to myself, 'That is ridiculous. There's got to be a mistake. Of course visually-impaired residents can get a permit to park in a disability parking space.' But I was wrong. After doing some research, I was shocked to find out that in Queensland vision impairment is not currently considered an eligible criteria under Queensland's disability parking scheme and, indeed, residents like Cheryl are ineligible for disability parking permits.

Discovering this ridiculous loophole in the legislation, I wrote to Minister Bailey as Queensland's transport minister and asked him to change the criteria to include those with vision impairments. He said no, and I table a copy of my letter dated 28 March and the minister's response dated 18 April.

Tabled paper: Bundle of letters in relation to disability parking permits for the legally blind [\[1148\]](#).


The minister's reply advised that the Queensland eligibility criteria would remain the same, focusing on only the applicant's functional ability to walk and, as such, people with intellectual, psychiatric, cognitive or sensory impairments are not recognised as having a disability. In the same letter the minister advised that the expansion of the scheme to include visual impairment had been carefully considered. The minister also claimed that granting permits to people with visual impairments would put significant increased pressure on the number of disability parking spaces available to those with mobility issues, and now we hear as part of the committee's review of this legislation that the expansion of the scheme is not expected to have a substantial impact on the availability of disability parking spaces, with an anticipated increase of approximately 7.5 per cent in permit eligibility.

I felt the minister's response showed little sympathy or understanding for those with visual impairment. A lack of car-parking spaces was not a good enough reason to refuse helping those vulnerable Queenslanders, so I started a petition. The petition gained the support of more than 3,200 Queenslanders as well as Guide Dogs Queensland, Vision Australia, Blind Citizens Australia and many other organisations that support those with vision impairments. In response to my petition, the minister advised that his department would review the scheme's eligibility criteria which eventually has resulted

in the bill we are debating here today. This important bill before us will finally see changes made to the relevant legislation to allow those with vision impairments the ability to obtain a permit to display on their carer's vehicle, significantly increasing their safety and comfort in car park situations.

I would like to sincerely thank Cheryl and Kevin Callaghan, who have been at the forefront of my calls for change, and also Bundaberg resident Helen Willett, her carer, Monty Mills, and her assistance dog Hank who have all been vital in making this change. Helen's story was quite similar to Cheryl's. Until a few years ago Helen lived in New South Wales where she had a disability parking permit which she displayed on her carer's car. When she made the decision to move to sunny Queensland and went to one of our Transport and Main Roads departments to renew her permit for a Queensland version, her request was denied. Helen told me that being declined a permit after having one for so many years was a slap in the face, saying, 'Well funny that, I must be able to see again now that I live in Queensland—I'm cured.' I am incredibly proud of our fight for this change that will bring Queensland's laws into line with other states across the country and what this will mean in the day-to-day lives of 18,000 Queenslanders with vision impairment.

While on my feet, I would like to thank the minister for changing his initial refusal of my request and eventually listening to the overwhelming community support. It took us a long time to get to where we are today, but it is better late than never. I would also like to thank our shadow minister for transport and member for Chatsworth, Steve Minnikin, for his early guidance on how to get this legislation reviewed and for the kind words he has said here. I also thank the member for Moggill, Dr Christian Rowan, shadow minister for disability services, for his support throughout this process and during this two-year struggle and all the other members who have mentioned the work we have done in Bundaberg to play our part getting this bill here today. I cannot wait to see the smiles on the faces of Cheryl and Helen when they get to put their disability parking permits on their vehicles. This is what being an MP is all about: bringing about positive change for the people of Queensland.

 **Mr ANDREW** (Mirani—PHON) (3.51 pm): I rise to speak on the Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill and the Transport and Other Legislation (Disability Parking) and Other Matters Amendment Bill. It was great to hear the story from the member for Bundaberg. It is good to see that the visually impaired are being looked after through this bill. It is also good to acknowledge that people driving with screens of any kind and living in a digital reality is nothing like living in the reality around us and that it kills people.

I note that a number of areas of concern with this bill have been raised in the submission process, particularly by the Office of the Information Commissioner and the Queensland Law Society. Most of these relate to the new camera detection system and proposed amendments to the Transport Infrastructure Act. I want to confine my comments today to another area of the bill, the implementation and operation of a digital licence app in Queensland. The fact is that I do not think the government is being at all transparent in relation to this new app scheme or its real purpose.

The app is described in the explanatory notes as little more than a matter of public utility for the general convenience and welfare of Queenslanders. The notes further reassure us that the current bill's power to keep and use information will be exercised in limited circumstances only and states on page 21 that information shared under part 5 of the bill will not include a digital photo or digitised signature. A careful reading of the relevant sections of the bill, however, show just the opposite will be the case.

The issue of what information is shared with outside parties will be dealt with by the provisions of the Photo Identification Card Act 2008, which the current bill amends. Under the provisions of the newly amended Photo Identification Card Act, the chief executive will be authorised to retain and release information obtained through the digital licence app. Moreover, under the amended Photo Identification Card Act's definition, information is inclusive of a digital photo and digitised signature. The explanatory notes reassurances on this point are highly misleading. This lack of transparency can hardly be accidental since the Commonwealth government recently revealed that the Queensland government has already undertaken to share the new digital licence app's photos and information.

In answer to a question in senate estimates last month, the Department of Home Affairs confirmed Queensland had fully committed to the uploading of digital licence app data to the National Driver Licence Facial Recognition Solution, NDLFRS. The current driver's licence system lacks the high-definition facial imaging required for the Commonwealth's new NDLFRS system. The new digital licence app, however, solves this problem. This is the real purpose of the new app. The app's high-definition facial imaging data will be shared with the Commonwealth government and the biometric

templates created from these images stored indefinitely. Ultimately the plan is to allow law enforcement, intelligence agencies and even NGOs to share and access Australian citizens' identity information in real time.

I am also concerned with a comment in the explanatory notes that says the new app will initially include digital driver's licences, photo identification cards and recreational licences. That word 'initially' bothers me a lot. Exactly what other information is the government planning to include under this system? Health information? Tax and insurance information? DNA data? The list of possibilities is endless and none of them very good.

Another question I have is: why is the app being designed in partnership with a foreign owned global military-industrial company with close ties to the US military, NASA and military grade hardware companies like Raytheon? Thales is a company that not only boasts close ties with the US Army, US Navy, US Pacific Command and NATO, but one which describes itself as a leading provider of combat management systems and electronic warfare. According to its website, the Norwegian owned Thales leads the world in surveillance, detection and intelligence systems. Its motto is 'Whatever it takes'—as long as it is not taking our privacy. That is not a very comforting resume for a non-state party being given unparalleled access and control to the sensitive biometric data of all Queenslanders.

That brings up the other situation in a digital world of being hacked and the situation of being open to be hacked. We put a lot of effort and time into our digital processes and there is always that situation. This bill relates to a whole area of governance that is rife with known and unknown risks to the citizen and about which there is a distinct lack of transparency or legislated control provisions. In a speech to the UN last year, the British Prime Minister warned about the dangers we face with new technologies of surveillance and control. He concluded his speech by saying that digital authoritarianism has become an emerging reality and unless we ensure that new technology reflects human rights and democratic freedoms, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights will mean nothing.

In Queensland we urgently need increased oversight and regulation by independent statutory commissioners, particularly around the areas of consent, retention, sharing and use of people's biometric information. Until that happens, all bills like this should be rejected.



Mr McCALLUM (Bundamba—ALP) (3.56 pm): I rise to speak in support of both the Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill and the Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill. A quick trip to the local shopping centre, an appointment with the GP, parking the car at the train station and catching public transport—these are parts of our daily lives that we can often take for granted. So too can we take for granted the availability of suitable parking, but for the visually-impaired a trip to the shops, an appointment with the GP and catching public transport can present unique access, safety and mobility challenges.

As an inclusive government for all Queenslanders, we are supporting the visually-impaired in overcoming some of these challenges as we unite and recover. Expanding the Disability Parking Permit Scheme to include vision-impaired people who are legally blind supports the vulnerable in our community. It improves safety, security and peace of mind, not only for the vision-impaired people themselves but also for their families, friends and caregivers. This includes families like mine. My younger brother Robert is legally blind, having developed his vision impairment when we were kids. Reduced walking distances and wide parking bays will have a profound impact on legally blind persons. When a person loses their sight their ability to judge or evaluate risk within an environment is impacted. This impairs their ability to move freely and increases the likelihood of harm. This bill recognises the unique mobility challenges faced by people who have been diagnosed as legally blind and expands the eligibility criteria for a disability parking permit to include people who are legally blind whether on a temporary or permanent basis.

The bill also introduces a definition of 'blind' that is consistent with the basis for the blind pension paid under the Commonwealth government Social Security Guide and under the Social Security Act. The definition in this bill is also consistent with eligibility for the Vision Impairment Travel Pass issued by TransLink here in Queensland and will align Queensland with the eligibility for equivalent schemes in operation in New South Wales, the Australian Capital Territory, Tasmania, Victoria and South Australia.

While expanding the Disability Parking Permit Scheme delivers real benefits for people like my brother and families such as mine, it is also future focused, planning for our ageing population and recognising the unique challenges that people with a vision impairment face on a day-to-day basis.

Expanding the scheme allows another 18,000 people to apply, permitting parking concessions that offer convenient access to facilities in wide parking bays. Importantly, we are doing everything we can to ensure those bays remain available only to those who are permitted to use them. That is why we have increased the state based infringement notice penalty for illegally parking in a disability bay from \$266 to \$533.

Acknowledging the important role local governments have in deterring and enforcing the socially unacceptable behaviour of illegally parking in a disability bay, we will continue to work with councils across Queensland to encourage them to adopt the higher penalty for illegal parking. This holistic approach to expanding and enforcing the Disability Parking Permit Scheme supports the visually impaired. It supports their families, friends and caregivers. It supports people such as my brother, Robert, and makes that little bit easier the lives of vulnerable Queenslanders in our community as we continue to unite and recover.

With respect to the Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2020, the minister has made it very clear that putting the latest technology to use in Queensland will significantly improve road safety outcomes in our state. I will make a short contribution that centres on the rollout of this technology in Queensland. To help address unsafe behaviour on Queensland's roads caused by illegal phone use and failure to wear a seatbelt, in Queensland there will be a trial of camera technology to detect mobile phone and seatbelt offences. This follows an operational trial of the same technology in New South Wales, which commenced issuing infringements for offences on 1 March this year. Media reports indicate that, in the first month of full operation, camera enforcement of mobile phone offences resulted in over 10,000 fines being issued to drivers engaging in that dangerous behaviour.

Before being deployed in Queensland, the camera system will be thoroughly trialled and evaluated to ensure that it is robust and can accurately detect mobile phone and seatbelt offences in Queensland conditions. The timing for the trial and the procurement process for the camera system have been impacted by the closure of our state borders in order to manage the spread of COVID-19. The trial will proceed as soon as is practicable for it to be done safely. When it is possible for it to go ahead, the trial will test the technology in Queensland conditions. The trial will include strict privacy and security measures to safeguard the system and the data that is collected.

Together these bills make road use in Queensland safer, fairer and more equitable. I commend both bills to the House.



Mr LISTER (Southern Downs—LNP) (4.02 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution on the cognate debate. I will focus my contribution exclusively on the Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2020. Like those who have gone before me, I acknowledge the work of the committee. As backbenchers we are all on committees and we know what happens. It is a great feature of our parliamentary democracy. I would like to make two points regarding the bill. Firstly, I will speak briefly about the technology to enable better enforcement of offences related to the use of seatbelts and mobile phones. I will also talk about some of my experiences in my electorate of Southern Downs relating to road safety and those matters.

I want to be on the record as saying that the use of any technology such as this naturally arouses concerns. I am sensitive to community concerns about the potential misuse of new technology associated with identification and law enforcement. I have no doubt that that will not be the case here. I think that on balance the app is a wonderful innovation that will work in the public interest. A member who spoke before me mentioned that anyone aged between 11 and 35 years will immediately take to it. I agree with that, but even an old hand like me would be able to make use of the app, so I think it is a good thing. The member for Chatsworth made that observation. Through you, Mr Speaker, I say well done, member.

We all acknowledge that the use of mobile phones and the failure to wear seatbelts are major hazards to road safety. I heard mentioned in the House earlier that one in four people who die in a road accident is not wearing a seatbelt. When we consider how little is involved in plugging in a seatbelt, that is a really tragic statistic. Likewise, the use of mobile phones and handheld devices while driving is a scourge. I suspect it has become today's equivalent of drink driving. Forty years ago people would drink and drive. We do not do that so much these days because of campaigns, community understanding and good law enforcement.

Mr Costigan: Thank goodness.

Mr LISTER: I take the interjection from my friend, the honourable member for Whitsunday; thank goodness, yes.

In my electorate of Southern Downs I have noticed that the use of mobile phones covers the spectrum of age. However, I have also lived in cities—for example, Canberra—on military postings. One thing in particular that disturbed me related not so much to interstate truck drivers but to those driving medium sized trucks in city traffic who were clearly using handheld devices. Perhaps I noticed so many of them as they are more conspicuous because of their seat position. That is lunacy when you consider the mass of a vehicle of that nature, its stopping distance and its potential for carnage. That is a real worry. Therefore, any technology that assists police in enforcing the law and providing evidence that can nail people who are doing the wrong thing is a good thing.

To all of my constituents I say this: please do not use your mobile phones when driving. It takes only a split second of inattention to cause a tragedy that can never be rewound. I am sure that any good person who has been involved in a fatality caused by a mobile phone would urge everyone not to do that. I commend the bills to the House.



Hon. CJ O'ROURKE (Mundingburra—ALP) (Minister for Communities and Minister for Disability Services and Seniors) (4.06 pm): I welcome the opportunity to place on the record my views on and support for the Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2019 and the Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2020. I commend the committee and the stakeholders who have contributed to the examination of the bill.

On numerous occasions people with disability have told me what a difference it would make to have access to disability parking bays. The misuse of disability parking bays has the potential to restrict the access of a person with disability to the community. I am sad to say that it is not unusual to spot cars parked in those bays without the relevant permit on display. When that happens it is not merely an inconvenience for people with disability; it can mean that they may not be able to park at all and that they end up not being able to go to work, to attend medical or other appointments or to simply get out and about in the community. For that reason I am delighted that illegal parking in a disability space will result in an increased fine for those who flaunt the rules.

I am also pleased that we are proposing to change the eligibility criteria for a permit to include people who have a vision impairment. Queensland's current mobility scheme and assessment for permits focuses on the applicant's functional ability to walk. Therefore, people with sensory impairments have not previously met the eligibility criteria. Extending the eligibility of the Queensland disability parking permit scheme to include vision impairment is a change that Minister Bailey and I have worked on very closely. It is far safer and more convenient for a visually impaired person to have access to disability parking spaces, which are typically placed near the entrances of buildings. The changes in this bill are based on the representations from Queenslanders with disability and the consultation that occurred with key stakeholders, including Queensland Blind Association, Vision Australia, Guide Dogs Queensland, Spinal Life Australia and Physical Disability Australia.


In 2010 a national review was conducted of disability parking schemes across all states and territories. That review resulted in the introduction of a nationally recognised disability parking permit and minimum standards for disability parking concessions. National eligibility criteria permits were also created, known as the Australian Disability Parking Scheme. It was important that there be a formal review before expanding the eligibility criteria for the scheme to ensure that there were not any unintended consequences associated with the change. We know these amendments to expand the scheme will enable people with vision impairment better access to their local community.

In turn, this supports the objectives of our All Abilities Queensland: Opportunities for all—State Disability Plan, which commits the Queensland government to building a fairer and more inclusive Queensland where people with disability, their families and carers are able to access opportunities on the same basis as everyone else. Quite simply, the expanded disability parking permit scheme means that people with vision impairment do not have to navigate long distances between where they park and where they need to get to. The implementation of these changes has been designed to make it as easy as possible for applicants.

Residents of Queensland will use their Centrelink or Department of Veterans' Affairs blind concession card, or their TransLink Vision Impairment Travel Pass. If they do not have one of these cards then their application can simply be certified by their doctor, optometrist or ophthalmologist.

In line with improving services and with a focus on safety, the Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill will amend various acts to support the introduction and ongoing operation of the digital licence app and facilitate camera enforcement of seatbelt and mobile phone offences along with some other minor technical amendments. Some of the amendments in this bill will adapt the legislative framework that applies to existing camera detected offences, such as speeding, to include identification of not wearing a seatbelt or using a mobile phone in Queensland and aims to save lives and reduce road trauma and the impact it has on families and communities.

The introduction of the digital licence app will provide Queenslanders the opportunity to engage digitally with Queensland government services. It will provide secure and immediate access to credentials including drivers' licences, provide customers with greater control in sharing their information, and facilitate reminder and payment notifications, noting that the app will be optional and in addition to the physical product. For the above reasons, I commend both bills to the House.

 **Mr McARDLE** (Caloundra—LNP) (4.11 pm): I rise to make a short contribution to the debate of the cognate bills. I first turn to the bill dealing with permits for disability parking. The bill provides for the extension of the eligibility criteria to those who are temporarily or permanently visually-impaired.

Often in car parks, in shopping centres or on busy roads you will see clearly marked parking spots available to those who are disabled. On many occasions you will see cars parked there but will not see the required sticker that marks the vehicle as owned and driven by somebody who is entitled to occupy that spot. This bill is a good step forward, because those who are temporarily or permanently vision-impaired are certainly disabled. Navigating car parks and busy areas can be very dangerous. Any help that we can provide to those who need that assistance is most welcome.

Increasing the penalty for those who occupy such a parking area without a permit is also welcome. Those who take the wrong step and do the wrong thing but, more importantly, take away the opportunity for somebody who needs that spot need to be penalised. There is no question about that. They need to be penalised and, in my opinion, they should also be publicly shamed and put on a website of some sort to show they had been fined for occupying a space that was set aside for someone who was disabled.

Mr Power: Put them in stocks?

Mr McARDLE: I would not say put them in stocks, member for Logan, but my mind heads that way in a certain manner. This is a situation where people are disabled—they need help and assistance—and those who take the step of occupying such a space when they are not qualified should be publicly shamed for what they are doing.

I want to pay homage to the member for Bundaberg. The government put their bill in the House in November 2019—almost 18 months after the member for Bundaberg commenced his petition, which garnered 3,200 signatures, from people seeking exactly this: a commonsense outcome for those people who need to access a parking bay because they are disabled due to their sight impairment.

The member for Hinchinbrook filed his bill in the House in October 2019 and the government put their bill in the House on 26 November 2019. Government members may stand in this House today and seek to claim the glory. They are third in the line of people who started this process. The member for Bundaberg started this in 2018, the member for Hinchinbrook introduced a bill in October 2019 and then the government introduced a bill in November 2019. The members for Bundaberg and Hinchinbrook are the members who should be given accolade for what they have done, not the government. This government will never give credit to anybody but themselves—because of their arrogance, because of their sense of superiority, because of their belief that they are the only ones who can get things right. This bill highlights exactly that point. Others in this chamber had the idea first, and they should also be commended for the great work they did in bringing this to the House.


The second bill being debated is the technology bill in relation to the digital licence app. It is a good initiative—an initiative that will allow access to certain credentials if people choose to show them on their app. My concern with this is that Labor and technology just do not go together. Labor has a history of technology failures over the past number of years stretching all the way back to the payroll debacle and more recently the Laboratory Information System at \$68.5 million, technology which has now been dumped. This government has a history. When government members say 'technology', watch the hip pocket, watch the blowout and watch the cost. Someone had better cue the Queensland

Auditor-General to get ready to do another review into another technology blunder by this government. There is no doubt that this is where it is going to head. I am looking forward to the Auditor-General's report into the latest bungle of technology by this government.

The government are also increasing the penalty for failing to wear a seatbelt and for mobile phone offences. They are good increases. People should be warned quite clearly of the danger of not wearing a seatbelt—and that should be reinforced on an ongoing basis—and the inherent danger of using a mobile telephone whilst driving. If you look around on any day of the week you will see that those who are using devices are focused purely on the device. It consumes every second of their life whilst they are on the device. Put that scenario into a motor vehicle and what you have is an inherently dangerous situation that leads to many deaths.

I can remember in the 1970s that the battle for the compulsory use of a seatbelt was in full swing. There were those back then who would argue that seatbelts were not needed, that in fact wearing a seatbelt could cause you greater risk. The example given was that by not wearing a seatbelt you could be thrown out the window and your life saved. That was a real argument back then—that being thrown out a window at 80 kilometres an hour or more would save your life. Thankfully, that argument lost. Today seatbelts save more lives than ever before. The use of seatbelts is no longer a discussion point. The use of a mobile telephone when not hands-free is also very dangerous to the lives of many Queensland drivers and those in the vehicle with them.

Both bills have excellent elements in them. I commend both bills to the House, but I want to again commend the member for Bundaberg for the great grandfathering work that he did in 2018 in starting the petition which has led to the bill finally here in the House.

 **Mr WHITING** (Bancroft—ALP) (4.19 pm): I rise to speak in support of the bills before the House. In my contribution, I wish to focus on the safety measures contained in these bills. As we have shown with our unite and recover plan, keeping Queenslanders safe is at the core of what the Palaszczuk government is about. We want to keep Queenslanders safe, whether it be from the scourge of COVID-19 or the scourge of road deaths.

As we have heard, there have been 127 fatalities on our roads so far this year. In this day and age, that is hard to accept. Also hard to accept is that 30 Queenslanders a year die because they are not wearing seatbelts. As the member for Caloundra touched on, this has had a history over two generations. After two generations, it is still hard to fathom why some people do not wear seatbelts. We know that failure to wear a seatbelt contributes to one in four deaths in vehicles and a further 166 serious injuries each year in Queensland.

Also disappointing during this time of COVID-19 is that in April, for example, despite a 30 per cent drop in traffic volume, risky driving behaviour increased. We saw more speeding and more phone use while driving. It is disappointing because we know that these behaviours lead to more deaths. We know that 80 per cent of fatalities are due to the fatal five—speed, fatigue, seatbelts, driver distraction and drink and drug driving. We know what drives home the message to counter these behaviours—that is, fines and the likelihood of getting caught. These are things that change behaviour.


We know that the new camera technology we are considering in this bill can really help change behaviour. This bill will enable mobile phone and other seatbelt offences to be camera detected in a similar way to other offences such as speeding and red light offences. As we have heard, artificial intelligence will detect whether an offence has possibly occurred. Before being deployed on Queensland roads, the camera system will be tested and tried on our roads and in our conditions.

This may be new technology for Queensland but we can see how it is operating in other jurisdictions. In New South Wales mobile phone detection cameras using this technology came into operation in December last year. In the first month of full operation the camera enforcement of mobile phone offences resulted in 10,000 fines being issued to drivers. For these reasons, I look forward to this new technology being deployed in Queensland.

Before I finish I want to talk about what the disability parking bill means to a family in the Moreton Bay area. Like I am, Dean and Donna Cameron are members of the Moreton Bay Cycling Club. Dean is vision impaired and rides a tandem bike. Donna stated—

For us the passing of this Bill would mean not having to negotiate car parks with Dean and his daughter who are both vision impaired, dealing with trolleys, groceries and navigating Dean through cars and car mirrors and open doors. It means accessing parking close to cycling events where I have to deal with Dean, his guide dog, his equipment and tandem bike.

This legislation is very welcome. We have a unite and recover plan to keep Queenslanders safe. These bills deliver on the thrust of that plan which is to keep Queenslanders safe.

 **Mr O'CONNOR** (Bonney—LNP) (4.23 pm): I will start with a contribution on the Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill. Of particular interest in this bill is the support for a digital driver's licence app. This makes sense. We are at the point where most people have phones with the capacity and security protections to function as an all-in-one device. I already have my debit card as well as most of my concert and movie tickets within my wallet app. Pretty much every other aspect of my life is on that phone as well. I am sure other members have been like me, particularly during COVID, and been on their phones a lot longer than normal—I am sure everyone has dreaded seeing their screen time when it comes up on their phone on a Sunday and tells them how many hours a day they have been on their phone. It is a massive part of our lives. It makes sense to add this form of identification to our phones. We have seen this rolled out in other states—South Australia and New South Wales—so Queenslanders should have the option as well.

This move to digital licences is a commonsense step forward in a direction we are already going. Young people will be some of the most keen to take up this option and they probably use their licences more than most other people. In particular, one group of young people will benefit from this change. That is everyone who is constantly misplacing their licence or wallet. At this point, I will give a shout-out to my mate Rhys. He is forever losing his licence, meaning that half the time we go out he carries his passport around and half the time he is getting turned away from venues. This move forward will make a real difference in the lives of people like Rhys.

There are a few things that are pivotal to the success of this rollout which were highlighted in the committee's report. Firstly, there is privacy. We have seen recently with the introduction of apps like the COVIDSafe app that many people have real concerns about what is happening with their data when they sign up to apps, particularly government apps. That might not make a lot of sense because, as we know, most people give far more information to whatever social media platforms they have. People do have real concerns.

The questions always come as to whether their location will be constantly tracked in the background, what happens to their data and what access will the app have to the rest of their phone. The positive of this technology in relation to privacy is that, on many occasions, less information will need to be shared with businesses as consumers can choose what information they share. For example, instead of the bartender finding out a person's birth date and address, they will just need to see proof that they are over 18 and not ask for a specific age. This kind of benefit is one thing that should be communicated well.

It still offers more privacy than a physical licence. If a person loses their wallet, someone can pull out their physical licence and see all those details. If a person loses their phone, most smartphones cannot be unlocked and even if the phone is unlocked this licence app will have a PIN. It would be disappointing if there is investment in this technology without that education or promotion to Queenslanders, leading to a slower uptake.

Secondly, there was a recommendation to legislate a prohibition on law enforcement and other authorities requiring an individual to hand over their device. I think this is an important recommendation to ensure the privacy and protection of the civil liberties of those who choose to install the app. Continuing to make physical licences optional will be important, particularly for the elderly in our community who are less likely to use smartphones. Continuing to communicate this will be important to reduce the stress on people within this demographic.

While I am excited to see this program expanded further within Queensland, I think the committee's recommendation to do a thorough review of the trial is important. Tracking bugs in the system, take-up rates and particularly the way in which businesses are able to use the technology is important. There was some pushback in South Australia where many retailers would not accept the digital licence. The government will need to work hard to ensure there is a high take-up from those checking licences otherwise the benefit will be greatly reduced. That will involve a lot of coordination with OLGR.


The other major feature of the bill is the introduction of camera detection for mobile phone and seatbelt offences. As other members have said during this debate, I find it staggering in 2020 that we still have people getting into cars and not wearing seatbelts. The figures of 31 people killed and 166 seriously injured a year in Queensland as a result of a road crash and not wearing a seatbelt is something we would think we still would not have to deal with. Equally so, is the large number of

Queenslanders who admit to using their mobile phone while driving. We know the distraction this provides and yet the fact that it still happens at an alarming rate is concerning. I am sure other members have seen every time they pull up at the lights someone to the left or right of them on their phone looking at something.

I agree that this camera technology could help reduce the number of offences committed, but there are some big questions around privacy when every vehicle will be photographed going past the camera. To use cameras to detect offences is a new technology to move into and there will need to be stringent safeguards to ensure detection of offences is accurate and that photographs taken with no offence found are permanently deleted.

On this side of the House we have always said we do not agree with covert cameras as opposed to raising compliance levels or changing behaviour because the public think the government is just doing it to raise revenue. Camera location will also be difficult to manage, as was highlighted in the report, as often distraction happens on smaller roads far away from the larger roads where we would traditionally have cameras. Overall, I believe the technologies discussed in this bill are positive moves forward for our state. I think the onus lies with the government to communicate with and educate the public on these matters, as well as to treat the data that is collected with a high level of sensitivity.

Finally, on the Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill, other members have touched on this in good detail with stories from their area of those that it will assist. I will congratulate again the member for Bundaberg for his advocacy. This is a good change and long overdue.

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (4.29 pm), in reply: I want to say a few things because we do not usually have a right of reply in these debates. I want to thank a range of people involved in these very important bills.

In terms of the disability provisions, I thank the Guide Dogs of Queensland for their tireless advocacy on this and Elisha Matthews, who is a very strong advocate on the north side. I have met with her and she has been very passionate about disability parking over many years. Labor has enabled this. We also had very strong representations from Ali France, Vision Australia, John Mayo, Spinal Life Australia and the many others who have advocated for this over many years.

I also thank David Greene, from my office, who has put a huge amount of effort into these bills. It is a good sign when everybody wants to claim credit for your bills. That is terrific, but let us be fair: the government has acted on this and has done this. I acknowledge the positive contributions of many people across the spectrum. The member for Hinchinbrook did the work to introduce a bill into the House. I know some of those opposite also advocated for it. I acknowledge those positive contributions, but it is this government that has acted. The member for Hill also did some good work.

I am pleased to advise that I anticipate that the changes in this bill will be implemented by 31 August 2020. I think that is a prompt process through to enactment. I think members would understand how committed I am to road safety. This bill will save lives in terms of the world-beating technology re the use of mobile phones. We should also be the first jurisdiction using this technology re seatbelts. That makes me feel very good. It makes this government feel very good. I acknowledge the support of others on the road safety element of this bill. We have to keep getting better at it. I know that a lot of members here and a lot of members in our community have been touched by this issue. It is something that they will always be very passionate about, as I am.

The digital licence app is obviously the future. I will not go into the details, as I was across this in my introductory speech. I want to cover one aspect of these cognate bills that I am very happy about and supportive of—and I acknowledge the member for Caloundra's contribution on this. I have a similar sentiment to him. Those people who take up disability parking bays when they are not entitled to them are arrogant and it is nasty behaviour. One point that crystallised this for me was when our department was working through the issue to make sure we had the capacity to expand the eligibility for those with visual impairment. A lot of ground work needed to go into these bills and we wanted to make sure we got it right.

I was standing in my constituency right next to a disability parking bay talking to a number of people when I saw a late model Holden Commodore with a pretty powerful engine drive into this parking bay. A chap leapt out of the car. He clearly did not appear to me to have disabilities. I actually challenged him. I said, 'Have you got a disability?' He said to me, 'No, mate. It's all right,' and started walking off. I have to say that I felt pretty angry about it, so I took my phone out and started taking a picture of his car parked in the disability bay. He turned around to me and said, 'What are you doing?' I said, 'I'm just

taking a picture of you committing an offence.' I could see him steam as he was looking at me considering his options. He went back to his car and moved his car in a very unsafe fashion, I might add, but he acted on it.

That moment really crystallised to me what the fine was and what it should be. In doubling the fine, I was actually considering increasing it a lot more because how you treat vulnerable people in our community is a hallmark of what kind of a community and society we have. They got away with doubling the fine, because I was considering a fair bit more. It sends a clear message—over half a grand. If you get caught, you will pay a pretty hefty price. A lot of the enforcement will be done by local government. I am quite deliberate when I say that I hope local government enforces this to the nth degree. I want to see people with disabilities be able to get to their basic services because that is the kind of community we should be. I welcome that part of the bill. I am very proud of that part of the bill.

In closing, I welcome the sentiments in the debate on road safety from members on the opposite side of the chamber, but before we start singing *Kumbaya* on road safety and, metaphorically in the COVID-19 era, having our arms around each other, there is not bipartisanship on road safety because the LNP at this moment still has a policy to water down speed cameras by putting up signs and telling people where they will be, taking the covert randomness out of it. That will mean more speeding. It will mean more crashes and more fatalities. I will keep going on about this. It is going backwards when New South Wales is contemplating the Queensland model and beefing up road safety to stop people dying in crashes. We have seen too many crashes recently due to speeding during the pandemic.

Mr Hart: What are you trying achieve—raising money, not safety.

Mr BAILEY: The member for Burleigh might not support road safety but we do. The covert nature of speed cameras—the fact that you could be caught anywhere any time speeding in Queensland—saves lives every single day. When we brought that in under a previous Labor government the fatality rate dropped almost immediately.

We have to be serious about this. I say to the LNP that that policy is reckless and irresponsible. It should be scrapped and we should have a bipartisan position. The New South Wales coalition government is moving towards our tough laws. I support them on that. I support the New South Wales Premier and the Minister for Transport moving in that direction. I think it is fantastic. It will save lives. Let us get the politics out of road safety.

I acknowledge the support of the opposition on these two bills. That is very positive, but they should not come and talk to me about being bipartisan on road safety until they fix that policy anomaly. It is a political position that I do not think is going to win them a single vote anyway. We should have a bipartisanship position on all aspects of road safety because there are too many people dying and there are too many people suffering permanent disfigurements if they do survive horrific crashes. We have to keep getting better at it. I commend the bills to the House. I thank the House.

Question put—That the Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Question put—That the Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms McMillan): Order! In accordance with the Speaker's ruling on 18 February 2020, given that the Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill has now been read a second time, the Transport Legislation (Disability Parking Permit Scheme) Amendment Bill cannot proceed and is discharged from the *Notice Paper*.

Consideration in Detail (Cognate Debate)

Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill

Clauses 1 to 37, as read, agreed to.

Clause 38—



Mr BAILEY (4.38 pm): I move the following amendments—

1 Clause 38 (Amendment of s 303 (Effect on land of busway declaration))

Page 26, lines 13 to 19—

omit, insert—

section 302(1)—

(a) the Minister of the department administering the *Land Act 1994*—

(i) is taken to have leased, under section 17(3) of that Act, the busway land to the State; and

(ii) must lodge a document evidencing the lease in the leasehold land register; or

(b) if the busway land is to be included in an existing lease under paragraph (a)—

(i) the chief executive must require the registrar of titles to include the busway land in the existing lease by written notice made under this section, instead of under the *Land Act 1994*, section 360A(3); and

(ii) the registrar of titles must amend the description in the existing lease to include the busway land.

(5) A lease under subsection (4)(a) is—

2 Clause 38 (Amendment of s 303 (Effect on land of busway declaration))

Page 26, line 28, after 'the lease'—

insert—

of busway land under subsection (4)(a)

I table the amendments, the explanatory notes to my amendments and the statement of compatibility with human rights.

Tabled paper: Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2020, amendments moved by Hon. Mark Bailey [\[1153\]](#).

Tabled paper: Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2020, explanatory notes to Hon. Mark Bailey's amendments [\[1149\]](#)

Tabled paper: Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2020, statement of compatibility with human rights contained in Hon. Mark Bailey's amendments [\[1150\]](#).

Amendments agreed to.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms McMillan): Order! It now being 4.39 pm, under the provisions of the business program agreed to by the House and the time allocated for this stage of the bill having expired, I will now put all remaining questions. In accordance with sessional order 2B, the House must now consider clauses or remaining clauses, schedules, any postponed clauses and any amendments circulated by the minister in charge of the bill.

Question put—That clauses 38 to 72 and schedule 1, as amended, stand part of the bill.

Motion agreed to.

Clauses 38 to 72, as amended, agreed to.

Schedule 1, as read, agreed to.

Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill

Mr BAILEY: I table the amendments, the explanatory notes to my amendments and the statement of compatibility with human rights.

Tabled paper: Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2019, amendments moved by Hon. Mark Bailey [\[1154\]](#).

Tabled paper: Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2019, explanatory notes to Hon. Mark Bailey's amendments [\[1151\]](#).

Tabled paper: Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2019, statement of compatibility with human rights contained in Hon. Mark Bailey's amendments [\[1152\]](#).

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms McMillan): Order! In accordance with sessional order 2B, the House must now consider clauses or remaining clauses, schedules, any postponed clauses and any amendments circulated by the minister in charge of the bill.

Question put—That the minister's amendments Nos 1 and 2, as circulated, be agreed to.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendments as circulated—

1 Clause 2 (Commencement)

Page 4, line 7—

omit.

2 Clause 2 (Commencement)

Page 4, line 8, '(2)'—

omit.

Question put—That clauses 1 to 17, as amended, stand part of the bill.

Clauses 1 to 17, as amended, agreed to.

Third Reading (Cognate Debate)

Question put—That the Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Question put—That the Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title (Cognate Debate)

Question put—That the long title of the Transport and Other Legislation (Road Safety, Technology and Other Matters) Amendment Bill be agreed to.


Motion agreed to.

Question put—That the long title of the Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT


Error in Division

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I have been advised there was an error in the reporting of votes by the Opposition Whip in division No. 2 earlier today. The division was on the motion to declare the Queensland Future Fund Bill an urgent bill. The member for Buderim's vote should not have been counted, as the member had been ordered to withdraw from the chamber under standing order 253A. The error does not affect the outcome of the vote; however, the record does need to be corrected. The result of the division was in fact ayes 45 and noes 38. In accordance with standing order 106(11), I have instructed the Clerk to amend the *Record of Proceedings*.

BUILDING INDUSTRY FAIRNESS (SECURITY OF PAYMENT) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 5 February (see p. 143).

Second Reading

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works, Minister for Digital Technology and Minister for Sport) (4.46 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

During the COVID-19 pandemic the Palaszczuk government has proven just how effective Queenslanders can be in a time of crisis. As we deliver Queensland's plan to unite and recover from harsh global economic headwinds, it is imperative that the stimulus we invest in Queensland finds its way to Queenslanders. The Palaszczuk Labor government has confirmed our \$51.8 billion infrastructure guarantee and is investing \$500 million into a long-term pipeline of work for the construction industry. It is also this government, through project bank accounts, that is delivering for Queenslanders working on government projects.

As I have said before in this place, for decades security of payment has remained a black spot, a drain on our economy and a stain on our social fabric. Delivering security of payment to the Queenslanders who work in our construction industry is a reform so critical but for too long elusive. For too long the issue of security of payment has been in the too-hard basket, and I think that is beneath us as a state. There are those who will say that this is just the way the construction industry is. I think it is also wrong to just accept that. It is wrong to the families who have been torn apart; it is wrong to the families who have lost their homes. Labor's nation-leading Building Industry Fairness (Security of Payment) Act is a game changer for Queensland tradies. Tradies deserve to be paid on time, in full, every time, and this is what our security of payment reforms have been delivering.

I now turn to the details of the bill. The bill before the House delivers on the recommendations in the report from the implementation and evaluation panel. The amendments in the bill will deliver a simplified project trust account process, improve subcontractor protections and manage the transition to the full implementation of trust accounts. The number of accounts will be reduced. Instead of three trust accounts, one project trust account will be needed for each eligible contract. If a head contractor holds cash retentions then one retention trust account needs to be held per contractor.

The disputed funds account will be replaced with added protections for tradies. Following the recommendations of both the panel and the Special Joint Taskforce, a head contractor must provide their principal with a payment claim and a supporting statement which states that all of their subcontractors have been paid, providing the subbie both security and certainty of payment. If a payment has not been made then the reasons for non-payment must be explained, and a penalty of \$13,345 will apply for a false or misleading supporting statement. To ensure there is no unnecessary administrative burden, the statutory declarations currently used for this purpose can now be adapted to meet the supporting statement requirements. The QBCC will also develop pro forma templates and other guidance material to assist with industry preparedness.

Amendments in the bill will also give head contractors certainty about payment. A head contractor will be able to lodge a payment-withholding request against a financier if an adjudication amount has not been paid by a principal. As well, a head contractor will be able to register a charge on the land on which the building took place if the owner of the land, the developer, has not paid an adjudicated amount. Principals will be relieved from account oversight as well. Instead, the Queensland Building and Construction Commission will have increased regulatory functions, including audit powers over trust accounts.

Subcontractors can also be confident that the government is capturing arrangements that are designed to avoid the legislation; for example, those where they enter into separate contracts on adjoining or adjacent land to claim the exemption on small-scale residential construction work. Similarly, tradies can also be confident that a supersubcontractor situation cannot be used to avoid the protections. This will offer peace of mind and confidence of payment to subcontractors.

Implementing the recommendations of the Special Joint Taskforce report will provide even more protection to subcontractors and tradies. The task force report amendments will enhance the QBCC's compliance, enforcement and regulatory oversight capabilities. They will also increase the integrity of industry participants and help prevent fraud. The bill will also implement key recommendations of the Queensland Building Plan and the national *Building confidence* report. Broadly, these reforms increase transparency, enhance independence and improve professional standards.

Amendments in the bill will also do the following: implement reforms arising from the Queensland Building Plan to strengthen the certification and inspection process and improve professional standards and compliance in the certification sector; implement reforms arising from the *Building confidence* report, such as enhancements to the regulation of architects and registered professional engineers; and ensure the continuation of external review rights for decisions about transition plans for retirement village schemes.

Amendments in the bill to the Building Act will strengthen the regulatory framework for construction industry licensing and the building certification sector. Together with amendments to the professional engineers and architects legislation, they support ongoing implementation of

recommendations from the landmark *Building confidence* report. The bill improves transparency in the inspection and certification process. It does this in a number of ways. It does it by allowing owners to request additional inspections or have earlier access to inspection documentation. Owners must also be given information about the certifier's responsibilities. Consumers need confidence that certifiers are independent and acting in the public interest. The amendments clarify that a certifier's primary duty is to act in the public interest and that doing this does not create a conflict of interest.

Measures also improve professional standards and allow consumers to make better informed decisions. Accreditation standards bodies will have to have their educational and experiential standards and professional development schemes reviewed at least every five years. A demerit point system is being introduced for certifiers and if they accumulate 30 points over three years their licence can be disqualified. The QBCC will also be able to publish certain information about a breach of a demerit point offence.

The bill and the amendments I intend to move have been designed to give industry plenty of time to prepare for full implementation of trust accounts, but this implementation will need to take account of the impacts of the COVID-19 emergency. Although this day marks significant positive legislative change for Queensland tradies, our government is acutely aware of the severe economic disruption being caused by the COVID-19 global pandemic. We are facing a harsh global economic downturn and the building and construction industry is in need of our support.

The government has already introduced sweeping changes to protect subcontractors against non-payment. However, rolling out trust accounts will require industry capacity to understand these substantial reforms. This will not be possible in the immediate economic environment. In response to this, I will be moving an amendment during consideration in detail to commence the provisions in this bill by proclamation. This will provide crucial flexibility for government to commence the trust account reforms at a time when industry is prepared and can properly benefit from the enhancements in the bill. To support this, we will also create an additional phase to smooth the implementation requirements for industry.

It is intended that the new trust account framework will commence on 1 March 2021 for the same cohort of projects that currently require a project bank account. That is, from 1 March 2021 eligible Queensland government building and construction contracts valued between \$1 million and \$10 million will require a trust account. At this stage, it is intended that the original phases will be implemented in the following way, on the basis that Queensland continues to manage the pandemic well. From 1 July 2021, state government and hospital and health services' building contracts worth \$1 million or more will require a trust account.

From 1 January 2022, project trust accounts will be extended further to all private sector building and construction contracts worth \$10 million or more. This and the next phase will also include statutory authorities, local government and government owned corporations. From 1 July 2022, trust accounts will apply to all building contracts worth \$3 million or more. Finally, from 1 January 2023 trust accounts will apply to all eligible building contracts, be they government or private, of \$1 million or more. This timing is a COVID-19 extension of just six months to final implementation, compared to the timing outlined when I introduced the bill.

Before turning to the committee report, I would like to thank all of the people whose experiences in the building and construction industry have helped to shape this report and this reform. We first started this journey in 2016. Getting paid is the norm in so many industries except construction. At its worst, the effects of non-payment are life threatening. Non-payment and mounting financial pressure have led to family breakdown, they have led to homelessness and they have led to suicide. These are entirely preventable deaths because too many tradies have borne the risk of this \$46 billion industry on their shoulders.

I want to thank great Queenslanders—people like John and Kylie, Les and Juanita, Brian, Wayne, Penny, Kent, Gary and more. There are stories that have stayed with me throughout the course of this process—stories like those from a concreter in the electorate that I represent who had been duded \$126,000. This is such a substantial amount of money, yet he felt there was nothing worth chasing. He knew that if he could get to the stage where the builder was required to pay him there would be no money left by the time he got there. I spoke to many people in those same hopeless situations.

Brick by brick, the Palaszczuk government has been restoring the balance for Queensland tradies and building confidence in Queensland's construction industry towards ensuring that tradies get paid in full, on time, every time—tradies like John Belden, a blocky from Townsville. When tradies like John get assurances that they will get paid and that there is a pipeline of projects, those tradies spend money and prop up their local economies. They put on trainees and buy a new truck.

I would like to thank every Queenslanders who assisted the panel and the task force, be that by consultation, by making submissions or by sharing their stories. I would also like to acknowledge the building industry fairness reforms implementation panel and Ms Bronwyn Weir, a construction lawyer and specialist in regulatory practice, who chaired the panel.

I would also like to thank the following people: the Hon. John Byrne and his team on the Special Joint Taskforce; Mr Wayne Smith, the former chief executive officer of the National Fire Industry Association; Ms Penny Cornah, the Executive Director of the Master Plumbers' Association; Mr Graham MacKrill, the former executive director of the Air Conditioning and Mechanical Contractors Association; Mr Malcolm Richards, the Chief Executive Officer of Master Electricians Australia; and Mr Les Williams and Ms Juanita Gibson of the Subcontractors Alliance. I would also like to thank members of my Ministerial Construction Council who have been closely involved in the security of payment reforms since I introduced the building industry fairness (security of payment) legislation in 2017.

I will now turn to the committee's recommendations. I would like to start by thanking the chair of the Transport and Public Works Committee, Mr Shane King, the member for Kurwongbah, and his fellow committee members who undertook a thorough examination of the bill. The committee held public hearings and heard evidence from 26 witnesses. It received 23 written submissions from stakeholders and I thank the individuals and organisations who made submissions to the committee. The 12 recommendations of the committee have been accepted in the development of the bill, and this can give industry confidence in its effectiveness.

I am pleased to say that, of the 12 recommendations, the government supports recommendations 1 to 11 in full and recommendation 12 in principle. I will talk to that now. Firstly, and most importantly, the committee has recommended that the bill be passed. I thank the committee for their support of these historic reforms. I will comment on the statement of reservations provided by the LNP members of the committee in due course. The second recommendation of the committee asked that I review all definitions identified by stakeholders as needing further clarity. I can advise that my department has worked to ensure that a substantial number of the definitions contained in the bill are clear and fit for purpose.

With regard to recommendation 3, the committee recommended that the bill be amended to include measures to prevent the use of multiple contracts on the same or adjacent land in relation to contracts for small-scale residential construction. I am pleased to advise that the building industry fairness act already protects against this type of avoidance. It provides that contracts for work at the same or adjacent site are considered one and the same and so trigger a project trust account.

During the committee process, the industry raised that the BIF act was not clear whether this provision applies to small-scale residential contracts that are otherwise exempted. In response to the committee's recommendation and industry feedback, I will move an amendment during consideration in detail. This amendment will put beyond doubt that residential construction work cannot be split into multiple small-scale contracts to take advantage of the exemption of contracts for small-scale residential construction work. This is an important anti-avoidance measure.

Recommendation 4 of the committee report is that the bill be amended to make it clear which parties are intended to be excluded by the exemption allowed in proposed new section 15E. The intent of this section is to implement the panel's recommendation 2 and exclude contracts that are solely for design work from requiring a project trust. This means that if a contract is only for architectural or engineering work, building design or landscape architecture then they will not be required to establish a project trust. However, these groups can be a beneficiary to the project. I will move an amendment during consideration in detail to amend section 15E to ensure that the policy intent is being met and it is clear for industry.

Recommendation 5 of the committee report is that the terms used in the proposed new section 15F be reviewed to ensure that intent is clearly articulated and, if considered necessary, amended. We heard industry's request for more clarity in this section, in particular about the points in time at which a decision is made about when the 90 days will apply. To provide clarity, I will move an amendment during consideration in detail to make it clear that the decision must be made when the contract is executed and when any contract variation is made. Where there are at least 90 days between the first contract variation and the expected practical completion date, a project trust will be required.

With regard to recommendation 6, the committee recommended that clause 63 of the bill be amended to ensure that the account nominated by the subcontractor must be under the control of the subcontractor. Questions have been raised by industry as to whether new section 20 of the BIF act

would prevent a subcontractor from nominating an account for receiving payments that is controlled by someone else. The intent is that this account can only be one that is owned or under the control of the subcontractor themselves. I will move an amendment during consideration in detail to make this clear.

In recommendation 7 the committee asked that the bill be amended to ensure that all relevant contractors are protected by the trust regime. The government wants to make sure that all eligible contractors who are working on a project receive the protection of the retention trust. The retention trust framework is intended to provide broad protection for all contracted parties in the building and construction industry from whom cash retentions are withheld. This includes electricians, architects, engineers and other professions that are currently excluded from the definition of 'building work' under the Queensland Building and Construction Commission Act 1991 and not regulated by the QBCC. It is critical that trust account protections apply equally to contractors who are not regulated by the QBCC. This is why I will move an amendment during consideration in detail to clarify the policy intent.

With regard to recommendation 8 of the committee's report, I will be moving an amendment during consideration in detail to omit clause 63, section 55B(6). This subsection was inserted in error and of course will be removed.

With regard to the committee's recommendation 9, the question was raised as to whether section 8 of schedule 1A of the QBCC Act remains a necessary provision. During its examination of the bill the committee heard that the QBCC Act exempts a head contractor from requiring a licence, provided they engage an appropriately licensed contractor to carry out the work and the contract is not for residential construction or domestic building work. At one point, this exemption was necessary to allow for public-private partnership and similar arrangements. However, specific exemptions for these arrangements now exist in the QBCC Act. Therefore, I will move an amendment during consideration in detail to action this.

Recommendation 10 of the committee report seeks to ensure passive fire protection occupational work is appropriately licensed. I welcome the committee's recommendation and will move an amendment during consideration in detail to ensure that a broader range of passive fire protection occupational work is licensed by the QBCC.

In recommendation 11, the committee has asked that I review the role of property developers in the building and construction industry, including their work practices. It is clear that the behaviour of developers can have a knock-on effect throughout the contractual chain. Amendments in this bill already address the risk of non-payment faced by head contractors by allowing them to register a charge over a developer's land on which the building work took place when an adjudicated amount is not paid. More can be done to protect against developer non-payment. Therefore, in support of this recommendation, I will move an amendment during consideration in detail to provide for a statutory review of the role of developers.

Lastly, in recommendation 12 the committee recommended that the review into developers in the industry be completed by 1 July 2021 in consultation with stakeholders. Industry consultation is critical to understanding the issue of developers and getting the right outcome. Throughout the reform process, industry has been engaged every single step of the way. There are new reforms proposed in the bill and new timeframes for their implementation. The timing for the review must include time for the new reforms to take effect and must be sensitive to the ongoing issue of the global pandemic and its impact on the industry.

Therefore, in response to both recommendations 11 and 12, I propose to introduce amendments in consideration in detail that will establish a statutory review of the role of developers in Queensland's building and construction industry. In consideration of the impacts of COVID-19 on the industry and that Queensland is only beginning its recovery from the resulting global financial crisis, the findings of the review will be reported to the Legislative Assembly as soon as practicable after the review is completed.

I would now like to briefly touch on the statement of reservations made by the LNP members of the Transport and Public Works Committee. It is both pleasing and surprising to see that those opposite agree that developers should be held to account in this state. It is surprising because it was the Leader of the Opposition and the LNP President, and former Clive Palmer employee, Dave Hutchinson who tried to flout the Palaszczuk government's ban on developer donations by offering 'diamond' membership of their party. The LNP committee members have said it is 'vital ... that everyone, including developers, are being held to account.'

I welcome the support for Labor's review into developers. I hope that the LNP backbench will again defy the opposition leader and vote for this bill. I call on the LNP backbench to take a stand for the 70,000 tradies and small business owners in Queensland and vote for this bill. I table electronically the government's response to the committee report.

Tabled paper: Transport and Public Works Committee: Report No. 36, 56th Parliament—Building Industry Fairness (Security of Payment) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020, government response [\[1159\]](#).


The bill includes important amendments to the QBCC Act to strengthen the compliance framework for the minimum financial requirements for licensing. The government implemented minimum financial requirements, or MFR, reforms last year as part of the broader package of much needed security of payment initiatives for Queensland's building and construction industry. The introduction of new MFR has seen an injection of \$1.2 billion into Queensland's construction industry. That is money getting paid today into the pockets of subbies and tradies. The requirements ensure that the QBCC has oversight of the financial position of building contractors and that businesses are operating in a financially sustainable manner.

However, an effective regulatory framework is essential to encourage contractors to comply with their MFR reporting obligations. I also proposed to move amendments in consideration in detail to the bill in relation to this. These amendments will omit clause 119 of the bill. If progressed, these amendments to the QBCC Act would have established offences where a licensee failed to provide information required under the minimum financial requirements. During the global pandemic is not the right time to do that and so we will not progress those amendments.

I also proposed to move amendments in consideration in detail to clarify trust account operations, including the requirement to top up a project trust account; support the transition to the new mechanical services licensing framework; and clarify the requirements for a fire protection licence, specifically, that to inspect and test does not include work such as additional routine service work.

The amendments in this bill will enhance Queensland's standing as a national leader by further improving security of payment for Queensland tradies. Queenslanders cannot recover from the economic impacts of COVID-19 without a government that delivers for them. Today, Queensland tradies can be confident that the Palaszczuk government has their back as they claim what is rightfully theirs. Queenslanders can be confident that these protections will help them secure payment for work that they have done.

Issues facing subcontractor non-payment have gone on for too long. Building a strong security of payment framework supports a strong building industry. Having confidence that they will be paid on time, every time, and in full, gives people confidence to run their business and to invest. This has never been more important. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr HART** (Burleigh—LNP) (5.09 pm): I say at the outset that the LNP will not be opposing this bill. The LNP's position is firm on the principle that everybody deserves to be paid for the work they do. Unfortunately, late payments and non-payment of Queensland tradies remains an ongoing concern in the building and construction industry. While the LNP has concerns about the project bank account process which I will outline later in my speech, it is clear that there is a level of support in the building industry for a process to ensure subbies and suppliers are paid. The LNP will therefore not oppose the legislation.

It is also clear to me that the government is not completely convinced that this process will work, either. By way of background, project bank accounts were an election commitment by the Labor Party in 2015. The Labor government endeavoured to address this issue with its Building Industry Fairness (Security of Payment) Bill 2017. At the time, the LNP opposition forced around 53 amendments on the government to make that particular bill a better bill.

I would like to talk about a couple of press releases put out by the minister. I table the press releases.

On 26 October 2017 a press release stated—

'For far too long, subcontractors have had to shoulder most of the financial risk on building projects, but that changes today,' Mr de Brenni said.

'These reforms help ensure that subcontractors in the building and construction industry are paid in full and on time, every time.

That has not happened. Another press release of 1 March 2018 stated—

'This Labor Government is committed to a fair go for construction businesses, for workers, and for families,' Mr de Brenni said.

'Queensland's \$45 billion construction sector employs over 220,000 people and it is vitally important that subcontractors and suppliers feel confident—

and here it is again—

they will be paid in full, on time and every time.

Again, this is not happening. However, with non-payment of subcontractors along with company collapses and the allegations of systemic fraud continuing throughout 2018, the LNP called for a commission of inquiry into all aspects of the building industry. Labor did not support this approach, but eventually it did respond by establishing a joint task force to investigate non-payment complaints and allegations of fraudulent activity. I will have more to say about that later.

In February 2019 the *Courier-Mail* published an article headed, 'Housing Minister defends tough laws to protect subbies.' It stated—

The State Housing Minister has defended his government's stance on protecting subbies "ripped off under a broken system" as the Opposition calls his department out for not doing enough fast enough, saying the industry is in crisis.

Remember, this was an election promise in 2015, a bill was introduced in 2017 and debated in 2018, and here we were in 2019. The article went on to say—

'Everyone in the building industry deserves the confidence they will be paid on time, in full, every time ... my resolve to deliver effective security of payment reforms has never been stronger,' he said.

The minister kept repeating that statement, but let us look at the facts. Companies continue to collapse and subbies were not paid under this government: RCR Tomlinson Australia, \$630 million in 2019; Ostwald Brothers in Dalby, \$55.5 million in 2018; Cullen Group, Gold Coast, \$45 million in 2017; CRCG Rimfire, a Queensland and Chinese company, \$41 million in 2018; and JM Kelly project builders—and we all have heard that name before, haven't we, members?—in Rockhampton—there were plenty of questions around JM Kelly in 2016—where \$31 million did not get paid to the subbies.

Remember again that this was an election promise in 2015 and a bill was introduced in 2017, yet companies continue to go broke: Bloomer Constructions on the Gold Coast, \$35 million in 2017; Gary Deane Constructions, \$16.7 million in 2017; CMF Projects in Brisbane, \$12 million in 2017; Bluestone, Gold Coast, \$6.8 million in 2017; CKP Construction, Brisbane, \$6.22 million in 2017; Rimfire Constructions, Brisbane, \$6 million in 2018; Stirling Homes, Ipswich, \$6 million in 2018; and Q1 Homes, Gold Coast, \$5.4 million. I can go on all day. There are pages and pages of companies that have gone broke owing millions of dollars and subbies were not paid—after this government and this minister went on and on about subcontractors being paid on time, every time. Even on 13 May this year the *Noosa News* stated, referring to Minister de Brenni—

He rejected criticism from key industry group the Subcontractors Alliance that the Palaszczuk Government's slow implementation of Project Bank Accounts meant to guarantee payment security represented a broken promise.

Mr de Brenni said that his government did not waver from its commitment to deliver Project Bank Accounts.

Well, they actually have not delivered any project bank accounts yet, except for government jobs worth between the figures mentioned before. We all know, of course, that government always pays its bills so these project bank accounts were never going to fail. It is not a real test of the system, but it is an indication of what cost might be involved in these project bank accounts. The article continued—

Alliance head Les Williams, speaking in the wake of the latest building company collapse on the Sunshine Coast, said 85 per cent of the industry responsible for employing 250,000 Queenslanders had been put placed at greater risk by the tardiness.

He is here talking about the minister's tardiness. The article continued—

Administrator FTI Consulting has yet to release data on the total debt left by RGD Group and RGD Constructions.

Mr Williams said if Project Bank Accounts were already in place, nearly seven years after the Walton Construction collapse in 2013 rocked the industry, subbies would still not be being caught by failed builders.

He also took aim at the Queensland Building and Construction Commission, calling for it to be disbanded in its current form.

'The QBCC knows false statutory declarations (that subbies have been paid) and false financials are mechanisms of fraud,' he said.

We may have heard some of that mentioned in my speeches about JM Kelly in Rockhampton. It went on—

'But we've seen no significant investigations or charges laid. We've said repeatedly this won't stop until someone goes to jail for destroying small businesses and their families.'

I agree with him. It went on—

Mr de Brenni said the criticism was not justified with Queensland the only state to legislate for Project Bank Accounts and the only state with the accounts on government contracts.

That is true: they are on government contracts, but governments usually pay their bills. It continued—

'It's been a long time coming but we want our system to be a model for the rest of the country,' he said.

'I wouldn't want to be a tradie in any other state. We are at the end of a process started in 2015.'

Tabled paper: Bundle of documents relating to changes to legislation to ensure protection for subcontractors and suppliers [\[1158\]](#).

We are not at the end of the process started in 2015—by the way, that is five years ago—because the minister has just told us that there will be 69 amendments to this piece of legislation which we have not yet seen. Members will be really surprised about that. In fact, I had a briefing from the minister at 2.30—a 10- or 15-minute talk about what amendments were likely to come up tonight. I was promised a copy of those amendments, but that has not been forthcoming. It would be good to see those. I checked my emails before the minister started his speech tonight and I still had not received those amendments. Members on this side of the House who will be talking on this bill obviously have not seen those amendments. The first they will have learned about the changes to the implementation dates was during the minister's speech.

The government is all talk and no action on this issue. We are now hearing that the dates for implementation will be by proclamation. In terms of proclamation versus regulation—what it was supposed to be—this does provide the government with some flexibility. It really just pushes the matter further down the track because, despite having the legislation, nothing is really in place from an actual commencement point of view. Industry is looking for certainty here. At the end of the day it wants to know when these things are going to kick in and it wants to know how it will plan for that. This change to the implementation was supposed to apply as of 1 July 2020. We all know that we are past 1 July now.

This bill has been sitting on the *Notice Paper* for a number of months and all of a sudden it has come up for debate—we found out it was coming up for debate yesterday—and there are a whole lot of amendments at the last minute. Members in this House are getting used to the fact that this government springs things on them at the last minute. I am not saying that there is anything untoward with these amendments. Later in the day when I get to look at the amendments and tear them apart—have a look at them—I may well speak to the amendments in the consideration in detail stage, but I suspect that again I will not get the opportunity to speak to those amendments because this bill will be guillotined and everything will just happen automatically, as is the way that this government seems to bring everything before us.

My understanding from what the minister told me earlier in the day and what has just been said is that the implementation dates have been pushed back and now the next phase of this will start on 1 March—and correct me if I am wrong, Minister—next year. It has been extended and it has been broken apart so that some of the government contracts will start on 1 January 2022 and some later on 1 July 2022, but the real crux of this matter is that for those private contracts of \$1 million or more project bank accounts will not start until 1 January 2023. This was an election promise promised in 2015, just to remind members again. Legislation was put to the House in 2017, but the core of this—getting to the stage where projects over \$1 million in the private sector will be covered by this so-called project bank account that will pay subbies on time every time—does not happen until 1 January 2023 by proclamation, mind you, so that could in fact change. We are not 100 per cent sure about that.

The amendments to the bill will implement the government's response to the recommendation of the task force. In addition, the amendments proposed seek to implement the recommendations of the Building Industry Fairness Reforms Implementation and Evaluation Panel, which, by the way, was a suggestion that the LNP put to the 2017 bill and the government at the time did not support an implementation panel, but thank God it finally saw sense because, as the minister said in his speech, some good recommendations came out of that. Those changes will be made and again that is why we are not opposing this bill.

With regard to the statement of reservations by the LNP members of the committee, it was a very good statement of reservations and I commend the LNP members of the committee. What they said in their statement of reservations was that, while the evaluation panel report on PBAs was provided to the government in March 2019, it took until November before it was tabled and before the opposition got a chance to have a look at it. Given the changes made to the reporting associated with minimum financial requirements, it is disappointing that Labor still has not got it right, with a significant percentage of contractors still not complying. The complexity of the bill means that even when contractors are endeavouring to comply they are often in contravention of the laws.

The deadline for the next phase of reforms was quite tight—that is, 1 July 2020. I wrote this speech a number of months ago, because this bill has been sitting on the *Notice Paper* for quite a while, so that is why that date of 1 July 2020 is in there but it is now 1 March 2021. That does give the industry a little bit of time to prepare, which it really did need. The LNP members also suggested that given the constructive recommendations provided by the evaluation panel it may have been prudent to retain this panel until the cascading schedule for activating the project bank accounts to all building and construction contracts valued at \$1 million or more has been concluded. We are suggesting that that implementation panel should stay until 1 January 2023, so there is a job for it for quite a while.

The LNP members of the committee also said that, notwithstanding the importance of ongoing professional training and development, there was no recommendation from the committee on this important matter. If members look at the joint special task force report recommendations, there is a whole section there on education. It says that the task force considers that greater understanding of relevant laws, contractual obligations and business, financial and contract management would improve subcontractors' bargaining power and payment outcomes and that, while acknowledging the power imbalances with which subcontractors must contend, the task force encountered cases where subcontractors did not take steps to protect their own interests—for example, by omitting to ensure that the subcontract was properly documented and executed, properly identified the parties, and enforced their legal rights in accordance with the statutory requirements.

The New South Wales Small Business Commissioner, in a recent review of the collapse of a civil construction company, found poor financial literacy amongst some of the contractors and subcontractors and poor commercial acumen and management of non-payment along the contracting chain. As a result, that commission is developing a new induction approach for small business subcontractors that is focused on improving financial literacy and awareness of security of payment mechanisms. The task force considered how Queensland's supervisory powers address education and training. One of the objects of the QBCC Act is to provide support, education and advice for those undertaking building works and consumers, and it goes on for quite a bit. It says that this proposal should be pursued by the government. It would be beneficial to ensure that financial and business management form part of the training options available to licensees.

I know Master Builders Queensland and the HIA are very interested in the ongoing professional development of builders, and it appears that this is something that the government has not even taken into account. In fact, the Special Joint Taskforce's recommendation 6 is that the government note the work of the QBCC to identify appropriate education and training operators for subcontractors.

Other objects of the bill are to implement the recommendation of the Building Industry Fairness Reforms Implementation and Evaluation Panel; to implement the recommendations of the Special Joint Taskforce that investigated subcontractor non-payment in the building industry; enhance Queensland's security of payment legislation and further extend the protections for industry; improve the QBCC's ability to address fraudulent behaviour in the industry; implement reforms arising from the Building Confidence report such as enhancements to the regulation of architects and registered professionals; and ensure the continuation of external review rights for decisions about transition plans for retirement villages.

The centrepiece of the building industry fairness act 2017 introduced by the Labor government was the introduction of the project bank accounts. These require money to be held in trust for subcontractors, and in 2018 these were put in place initially for government contracts between \$1 million and \$10 million. It is supposed to be rolled out to the private sector.

The BIF Act required the initial implementation be reviewed by the independent panel. The independent panel made 20 recommendations which were accepted by the government. Again, we have not seen the government's response to this committee report. It has been tabled but we have not actually seen it yet. The recommendations related to simplifying the framework, improving protections and oversight and managing the financial transition, and these are contained in the proposed amendments in this bill. I want to quote from part of the implementation panel's report to show how tardy the minister has actually been in delivering—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms McMillan): Honourable member, the time for government business is now over.

Debate, on motion of Mr Hart, adjourned.

**ANTI-DISCRIMINATION (RIGHT TO USE GENDER-SPECIFIC LANGUAGE)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Resumed from 19 September 2018 (see p. 2596).

Second Reading

Mr KATTER (Traeger—KAP) (5.31 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

Those who oppose this bill will say that it is not needed, that it is pre-emptive and we are boxing at shadows. Most of us intuitively would say this is a pathway that is firmly embedded in society and it is an issue that needs to be addressed now. It would certainly be my view that it needs to be addressed now. None could deny that there is a cultural shift in society, particularly in metropolitan areas where it is most prevalent, and I think it should be debated in a place like this and should be confronted.

This bill seeks to address two issues. The first is to make amendments to the Anti-Discrimination Act so that if someone like myself wanted to use traditional gender specific language and say 'he' and 'she', for example, they would be protected and would not be discriminated against for using that language. If someone politely—not even politely—asked me to use something different, I would be quite happy to do it—and I think most people would—but I should not be forced to change the primary language I have been using and brought up with for that purpose. I think there should be a tolerance and that people should be able to say, 'Why don't you call me something else.' What I am asking is for tolerance from the other side, for the other side to say, 'We would allow you to use that, Rob Katter, because we tolerate all sorts of views.' That is the essence of this bill. I would argue strongly that the basis for this is tolerance in all parts of our society.

Whilst the first part is to protect the rights of people using gender based language, it is also to protect businesses and other organisations such as sporting clubs from disadvantage in the provision of facilities and services that exclusively recognise gender as either male or female. A working example of that may be if hypothetically at some time in the future at the local sporting club someone did not want to identify as male or female and was offended that there were not facilities provided at that sporting club. That sporting club would then be subject to penalties for not providing that. We would like to, at no real cost to anyone, give them some certainty that they would be protected from that. Certainly in my electorate they could ill afford to build another toilet facility at the football ground. If they cannot afford to they should have some protection.

I was asked for evidence in relation to this issue. Last time this was brought up in the media the University of Queensland said they do not do that, they do not know where people are getting this from. It was said in this House that this is just the KAP trying to cook up a storm and there is no basis for this. We were contacted by two university students. I have unfortunately lost the communication from one of them, but I will table the other and read it out first—

Thank you very much for planning to introduce legislation that will prohibit universities from penalising students who don't follow their language guides. As a student at UQ I have been marked down for using words like man or mankind as a synonym for humanity. These policies are anti-academic freedom and by having them in place universities are forcing students to accept all the premises of the marxist ideology that is behind them.

Tabled paper: Extract from a social media page regarding gender-specific language [\[1155\]](#).

I am not trying to say they are Marxist ideologies, but the evidence is there that someone has been discriminated against for using that language. I have browsed the guidelines of the university again today. One might say they are just guidelines, but members cannot tell me that we are not going to end up in the position in five or 10 years time—who knows how long it will take—where a person will be penalised if they do not do it. Here is an example where someone is forced to use that language. We have not debated this. There is not the social or moral mandate to enforce this. It is a good time to have this debate and bring these issues to the surface.

I am sure everyone will say this is an aggressive grab of conservatism. No, it is not. It is an appeal for tolerance towards other people expressing a different point of view and wanting to retain that primary vernacular that they are accustomed to by saying he or she. I do not think that should offend anyone. Here is the point, I might be offended if you force me to use the other language.

Ms Boyd: I'll start calling you a woman and we will see how you go.

Mr KATTER: I take that interjection. We have already descended to the lowest common denominator and we are playing the gender card. I find it interesting. I do not know what I am supposed to call the women's hospital when this progresses in the future because that will offend someone. Again I will stress that I might be offended by being forced to say something else.

I will address it again: people say we are taking this too far, we do not need to have this debate, it is just being confrontational. Tell that to Jordan Peterson in the United States. He got sacked from a university. It started a movement. Members cannot tell me that the same sorts of issues will not come to Australia. It is only a matter of time. For those reasons it is healthy to debate this now.

Already the Queensland government has committed to building awareness and education around transgender identities in schools by providing information to principals about gender-neutral school uniforms—that is fine—school camps, use of toilets and participation in sport, but you cannot tell me this is not a precursor to enforceable codes, because it will be.

The University of Queensland has policies to mark down students for language that could be considered gender exclusive even though the language is grammatically correct. It is interesting that the last time that this issue was in the media the university was saying it did not do that. That is fine. If you do have that position you are allowed to have a different point of view, but be consistent. Here we have students saying they are marked down. The guidelines and the policies are easily accessible on their website. I do not understand why you would try to take that on as an issue. If you want to have that point of view that is fine, but stand behind it and let us confront the issue maturely in the debate here and enshrine some rights for both sides of the argument.

I do not agree that it is intolerant of me to maintain language by saying 'he' and 'she' or 'his' and 'her'. That does not mean that I have to use that language; it just means that I am protected if I do use it. We had an interesting contribution from the Australian College of Nursing, which advocates protecting the rights of nurses who might inadvertently offend someone by using the wrong language. They should be given the opportunity to correct that while, in the meantime, continuing to say 'mister', 'missus', 'he' or 'her' and not having to change the norm.

At the same time, I really promote the idea that people are open to different types of language and the exploration of that, but we should not be forced to use particular language. That is the crux of my argument. We want to put that up as a proposition, to see how people would vote on it. I think that is a reasonable proposition for someone like myself who wants to retain those values and retain the ability to use such language without facing any discrimination into the future. I would like those rights protected. It behoves the government to provide those rights for everyone across both sides of the cultural divide.



Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (5.40 pm): I rise to speak against the Anti-Discrimination (Right to Use Gender-Specific Language) Amendment Bill 2018. The bill would amend the Anti-Discrimination Act 1991 to: prohibit discrimination on the basis of the use of gender-specific language; expand the current definitions of 'direct discrimination' and 'indirect discrimination' in the Anti-Discrimination Act to include specific examples in relation to the use of gender-specific language; and prevent a person from treating, or proposing to treat, an entity, being a provider of services or facilities, that does not accommodate persons who are not, or do not identify as, male or female, less favourably than another entity that accommodates such persons.

The bill is inconsistent with the objectives of the Anti-Discrimination Act and with fundamental legislative principles. The bill will have a negative impact on certain members of the community, including those who are transgender, gender diverse or intersex. I note that the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee recommended that the bill not be passed. I support that recommendation.

The purpose of the Anti-Discrimination Act is to promote equality of opportunity for everyone by protecting them from unfair discrimination. That is achieved by prohibiting direct and indirect discrimination against a person on the basis of certain protected attributes, including sex, age, race, impairment, religious or political beliefs or activities, gender identity, sexuality and family responsibilities. The protected attributes in the Anti-Discrimination Act have been included to promote equality of opportunity for everyone by protecting them from unfair discrimination in certain areas of activity and from sexual harassment and certain associated objectionable conduct by making discrimination, harassment, vilification and victimisation unlawful in Queensland. Those protected attributes are recognised in various international human rights instruments. The use of gender-specific

language is not a right that is recognised in the international human rights instruments to which Australia is a signatory. To expand the current operation of our anti-discrimination legislation, compelling evidence of injustice and discrimination would be required.


The member for Traeger has sought to provide some anecdotal evidence, but also notes the bill's central purpose is to initiate a discussion about our use of gendered language. In order to progress that conversation, I would invite supporters of this bill to specifically articulate what it is that they want to be able to say that they cannot say now.

The bill would give protection to an entity, including businesses and other organisations—a concept that would be highly unusual in the context of human rights generally and the Anti-Discrimination Act, which protects individuals from discrimination. That would be a fundamental shift and, indeed, an expansion of the application of anti-discrimination legislation. As the Queensland Human Rights Commission, formerly known as the Anti-Discrimination Commission Queensland, noted in its submission to the committee, it is individuals who have human rights and receive protection from discrimination under the act.

The bill would protect deliberate and persistent misgendering of a person, which is something that could cause significant harm to a vulnerable group the Anti-Discrimination Act seeks to protect. The Caxton Legal Centre submitted to the committee that where someone mistakenly misgenders a person it is unlikely that unlawful discrimination will have occurred. Deliberate misgendering can be detrimental to the mental health of transgender and gender-diverse individuals. It undermines the dignity and human rights of gender-diverse people. The committee noted that it is not entirely clear how the provisions of the bill would work in practice. In particular, the Queensland Human Rights Commission had concerns that the provisions omitted the tests of proportionality and the reasonableness tests that are a feature of Queensland's pre-existing anti-discrimination framework. The omission of those tests will mean that individuals who are employers could find themselves in court for seeking to enforce commonsense codes of conduct.

The Queensland Human Rights Commission does not support the bill. It submitted to the committee that the bill may be inconsistent with the Commonwealth Sex Discrimination Act 1994. Protecting the use of gender-specific language is not something that has been raised with the commission in any of its information, complaint handling and community engagement services.

This bill goes against everything that the government has sought to do since coming to office. We have a proud history of recognising and supporting diversity in our community, the LGBTIQ community, and brought in the Human Rights Act. It is important that we maintain the work that we have already built on and not take that backwards. I believe the bill before us tonight would be taking us backwards. I do not think that there have been sufficient grounds to support the need for this bill. If people want to have the conversation, by all means they should have the conversation. However, you do not start a conversation by first changing the law. You have the conversation first. You find the evidence to support the need to change laws and then you bring that law before the parliament. It is for all those reasons that I oppose this bill.

 **Mr JANETZKI** (Toowoomba South—LNP) (5.46 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Anti-Discrimination (Right to Use Gender-Specific Language) Amendment Bill 2018. The bill was introduced on 19 September 2018 by Katter's Australian Party. The policy objectives of the bill are to protect an individual's right to use traditional gender based language and to protect businesses and other organisations that offer facilities and services that exclusively recognise gender as either male or female. The bill seeks to achieve this by making amendments to the Anti-Discrimination Act 1991 to add new grounds and types of unlawful discrimination.

The reasoning behind the need for the bill relates to the stated increase in intolerance and hostility because of the direct and implied limitations on the use of traditional gender based language. It is argued that limitations on the use of traditional gender based language have taken the form of explicit and implied prohibitions, punishments and disadvantage against individuals and organisations. It is further argued that the increasing prevalence of those limitations requires a legislative response to protect the right to use language that reflects the values of a majority of Queenslanders.

The provisions in the bill create a new class of prohibited discrimination, that is, discrimination on the basis of the use of gender-specific language. The bill states—

Gender-specific language means words, symbols or images that directly or indirectly designate, or are associated with, the male or female gender.

It includes language such as male, female, man, woman, he, she, mister, missus, Ms, husband, wife, widow, widower—and the list goes on. The Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee recommended that the bill not be passed. Clause 4 would amend the meaning of ‘direct discrimination’ in section 10 of the Anti-Discrimination Act. The bill states—

Direct discrimination on the basis of the use of gender-specific language happens if a person treats, or proposes to treat, a person who uses the language less favourably than another person, who does not use the language, is or would be treated in circumstances that are the same or not materially different.

Clause 5 would amend the meaning of ‘indirect discrimination’ in section 11 of the Anti-Discrimination Act. The bill states—

Indirect discrimination on the basis of the use of gender-specific language happens if a person directly or indirectly imposes, or proposes to impose, a term or standard, whether written or unwritten, that a person will not comply with if the person uses the language.


An example, as provided in the bill, is where an employer gives a memo to employees requesting employees stop using the words ‘husband’ and ‘wife’.

Clause 6 applies in circumstances where an entity provides facilities or services that do not specifically accommodate persons who are not, or do not identify as, male or female. It provides that a person must not treat, or propose to treat, the provider less favourably than the person treats, or would treat, a relevant entity in circumstances that are the same or not materially different. In short, it would make it unlawful to discriminate against a provider of facilities or services that does not specifically accommodate persons who are not male or female or do not identify as male or female. For example, during a tender process for a contract, a business’s bid may be unsuccessful because the business does not provide bathrooms specifically for persons who are not, or do not identify as, male or female.

There were seven submissions made to the committee. The submitters included the Anti-Discrimination Commission—the Queensland Human Rights Commission, as it is now known—Caxton Legal, the Australian College of Nursing, the Australian Association of Social Workers, Fair Go for Queensland Women and two individual submitters. Of these seven stakeholders, five recommended that the bill not be passed. Two organisations—the Fair Go for Queensland Women and the Australian College of Nursing—did not expressly say that they supported the bill; however, their submission indicated support.

The main issues raised by stakeholders included protection of businesses and the necessity of the bill. It was noted that no complaints had been made to the Anti-Discrimination Commission of Queensland—now the Queensland Human Rights Commission—in relation to the subject matter of this bill. The Australian College of Nursing believed that nurses should not be sanctioned for using traditional gender-specific language, particularly if done so inadvertently and with no intent to cause harm, when assigned to care for an individual who identifies as transgender, gender diverse or non-binary. Fair Go for Queensland Women suggested that there needs to be the freedom to retain language that respectfully and explicitly defines and describes women and girls, their experiences and needs. They argued that there also needs to be the freedom to use such gender-specific language in our society without being targeted for harassment, censure or abuse.

While acknowledging the concerns of the mover of the private member’s bill, ultimately a legislature cannot legislate common sense. Governments, wherever they may be, should be encouraging more freedom, not more law. Quiet Queenslanders know instinctively that whenever legislatures get involved in what its citizens can and cannot say, it not only guarantees bad law but also guarantees less freedom. Ultimately, this is why the opposition will not be supporting the bill.

 **Mr RUSSO** (Toohey—ALP) (5.53 pm): I rise in the House to oppose the Anti-Discrimination (Right to Use Gender-Specific Language) Amendment Bill 2018, introduced by the member for Traeger from Katter’s Australian Party on 19 September 2018. In this speech in opposition to the bill I draw on a number of sources, including evidence that was provided to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee in respect of this bill. In my view, this legislation is unnecessary and, rather than protecting citizens from discriminatory conduct, is likely to be harmful to vulnerable persons. The legislation will not enhance the Anti-Discrimination Act 1991 but, rather, will undermine the important policy objectives of that beneficial legislation.

I observe that a written submission from then anti-discrimination commissioner—now the Human Rights Commissioner—submits to the effect that the bill is neither necessary nor warranted and is beyond the objectives of the Anti-Discrimination Act set out in the preamble, in particular paragraph 6(c) in which parliament has recognised the following—

- (c) the quality of democratic life is improved by an educated community appreciative and respectful of the dignity and worth of everyone.

The bill's objectives, as stated in the explanatory notes, are: to protect an individual's right to use traditional gender based language; and to protect businesses and other organisations from disadvantage in the provision of facilities and services that exclusively recognise gender as either male or female. However, the reality is that the protection of the use of gender-specific language has the potential to be divisive and is inconsistent with the contemporary objectives of fostering an inclusive society.

The anti-discrimination commissioner, now the Human Rights Commissioner, directed the legal affairs committee's attention to the submissions made by the Caxton Legal Centre to the effect that the promotion of a right to use gender-specific language is likely to expose those people who are transgender, gender diverse or intersex to increased discrimination. The commissioner went on to say that the bill's proposal to remove the reasonableness test from the elements of indirect discrimination would be highly problematic as it would remove the ability to consider the context in which discrimination is alleged. The commissioner emphasised that the proposal to remove the reasonableness test from indirect discrimination across all of the attributes would have a profound impact on discrimination laws and the ability of the courts ultimately to weigh up and balance rights and responsibilities. I respectfully share the commissioner's views.

In the course of the hearing before the legal affairs committee, the commissioner was asked how the objectives of the bill can be seen by all Queenslanders, rather than inciters, as being worthy and to comment on whether the bill goes against the objectives it purports to support. The commissioner responded that the bill—

... would create a new attribute in the act that would create a right for people who have used gender-specific language to bring a complaint against another person or entity that they say has discriminated against them on the basis of that attribute. The Katter bill would potentially expose vulnerable people such as those who are transgender and those who are gender diverse or intersex to increased discrimination, because if people think they have a right to use gender-specific language willy-nilly they may not appreciate the niceties of when that language actually does stray into prohibited territory that is covered by sexual harassment, vilification and sex discrimination under the act.

The commissioner expressed the view—

After having read the transcript of the evidence provided by the member for Traeger, it does not seem that there is a legitimate or a serious concern within the community that would justify making substantial, and, quite frankly, radical changes to the Anti-Discrimination Act.

Similarly, in response to a question from the member for Mirani, Mr Andrew, as to whether there would be an interest in undertaking a probe into the University of Queensland to understand if discrimination is happening, the commissioner answered—

I think if there was overwhelming evidence presented to the commission that a group of people were vulnerable because of a particular attribute, the commission has certain investigative powers but, frankly, on the evidence that is currently before this committee I think it unlikely that that would be the case.

The commissioner was asked to comment on the notion advanced by the member for Traeger that the current situation, pre bill, is political correctness gone mad and that he wanted to protect some of his constituents who may believe they are not doing anything wrong by using gender-specific language, and whether there is an alternative approach that could be adopted or whether it was simply that the context referred to by the member for Traeger simply did not exist. The commissioner responded—

I will try to answer your question as best as I can. I think there are a number of different contexts that the member for Traeger was referring to. One seemed to be addressing gender-diverse people by a pronoun that is not the preferred pronoun of that person. There seemed to be an expression by the member that, whilst people were happy to do that, they did not want to be forced to do that. I think that seemed to be the nub of what he was trying to get to. I guess what I would say to that is: there needs to be greater public awareness, and perhaps the commission has a role in this, in explaining to the public the potential impact of misdirected language on people who are vulnerable. What we saw with the gay marriage debate was a group of people who were already highly vulnerable being exposed to a public debate which, in effect, questioned the validity of their lifestyle. What we saw from that was a huge impact on people's mental health. In fact, this is a public health issue as much as it is a legal and social policy issue. Suggesting that it should be optional for people to respect the gender choice of individuals when in fact that may create psychological harm is problematic.

With respect, the commissioner has identified the problem with clarity and precision and that the bill, which would make respecting the gender choice of individuals optional, may be problematic, including in its capacity to create psychological harm. The legislation, as it stands, does not purport to police every aspect of our lives or our engagement. That is an important thing to recognise in giving perspective to the current debate. The act protects 16 attributes, including, amongst other things, sex, family responsibilities and gender identity, but for discrimination to be unlawful it must happen not only


on one of those grounds but also on one of the various areas of activity under the act. Generally, those areas of activity are public areas of activity—for example, work, education and receiving goods and services.

The discrimination also needs to fall within at least one of the two types of discrimination in the act to be regarded as unlawful—that is, direct discrimination and indirect discrimination. As Ms Bell, Principal Lawyer at the Anti-Discrimination Commission Queensland, explained to the committee—

Direct discrimination is if someone does something because of your attributes—‘I’m not going employ that person because she’s a female’ or ‘she’s of an age where she might have children and have to take time off work’. Indirect discrimination happens when someone imposes a term, a requirement or a condition that you cannot or find it difficult to comply with because of your attributes.

The point of mentioning all of this is to bring perspective to this debate. The current act operates only in certain circumstances. The legislature here, and in many other places in Australia and across the world, has sought to strike a proper balance between aspects of conduct which need to be regulated against discrimination and those which are not the proper purview of regulation. The act, in its current form, strikes a proper and considered balance. The proposed bill does not.

Further, the bill, if passed, would create an inconsistent approach to regulation of discriminatory conduct in Queensland compared to the Commonwealth. Although it is not always necessary or desirable for Queensland legislation to be completely in sync with its Commonwealth equivalent, in this case the inconsistency would represent a substandard legislative model for Queensland, and the likelihood of court rulings needing to be made that the Commonwealth legislation prevails over the Queensland legislation to the extent of the inconsistency. I oppose this bill.

 **Mr KNUTH** (Hill—KAP) (6.02 pm): I risk to speak in the debate on the Anti-Discrimination (Right to Use Gender-Specific Language) Amendment Bill 2018. This bill was first introduced into the House by the member for Traeger on 19 September 2018. That is nearly 22 months ago and we are only just now starting to debate the issue. It is very poor form that a bill about protecting the basic right to use simple language without the fear of abuse, recrimination or reprisal has taken nearly two years to hit the floor of the parliament. Who says that crossbenchers are not discriminated against?


This bill is straightforward and logical. It aims to protect an individual’s right to use traditional gender based language and protect businesses and other organisations from disadvantage in the provision of facilities and services that exclusively recognise gender as either male or female. This is an everyday issue that many Queenslanders feel very strongly about and is starting to creep into everyday life.

Let us look at a couple of examples. A student at a Brisbane university thanked the KAP for originally introducing the bill as he had personally been marked down for using words such as man and mankind as synonyms for humanity. Not only is this anti-academic, it penalises students for using language which the university deems does not follow their so-called language guide. It is an absolute joke that words like man and humanity are no longer good enough to use at universities, and worse still students are being penalised for the use of these words.

A friend of mine told me about being accused of not being gender sensitive when he thanked a woman for a coffee by calling her ma’am. He was shocked and asked what he should have called her. He was told ‘not ma’am’ and was told that she was offended by that word as she was gender fluid. I did not even know what gender fluid meant. I did a bit of research and found that in 2014 the ABC released a list of 58 different gender terms, which I think has now expanded to over 70. I am not questioning anyone’s right to call themselves whatever they want—that is not a problem, and all the best to them—but it is not acceptable for anyone to be abused for using simple general language such as ‘ma’am’ or ‘sir’.

Most small cafes or restaurants have men’s and women’s amenities. In the near future, if someone is offended could the owner be sued for discrimination for not providing a third bathroom option? It has never been an issue until now, but can anyone honestly sit here, hand on heart, in this day and age and rule out that this will never happen?

There are three reasons this bill is necessary. We have to protect the millions out there who grew up using the words ‘he’, ‘she’, ‘man’, ‘woman’, ‘boy’, ‘girl’, ‘male’, ‘female’, ‘mate’ and so on. This bill is about protecting our traditional language. This bill represents and protects those who are being discriminated against just because they use basic language. This bill certainly passes the pub test. I would challenge any MP to put this bill to the test. I 100 per cent support the bill and commend the bill to the House.

 **Mrs McMAHON** (Macalister—ALP) (6.06 pm): I rise to speak against this bill. I understand the objectives of the bill. I understand the general railing against anything that seems to be labelled progressive or inclusive. I understand that bills like this tend to become a lightning rod for the anti-PC brigade, but I posit that the objective, the premise for this bill is fundamentally flawed.

Let us examine this bill objectively. Let us look at the evidence. Firstly, its objective is to protect an individual's right to use traditional gender based language. The member for Traeger told the committee that people who choose to use traditional language—and let us not fall down the rabbit hole of understanding how problematic it is when dealing with the etymology of language given how dynamic it is—are currently being punished. Furthermore, he states that this punishment will continue to grow.

When asked to provide evidence of people being punished for such language, the member for Traeger could only point to articles contained in newspapers. When specifically asked about the issue of students at the University of Queensland being marked down for using particular pronouns in an assessment, the member for Traeger was not able to provide any additional information other than what had been previously reported in the media. In fact, when asked how much of an issue this was at the University of Queensland, a university of some 50,000-plus students at the time, the member for Traeger could only indicate a handful of people—somewhere between two and five—had contacted his office to complain about the marks they had received. What were the marks they received? What was the assessment piece? What was the marking criteria against which the student was marked? The member for Traeger could not say. At the time he was also not interested in actually ascertaining the university's policy on assessment and redress.

The member for Traeger also pointed out that Commonwealth Games volunteers were told to use gender neutral language and that Qantas has a words at work policy that suggests or recommends certain language. When asked whether any of these volunteers or staff had been directed, rather than just suggested or encouraged, to use such language, the member could not say. Apparently, also concerning is that the Queensland government provided information packages to school principals to assist in helping transgender students. They are to be used at the principal's discretion. Shock-horror that a principal may wish to assist a vulnerable student.

Heaven forbid that the Australian Defence Force encourages the use of certain language. I will give the member for Traeger a tip: the ADF does and can do a lot more than encourage members to do certain things when it wants members to comply. It has whole acts and regulations to direct members to do certain things. If the member for Traeger wants to rail against UQ's policing of the written words of its students, I suggest he look no further than at how restrictive the ADFP 102 is. It is the bible for staff officers who draft correspondence on behalf of the ADF—and I think there is a whole chapter on pronouns. How riveting!


Yes, workforces do have a say on how people who represent their companies, and their uniforms, write on behalf of their organisations. Universities are training grounds for this. What is currently the penalty or what repercussions could the member point to for errant employees or volunteers who disregarded these guidelines or recommendations? Well, nothing. Not only was the member not aware of anyone being directed to use non-gender specific language, but he could not identify whether any person or entity has been prosecuted for not using gender-neutral language.

The second objective is to protect businesses and other organisations from disadvantage in the provision of facilities and services. The reasoning, I am assuming, is that small businesses and community organisations will be lumped with the cost of providing facilities that cater to all patrons. When asked if the member had been approached by clubs in his areas about this increased cost blowout or burden, the answer was no. Perhaps the member is concerned that when new public facilities are built there is a requirement for a disability access toilet—that is, a toilet that is non-gender specific.

The lack of evidence, the lack of stakeholder consultation, the lack of any visible community concern over specifics contained within this bill was quite striking. This is a private member's bill based on a vibe—a concern or, as the member for Traeger worded it, a malaise. I suggest that 'malaise' is probably a good word to use because the exact cause or reason for this bill is difficult to identify.

The member stated that many of the issues he is concerned about—the undermining of what he calls accepted values and social norms without a political, social or moral mandate—are not being debated or properly addressed in this House. When I asked about this lack of debate, this lack of oversight of this House about these changing and social norms and about whether he spoke on such bills that had been introduced to the House, his answer was no. He is a busy man with a big electorate, an electorate in which these issues are not of high concern apparently, unless you are at the pub. He is not too busy though to introduce a bill on a vibe, a feeling, an opinion.

This bill seeks to amend the Anti-Discrimination Act, now the Human Rights Act. It seeks to make the right to use gendered pronouns a protected attribute. It completely misses the point that the objective of that act is to provide protections to vulnerable categories of people. People who are seeking to deliberately use gendered language at the expense of the sense of worth and wellbeing of others are not in and of themselves a vulnerable group needing protection. They certainly do not need protection at the expense of those who are already greatly maligned and misrepresented in the broader community. I stand here, I believe, with the political, social and moral mandate, to protect those this bill seeks to further marginalise and disenfranchise. I do not support this bill.

 **Mr DAMELTO** (Hinchinbrook—KAP) (6.13 pm): I rise to give my contribution on the Anti-Discrimination (Right to Use Gender-Specific Language) Amendment Bill 2018. Madam Deputy Speaker, if this bill were not debated in the House today, one day we might lose the right to use the word 'madam' in this place. That is a concern. There are people who would say that ideology is not only being pushed through our society right now but also being pushed through our universities, our workplaces, our schools and even some of our larger corporations. Some corporations are pushing in a certain direction now where they believe they are getting it right. Unfortunately, there is a large group of people out there—I would say a silent majority, Madam Deputy Speaker—who are very discontent with this. There are a lot of smirks around this place, but people have come to us who are disappointed that the conservative side of the House has not picked up on some of these things and so they have come to us with these issues.


The bill's objective is to protect an individual's right to use traditional gender based language. You would be hard pressed to go out there and find one person who has not noticed things changing over the last 20 years—for the good in many ways. Some people would say that things are being eroded—our vernacular is being eroded, the way we are allowed to speak to people is being eroded and the way we are allowed to name things is being eroded.

Not only does this bill go so far as to protect an individual's right to use gender based language; it protects businesses and other organisations from disadvantage in the provision of facilities and services that extensively recognise gender as either male and female words. There are small businesses, small companies and small sporting clubs that cannot provide the required amenities. To think we do not have legislation to protect them from someone at some stage coming to them with an anti-discrimination court case is worrying. These people should be indemnified from that sort of litigation.

I hope this bill marks a turning point for the battle of common sense. It is a slippery slope. People might shrug their shoulders, but a lot of people believe that. Is this built on a hunch? This is built on a feeling or a vibe out there in the community. I am not the only one who shares it and I am not the only member in this House who shares it, but we may be the only members in this room who will stand up for this.

There is an aggressive push away from gender based classifications and using gender specific words at universities. We were contacted by a young person at UQ. They said, 'Nick, I was marked down for using gender specific words in my assessment paper.' I have a son across the river at the University of Queensland as well. To think that he may be marked down because there are no protections in place in the form of legislation such as this concerns me.

It should concern everybody in this House, not because of what is happening today. We are pre-empting things with this legislation. There are not many cases, if any, where people have come forward with any real prosecution or where anyone has had any penalties awarded against them. The fact of the matter is that we are heading that way. This could happen in the future. The KAP want to make sure that these provisions are put in place to protect those people.

 **Ms McMILLAN** (Mansfield—ALP) (6.17 pm): I rise tonight to make my contribution to the Anti-Discrimination (Right to Use Gender-Specific Language) Amendment Bill 2018. The bill was introduced by the member for Traeger to unnecessarily protect the right to use gender specific language, claiming that users of gender specific language are perceiving to be in some way penalised. In fact, the member for Traeger and now the member for Hinchinbrook tonight went so far as to state that this bill will mark a turning point in the battle for common sense.

Interestingly, the member for Traeger relies on and refers to the *Courier-Mail* as his primary source of evidence—an unfortunately all too common practice in this state. His concerns are altogether misplaced. There is nothing sensible nor indeed practical about this bill. By way of interest, referencing the common press is yet another practice that is discouraged by higher education institutions, including

the University of Queensland. I make this informed comment as a member of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee who had carriage of this bill and where, in report No. 31 of the 56th Parliament, the committee did not recommend this bill be passed.

The bill proposes to amend the Anti-Discrimination Act 1991, hereby referred to as the act, to make it unlawful to discriminate on the basis of the use of gender-specific language. With reference to the community consultation on this bill I will highlight the futility, the absurdity and the danger should this bill be passed.

The member has clearly not done his homework in terms of investigating the assessment policies of the University of Queensland nor, indeed, any other higher education institutions. I am a master's graduate of the University of Queensland, and in the past as an academic I have been involved in the assessment of students' work. I am not aware of any policy authored by the University of Queensland that suggests that the assessor should mark down any student's work on this basis. Further, the use of gendered language—and in fact, pronouns—is not common in academic transcripts, as usually this work is written in the third person. Mr Katter should surely be aware of this. Had he properly investigated this matter, he would appreciate the use and importance of academic conventions and the contemporary style of academic writing. It seems to me that the only person offended is Mr Katter.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Pugh): Correct titles.

Ms McMILLAN: Further, the member has also not adequately investigated the issue as it relates to schooling and diversity—the very people the original Anti-Discrimination Act was designed to protect. The ways that schools have dealt with issues related to gender have been a matter of nuance over many years.

Initially, the bill proposes to extend the meanings of direct discrimination and indirect discrimination to include the use of gender-specific language. This amendment would mean that direct or indirect discrimination on the basis of the use of gender-specific language would be prohibited except if the language is offensive in any way.

The member for Traeger fails to provide any evidence of a widespread disadvantage to groups or individuals. The submission of the Caxton Legal Centre supports this argument, suggesting that people who use gender-specific language do not have a particular vulnerability that requires protection, and that providing protection for them under the Anti-Discrimination Act 1991 may result in increased discrimination towards a vulnerable group of people, which includes those who are transgender, gender diverse or intersex.

The Caxton Legal Centre rightly outlined that the current act already ensures the protection of human rights of particular groups of people who do not fully enjoy their fundamental rights in public life and who are more vulnerable to human rights violations. The centre also advised that the act should be amended to promote conduct which could cause significant harm to a vulnerable group which the act also seeks to protect. Such conduct could exist in the form of deliberate and persistent misgendering of a transgender or gender diverse person, which will inevitably cause significant harm.


This is not an imagined harm; nor is it, as the member for Traeger would have you believe, radical political correctness. This is about protecting our most vulnerable people and ensuring that they live in a Queensland free from discrimination—a Queensland that this Palaszczuk government can be proud of. It bears repeating that transgender people over the age of 18 are 11 times more likely to attempt suicide—11 times more likely. Almost half—41.8 per cent—of gender diverse and transgendered youth between the ages of 14 to 25 have attempted suicide in their lifetime. Indeed, in Mr Katter's own electorate a transgendered woman named Emily told ABC North West Queensland in 2018—

I've been followed out of shops and abused, I've been abused in shopping centres, called a freak, called an 'abomination'.

Shocking as that was—and as it still is today—frivolous legislation as used by the member for Traeger shows the importance of the Anti-Discrimination Act to ensure the protection of all students at our institutions of higher learning. These are our future scholars, our writers, our lawyers, our teachers and our politicians. The very least we can do is to ensure their protection at our institutions of higher learning.

As all members of this House are aware, the Anti-Discrimination Act was passed to protect the most vulnerable people in society who are consistently discriminated against on the basis of their race, religion, abilities, sexual preferences and so on. Those who use gender-specific language cannot be deemed as a vulnerable group for the purposes of the act, and to make this assertion is just ridiculous. The contents of this bill and its intentions provide some interesting insights into the member for

Traeger's philosophical beliefs and ideologies, not least the member's comfortability with his lack of an evidence based approach to law reform in Queensland. Rather, his motivation for reform is to merely push his own prejudices for purposes unknown. I oppose this bill.

 **Mr BERKMAN** (Maiwar—Grn) (6.24 pm): I rise to make a contribution on the Anti-Discrimination (Right to Use Gender-Specific Language) Amendment Bill 2018, and I rise to speak in opposition to this bill in the strongest possible terms.

Today happens to be International Non-Binary People's Day. This is a day when we should be sending strength, love and solidarity to the non-binary and gender diverse people in our community. Non-binary, transgender and gender diverse people live all over Queensland, and this parliament should be working to represent and support all of its constituents—not to embolden those who would marginalise others. I am sorry to say that that is exactly what this bill would do. It is completely antithetical to the Queensland Greens' policy on sexuality and gender identity.

In its own terms, the bill supposedly sets out to protect an individual's right to use traditional gender based language and to protect business and other organisations from disadvantage in the provision of facilities and services that exclusively recognise gender as either male or female. The stakeholders who made submissions on this bill were scathing. Organisations such as the Australian College of Nursing and the Caxton Legal Centre, who are immersed in supporting community members every day, pointed out the many issues with this bill in the parliamentary inquiry. The Australian Association of Social Workers opposed the bill because it would continue practices that are already harming gender diverse people who are already vulnerable to mental health issues and social stigma. This flies directly in the face of current evidence showing the need for gender-inclusive language practices and undermines the dignity and rights of gender diverse people.

The then Anti-Discrimination Commission opposed the bill because its amendments to the Anti-Discrimination Act are unnecessary and inconsistent with the purposes of the act. It pointed out there is no evidence suggesting a need for this bill. While the explanatory notes state there is an increasingly hostile social environment which limits language reflecting Queensland's so-called traditional values, these issues have never been brought to the Anti-Discrimination Commission in any of its information complaint handling or community engagement services.

Of the eight examples set out in the introductory speech for this bill, many of them would not be covered and have no relevance to the bill. The Building Code, the Australian Defence Force and the Victorian Public Service are among them. The commission pointed out other fatal technical flaws in the bill. The High Court has recognised that people may be neither male nor female, and if conduct is unlawful under the Commonwealth Sex Discrimination Act this bill cannot make it lawful.

The Caxton Legal Centre pointed out the significant harm that deliberate and persistent misgendering can cause, and other speakers have touched on this as well. The act should not be amended to promote conduct causing such harm to a vulnerable group while also seeking to protect that group. The Caxton Legal Centre also pointed out that the bill tries to protect entities over individuals, absurdly trying to give human rights to an organisation.

The Australian College of Nursing strongly advocated for the use of respectful language, highlighting the Australian guideline for children and adolescents, which supports an affirmative model of care whereby those who identify as gender diverse can explore and express their identity as they wish. This model is associated with improving wellbeing and mental health. Using a person's preferred name and pronouns is vital for affirming and respectful care. All of these organisations, which are at the coalface supporting our community, want to see a legislative environment that supports an inclusive and diverse community.

As someone who is not gender diverse, I want to elevate the voices of people in my community who are gender diverse and who would be directly affected by this bill. I have sought input from people who wanted to comment so that I could put them into the record today. I received more responses and personal stories than I have time to read. Each and every one of them is so important to hear. You can read many of these stories on my Facebook page or the Twitter thread I started today. I will take the opportunity to table these responses, but I would also like to read a couple of excerpts from the many responses I received.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Anti-Discrimination (Right to Use Gender-Specific Language) Amendment Bill 2018' [\[1156\]](#).

Taylor, a trans woman and resident of Indooroopilly in my electorate, said—

Being misgendered has a really clear negative impact on my mental state—it's like more of that weight you've thrown off is being put back on. Trans people aren't asking for special rights, we just want to be treated like we are who we say we are.

Dr Sandy O'Sullivan said—

... as an Aboriginal trans person, I'd suggest that it—
meaning this bill—

fails to recognise the deep history of gender diversity across our Communities and further disrespects a sense of the state 'reconciling' with that deep history.

Sam from Toowong spoke about how this bill pits the idea of 'freedom of speech' against freedom to simply exist, acting—

... like the right to verbally abuse is more important than the right of working-class people, black people, gay people, trans people to feel safe in a society that is simultaneously infatuated with us and disgusted by us.

Eli said that he is a non-binary person who uses they/them pronouns and regularly struggles with—

... dozens of mental calculations daily regarding whether to inform those around them of their pronouns, or enforce them when they've been forgotten.

Eli went on to say—

This bill threatens to erode the small amount of safety and security currently afforded gender diverse people in professional contexts ... it is nothing more than a blatant attempt to make us invisible, silent, and eventually extinguish us altogether ... We must not be allowed to go extinct.

One more anonymous response from a trans person said—

We're not interested in pushing any kind of agenda. We're just asking for the same respect as everyone else in our communities; the kinds of things you don't even realise you've never had to ask for. Here we are, asking. Please do the right thing by all Australians.

This bill would undo so much hard work by advocates to support gender diverse people in our communities. It presumes we should be protecting the right to inflict harm rather than protecting people from harm. It is an incredibly simple choice for me. That is why I will not be supporting the bill today and why I implore everyone else here to oppose this bill in the strongest possible terms.



Hon. DE FARMER (Bulimba—ALP) (Minister for Child Safety, Youth and Women and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (6.31 pm): I rise to speak against the Anti-Discrimination (Right to Use Gender-Specific Language) Amendment Bill 2018. The bill would amend the Anti-Discrimination Act 1991 to: prohibit discrimination on the basis of the use of gender-specific language; expand the current definitions of direct and indirect discrimination in the Anti-Discrimination Act to include specific examples in relation to the use of gender-specific language; and prevent a person from treating, or proposing to treat, an entity, being a provider of services or facilities, that does not accommodate persons who are not, or do not identify as, male or female, less favourably than another entity that accommodates such persons.

The bill is inconsistent with both the objectives of the Anti-Discrimination Act and fundamental legislative principles. I note that the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee recommended that the bill not be passed and I support and endorse this recommendation. Language is important. It excludes or it includes. It reflects and reinforces social norms, and it can reinforce differences or underline similarities. Using non-gendered language is a way of avoiding words that exclude others.

I want to make some points on this bill with a few different hats on. The first is as the Minister for Women and someone who has been committed to fighting for gender equality my entire life. The second is on behalf of the many people in this state and country who do not identify as either male or female. I want to use some words specifically from my friend Jo who is a trans woman on my staff and who told me how this bill makes her feel. I also speak with the hat on as the minister who has the dubious privilege of responding later this week to a question on notice from the opposition which refers to me as 'he'. Members opposite still need to work out that ministers can be women.

Ms Trad interjected.

Ms FARMER: I take that interjection. They are still very confused. This bill is disrespectful to trans and gender nonconforming people, including intersex people, and it erases their existence. There is no third or equal way of saying policeman or policewoman, or fireman or firewoman, or chairman or chairwoman. Trans people across Queensland, like my friend Jo, see bills like this and they know what it really means. This is what Jo says it means to her. It says to her, 'We are not respected. We are not valued. We are less than our fellow Queenslanders.'

There are people like Jo all over Queensland. In fact, a 2016 US study showed that one in every 250 people in the US identify as trans. That means that there are thousands of people like Jo all across Queensland who are seeing this bill tonight and are listening to what we are saying and they are asking,

‘Am I of the same value as every other Queenslander? Am I just as important as every other Queenslander?’ Those people are in Mount Isa, and they are in the electorate of every single person who is supporting this bill tonight. They do not only belong in the inner city, they are not trendy, they are not people who are politically correct; they are just people who deserve the right to be treated respectfully. I want to say to all of those people that on this side of the House we show that respect.

I also want to talk as the Minister for Women. There is no government that has been a greater champion of gender equality than the Palaszczuk Labor government—no government. We have shown that. We have a female Premier, half of our cabinet are women, half of our caucus are women, and we have achieved gender equality on government boards. The reason we have a specific portfolio for women is that we believe gender equality is so important. We are not saying that we want more than men but we just do not want less than men. We want to be absolutely equal.


Despite the great strides that have been made by this government by women and men fighting for gender equality for decades, there remains huge inequalities for women. There are fundamental systemic inequalities—like the gender pay gap, like women retiring on up to 70 per cent less superannuation than men, like women being the ones who most need housing as they reach the later parts of their life, and like women dominating lower paid professions and men dominating higher paid professions.

There is so much evidence around the use of language when it comes to occupations. In fact I read a really interesting study that found that, when ads are gender unbiased or reverse biased, jobs underrepresented by women are more likely to receive applications by women. There are so many studies that show women and men are less inclined to act on job ads that contain phrasing that is biased against their gender. It is a real reason why occupations end up so segregated, because ads effectively filter by gender, which in turn helps sustain the pay gap and the glass ceiling, among other types of gender inequality.

One of the really concerning issues with gender inequality is that it is the fundamental basis of domestic and sexual violence. The national prevention body for violence against women, Our Watch, calls out gender stereotypes of masculinity and femininity as a major driver of violence against women. It finds that challenging gender stereotypes and roles is a tool that helps to prevent violence against women. Gender neutral laws in fact protect everyone.

I was listening to the members who spoke in support of this bill and I heard about some people who got marked down in their university assignments and I heard something about people at sporting clubs. The same couple of examples have been used by all the people who are speaking in support of this bill. I wonder about a parliament that actually uses a couple of anecdotes in order to make a fundamental change in the way people are treated in this society. This could have fundamental impacts on the way that the tens of thousands of people who do not identify in a particular gender are treated. This would undermine every single thing we have achieved in terms of gender equality on the basis of some people who apparently got marked down in their university assignments and some people who may or may not have been able to use facilities at a sporting club.

I just want someone to tell me what it is that people are not able to say right now under our current laws which respect us all? There is no discrimination on the basis of gender. I just do not know what it is that people can or cannot say now with the laws that are currently in place that treat everybody as equal. I invite those people who put this bill up and who support this bill to think of every single person in Queensland who will be impacted by this either directly or indirectly. If they want to change laws that have such a fundamental impact, I ask them to please do so by respectfully showing us the evidence; please do so by respectfully looking at the impact of what they are doing and thinking about that. I ask them to think about equality.

 **Ms TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (6.41 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Anti-Discrimination (Right to Use Gender-Specific Language) Amendment Bill. From the outset I say that I will be joining with my Labor colleagues in opposing this bill. I note the recommendation, the only recommendation, from the parliamentary committee which was that this bill not be passed. I endorse that recommendation as well as much of the commentary and analysis that has been provided by many of the stakeholders in relation to this bill.

This is an old argument, but there is a new group of people who are the target of this old argument. I remember growing up in an Australia where it was okay to call sporting stadiums a derogatory, racially offensive term, and that happened not too long ago. I remember growing up in an Australia where it was okay to refer to women as ‘sheilas’, to refer to immigrants as ‘wogs’ and to use a whole range of other loaded terminology and language in order to separate Australians from each

other, to separate people from each other. Anti-discrimination laws have been introduced in this nation to unite us, not to divide us. This bill currently before the House seeks to continue to divide us and disrespect each other.

I understand that people from the Katter's Australian Party have come to this after having had conversations with people in their community; I do not doubt that for a second. Let me say that in this great nation of ours we have overcome a lot of the fear that has existed in our community and a lot of the fear that has been pitted against each other by interests and by the feelings of hopelessness and powerlessness within our economy and within our communities. We have resisted that in order to unite our state and our nation. It is proposed laws like these that seek to tear that asunder. That is why I am not supporting this bill.

I note that the member for Mansfield has talked extensively about the impacts of discrimination against people from the LGBTIQ community. I note also that there is no doubt that there is continued disrespect and continued otherness that is practised against people who do not identify with any gender, who are non-binary or who are transgender or transsexual. These discriminatory and disrespectful practices are causing serious health concerns in their communities. To see that we need only to look at significant research, both here in Australia and in the United States where there is a much bigger survey sampling.

It is clear from the 2013 Beyond Blue research conducted here in Australia that trans people experience very high levels of mental health problems, particularly depression and anxiety syndromes. At the same time they completed the questionnaire, about 43.7 per cent of the sample were currently experiencing clinically relevant depressive symptoms and almost 30 per cent met the criteria for current major depressive syndrome; 5.4 per cent, for another depressive syndrome; and 18.3 per cent, for panic syndrome and much more. Staggeringly, almost 21 per cent, or one in five participants, reported thoughts of suicidal ideation or self-harm on at least half of the days in the two-week period preceding the survey. If that does not give us cause for concern to pause and think about how we treat each other, I do not know what does.

Yesterday in preparation for this bill and in acknowledgement that we do not have a transgender or non-binary person in this chamber, I put out a call to my community on Facebook asking for their perspectives because I, like others in this place, wanted the voices of those Queenslanders who would be affected by these law changes on the public record, in *Hansard*. I would now like to read some of those comments into the record. Jessie, 24, is non-binary. They said—

It costs nothing—no monetary or moral price—to treat people with respect and allow people to identify however they want to. Allowing people the right to their own gender identity/presentation and to be treated respectfully for it does NOT infringe upon the rights of—

other—

folks, and if you believe that treating a person with respect is an infringement on your rights, maybe you should have a good look at who is really causing the animosity in Australian society.

James, 24, said—

As a non-binary person, I am disappointed that you feel that by removing gendered language from our legislative and judicial systems that that is somehow undermining traditional values. That isn't the intention at all. Nobody is saying that you can't call someone your husband or wife; a girl or a boy. If someone wants to be called those things, then call them that! However, by removing gendered language it allows our legislative and judicial systems to better serve and protect all Australians. Nothing is taking away from the values or rights held by the KAP, their supporters, and those who share their values by the removal of gendered language. I invite you to have an open discussion with—

anyone from my community—

and other diverse Australians about how allowing the legislative and judicial systems to serve and protect us (as they are supposed to do) is a step in the right direction that doesn't impact on the day to day lives of the KAP, their supporters, and those with traditional values.

Emily, 23, said—

As someone who is coming to terms with being gender fluid it's already hard to ask people to use gender neutral language—this is going to make it even harder.


An anonymous contributor said—

There are very few occasions when you should be; intimidated by, concerned with, or interested in, what is under my clothes. It is a matter of respect. I have no interest in holding it against you.

There are so many other contributions, but I want to finish on this point. I think there is a weaponisation of language in our society and it seeks to really target those people who are least able to defend themselves. Currently, I am reading a fantastic book by Shannon Molloy. He is a young man

who grew up in Central Queensland as a gay man. I have to say that some of the stories coming out of his novel about his experience at the age of 14 are pretty distressful and I have had to put down the book on many occasions.

I ask those who have put forward and who support this bill to pick up that book and read it. Just for a day, walk in the shoes of someone who has been a target and who has been under attack for their sexuality, their gender, their identity. After reading that book, see if you can reconcile the impact that we have in terms of positions put like this in this chamber on the lives of ordinary, everyday Queenslanders who deserve, like we all do, to be treated with respect. This proposed legislation is very ill thought out and has the ability to do much damage. That is why I will vote against this bill.

 **Mr ANDREW** (Mirani—PHON) (6.50 pm): I am pleased to speak in support of the Anti-Discrimination (Right to Use Gender-Specific Language) Amendment Bill 2018. I listened to the member for South Brisbane's contribution. I have worked in a lot of different areas—the fishing industry, the mining industry. I have never seen workers in those industries have their integrity questioned about the way they treat people in terms of decency and respect. Those guys are rough and tumble but are always decent. If someone is down, it does not matter where they are from or who they are, they will stand by them. They are the facts.

Political correctness has now become ingrained amongst our elite. Even a global pandemic has not stopped them censoring forms of speech which not so long ago were considered entirely the norm in this country. Just last month, the UN interrupted its busy schedule to push for a radical overthrow of democracy around the globe to lecture the public on the use of gender-neutral language. A helpful list of suggestions was provided by the UN, some of which were baffling to say the least. For example, it suggested replacing the word 'landlord' with 'owner' to which one might ask, 'The owner of what exactly?' 'Businessman' should be replaced with 'representative', despite the fact that the two words mean completely different things. Words like 'boyfriend', 'girlfriend', 'husband' and 'wife' are too gender-specific to be used anymore. Instead, the UN told us the words 'partner' or 'spouse' must replace them. It is complete madness.

There is absolutely nothing offensive or exclusionary about any of these terms and words. To categorise them otherwise goes against the commonsense views of ordinary Australians. Freedom of speech needs as much protection as it can get nowadays. This is what the bill seeks to achieve. To quote the bill's explanatory notes—


... there has been an increase in direct and implied limitations on the use of traditional gender based language ... in government and non-government employment environments as well as educational institutions, the defence force and the provision of public and private facilities and services.

Accordingly, the policy objectives of this bill are twofold: to protect an individual's free speech right to use gender-specific language; and to protect the rights of small business owners from legal attack or commercial disadvantage should they fail to provide services and facilities that imply there are only two genders as opposed to the nearly 60-odd new gender categories we are now told exist.

According to this year's Australia Talks social survey, over two-thirds of Australians believe that political correctness has gone too far and that certain segments are much too easily offended. This disapproval of political correctness is a majority view across age groups and income groups as well as the states and territories. The survey also highlighted the fact that the older you are, the poorer you are and the less educated, the more strongly you felt on this issue. Even amongst immigrants, the majority view was against political correctness. For recent immigrants it was 55 per cent against; for immigrants who had been here for 10 years or more it actually jumped to 70 per cent. The survey does not identify the rural or regional vote, but UN lectures on 'safe space' language do not go too well where I come from. Why? It is because we do treat people with respect. Members may think there is difference, but we really do. To quote my fellow Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee member and deputy chair James Lister, there is a 'pervasive scorn for this creeping use of gender-specific language and political correctness'.

Mr Rob Katter, state leader of the Katter party and sponsor of this bill, has made it clear that the amendments are not intended to stop anyone from using gender-neutral language if they choose to, nor does the bill seek to condone the use of gender-specific language in a discriminatory or harassing way. The amendments purely seek to support the multitude of ordinary Queenslanders who feel deeply alienated about the new 'woke' or 'safe space' culture and to support their right to use speech norms they grew up using and are comfortable with. They are people from all races, classes and creeds who are much more worried about paying their rent, keeping their jobs and saving their businesses than

what is currently an acceptable word to use for any given situation. It is these people that the bill will hopefully shield from the contemporary call-out and punish culture of our entitled elites in the government and government protected institutions.

 **Ms BOYD** (Pine Rivers—ALP) (6.55 pm): I rise tonight to oppose the private member's bill. In doing so, it is remarkable that I follow on from the contribution from the sole One Nation member in this place who claims that One Nation treats all people with respect.

Mr Harper: Except for those non-English-speaking ones.

Ms BOYD: I take the interjection from the member for Thuringowa. Certainly, after decades on the public record, we have not seen that from One Nation.

It is rare that a bill introduced in this parliament makes me feel physically sick, but I feel sick about this private member's bill from the leader of the Katter party. I find it offensive in absolutely every way. It is divisive and it is repugnant. In modern, vibrant, tolerant communities like ours, it has no place. From the outset I put on the record, in particular to all of those gender-diverse or gender-questioning folks in our community, that the socially constructed and hierarchical categories assigned to individuals on the basis of their apparent sex at birth do not define them. Many people in our communities do not fit into these narrowly defined and rigid gender norms. We know that some people may not feel either masculinity or femininity or may reject gender all together. I want to live in a world that is more diverse, more welcoming and more tolerant and does not confine people through gender norms. People are not contained by social constructs around how they should dress or what role they should play in society. You do not have to conform to rigid gender roles—masculine, feminine or neither. Just be true to you.

There is a fundamental insecurity that lies at the heart of the vehement position of gender-binary language, and that is power—the power relationships between men and women and the loss of perceived power that leaves people feeling threatened and intimidated. We know that when people do not adhere to the norms associated with their gender it can and does result in ridicule, intimidation and even, tragically, violence.

This private member's bill is fundamentally flawed. It seeks to protect gender-specific language as if it were an attribute for the purposes of the Anti-Discrimination Act. It is not. There is no right to use gender-specific language under the various international human rights instruments. This Katter bill seeks to include an entity or business for protections from discrimination. It cannot; it is for individuals. This Katter bill would enshrine the right of a person to deliberately and persistently misgender a person.

Mr Power: Maliciously.

Ms BOYD: I take that interjection from the member for Logan—deliberately and persistently. Misgendering is not okay. It certainly should not have protections under the Anti-Discrimination Act. This bill is harmful, this bill is dangerous and this bill is not tolerant. This bill has no place in a tolerant and accepting community like ours.


The leader of the Katter party wants this brought to a head. He wants it discussed and debated, but for what purpose but to be divisive? What impact does having a gender on your licence make? What impact does having a gender on your birth certificate make? What impact does having a unisex toilet rather than gendered toilets make? What impact does girls wearing shorts and pants as part of their school uniform make so they can fully participate at school?

These are the examples that the Katter party has listed as problematic, as offensive and as a need to protect discriminatory behaviour. This bill only speaks to the threat of privilege and power and is not only fundamentally flawed; it is just plain wrong. Not everyone conforms with mainstream heterosexual culture. That is okay. Those people should be embraced and celebrated and encouraged and loved. The member for Traeger appeals for tolerance, but the only tolerance he is appealing for is the tolerance for the ability to be intolerant. I will not be supporting this bill.

Debate, on motion of Ms Boyd, adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

Gold Coast Convention and Exhibition Centre, Expansion

 **Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (7.00 pm): I was shocked and disappointed to read that the Palaszczuk Labor government had looked a gift horse in the mouth and rejected it by walking from a golden opportunity to expand the Gold Coast convention centre, create jobs for Gold Coasters and support the struggling Gold Coast tourism industry post the corona health crisis when we enter our


serious economic crisis. The Star Casino offered a \$100 million expansion of the Gold Coast convention centre in return for a fixed period of single-operator status on the Gold Coast. The single-operator status was the same protection given to Jupiters Casino when it first opened, as was the Brisbane Treasury Casino when it first opened when Terry Mackenroth was in charge. Just recently, the Palaszczuk government has given Queen's Wharf Casino single-operator protection status and yet it has refused to do so for the Gold Coast Star Casino.

It is not as if there is a queue of potential investors lining up to put forward a proposal for the Labor government's phoney global tourism hub polly speak gobbledegook with no known location, no known proponent and no known concept plans. The Star's proposal for a concrete \$100 million investment in public infrastructure in return for a maybe 20-year exclusivity on the Gold Coast casino operation seemed like a rolled-gold no-brainer of a deal to me when the alternative from the Palaszczuk Labor government is nothing, diddly squat, crickets for the Gold Coast. The tourism industry has been the most savagely affected on the Gold Coast, and an opportunity to get a \$100 million injection from the private sector into tourism infrastructure such as the convention centre should not be ignored.

We on the Gold Coast want, need and deserve a clear and reasoned answer from the Palaszczuk Labor government as to why it walked away from what seems a legitimate and positive offer from a major respected tourism operator already on the Gold Coast. We are all aware how important the convention industry is for tourism on the Gold Coast, and the fact that it brings high-spending tourists into the Queensland economy is reason alone for the Palaszczuk Labor government to get on with the job of expanding our convention centre. The added bonus of not having to pay for it and blowing out the Labor government's debt for Queenslanders of \$100 billion even further should have been the motivation needed to grab that gift horse with both hands and ride it all the way to the finish line.

The economic fallout from the worldwide corona health crisis is really yet to be felt in Australia, with the Morrison federal government propping up businesses and employment through JobKeeper and JobSeeker payments—and that at some stage will have to stop. That is when tourism operators on the Gold Coast will really feel the pinch and projects like the extension of the Gold Coast convention centre will be an absolute necessity to help the tourism industry in unheard of dire financial times.

Bancroft Electorate, Unite and Recover Community Stimulus Program

 **Mr WHITING** (Bancroft—ALP) (7.03 pm): It is a great pleasure to follow the member for Mermaid Beach. He is talking about potential projects in his area. I direct him to the very successful Works for Queensland program brought in by the Palaszczuk government. We would be pleased to help him with his application because it is a great program and we can walk him through the process. I am pleased to report that the Unite and Recover plan is already delivering results in the Bancroft electorate. I recently joined with the Minister for Local Government, Mayor Peter Flannery and Councillor Mark Booth to announce new local projects funded by the Unite and Recover Community Stimulus Program.

These local job-generating projects are projects like those in Burpengary East and the Buckley Road footpath. That is a great connector for our area. A lot of kids go up and down that road. This makes it safer for them. There is then the Uhlmann Road boat ramp amenities block, consisting of joint funding. We recently built the pontoon at this boat ramp. It is a great local facility that enhances lifestyle, and we widened that boat ramp with local company Mobile Conveying Services to once again enhance lifestyle. In North Lakes we are putting money towards building a new playground at Endeavour Boulevard. There is no play equipment in this area and it is surrounded by new townhouses. Announcements about Deception Bay are also on the way. The council is fast-tracking essential infrastructure that is important in people's day-to-day lives because of what we are contributing as the Palaszczuk government. We are helping council get communities back on their feet as soon as possible.

Our Unite and Recover investments in local communities show that the Palaszczuk government has confidence in our communities and that we are investing in our communities and we are investing in jobs for Queenslanders. This is in stark contrast, unfortunately, to what the LNP is offering local people in Bancroft. Firstly, the LNP is offering nothing to my community. We are 12 weeks away from the opening of voting and not one local policy has been announced in my electorate, and it does not even yet have a local candidate in the area. This says to our community that it has given up on our community. What is more, many of its policies can be knocked down with just two minutes research. Today the member for Everton called Cross River Rail a waste of taxpayers' money and I find that amazing, because for commuters in Bancroft Cross River Rail means 1½ hours less commuting by train each day to the city and back. It also means an extra 5,400 peak-hour seats for Moreton Bay residents. It is only the Labor government that is delivering for the people of Bancroft.

Pumicestone Electorate, Road Funding



Mrs WILSON (Pumicestone—LNP) (7.06 pm): It is good to be back in the chamber with a new hip and a new lease on life. I want to thank my team back in Pumicestone—Sally and Paris—and my parliamentary colleagues for their support whilst I underwent and recovered from my recent surgery.

Over the past few years I have delivered many speeches in this House on the condition of Bribie Island Road and the urgent need for upgrades, and none is more urgent than the notoriously dangerous intersection of Bribie Island Road and Old Toorbul Point Road. Recently the Minister for Transport and Main Roads was in the electorate, unbeknown to me, announcing a major upgrade to this intersection, saying that works would commence soon. We are an optimistic bunch in Pumicestone and we know that this is good news for my community, but suffice it to say that when the minister's recent glossy announcement is stripped back what we see is nothing more than a cheap political stunt.

Firstly, every resident in Pumicestone is asking why it has taken so long for this intersection upgrade to happen. They know that there is \$20 million of federal funding for the upgrade that has been sitting idle in Canberra since it was announced in July 2018, and they know that the minister delayed submitting the project proposal for these funds to be released despite my continual lobbying of him to get cracking. They also know that the \$10.4 million of state government funding that the minister recently announced has been allocated in the state budget papers since 2017-18. The minister saw fit to again announce this funding four months out from a state election. It was first announced in 2017 by the minister standing alongside the former Labor member Rick Williams, and here is a glossy pic of the little folly. I table this picture for the benefit of the House.

Tabled paper. Photograph depicting the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, Hon. Mark Bailey, the former member for Pumicestone, Mr Rick Williams, and others [\[1157\]](#).

'A dangerous intersection is going to be fixed,' they announced back in 2017. Fast-forward to May 2020, three years later, and the minister this time is standing beside Ali King, Labor's failed candidate for Maiwar who has been flown in as their candidate for Pumicestone, making the same announcement—'A dangerous intersection is going to be fixed,' they announced. A Pumicestone local of 35 years, Matt Owen recently wrote an article in a local paper, the *Local Island and Surrounds*, about the minister's announcement where he said—

The community deserves a real answer, an answer with substance and transparency, with details, with honesty and with accountability.

How can the Minister come to the same place 3 years later and pose for the same photo, sprouting the same funding—what happened to the original funding?

This is what we want to know and I hope that we get the answers before October, because my community deserves some honesty from this government.

Care Bag Appeal; Child Protection




Mr KING (Kurwongbah—ALP) (7.09 pm): I rise tonight for a wonderful and worthy cause: the Care Bag Appeal by community organisation Sweet Dreams and Goodnight Wishes. For those who do not know, care bags are put together for children entering foster care who sadly sometimes leave home with nothing but the clothes on their backs. These care bags include a set of clothes, pyjamas, underwear and socks, toothbrush, a hair brush, backpack and a comfort item such as a stuffed toy, colouring-in materials or a book. Judging by the bags dropped off to my office so far, they often contain optional extras like hats, water bottles or sleeping bags. Care bags contain only new items for health reasons, particularly during this COVID-19 pandemic. I sincerely thank all those kind-hearted people who have gone above and beyond in purchasing these items for vulnerable children in need, and thanks to Sweet Dreams and Goodnight Wishes for the work they do on this appeal all year round.

This is the second year my office has been a drop-off point for care bags. Last year we collected 84 bags. This year COVID-19 has made things tougher and budgets are tighter, but I am proud to say we have collected nearly 50 bags with a special effort from Peace of Mind Kindergarten which delivered 28 bags the other day—thanks! The final day for drop-off is this Friday. If you can afford to donate please do it this week. It is so important we provide support for our foster-care system as a community and as a government. We are recruiting for foster carers right now, and I echo the call from my colleague the Minister for Child Safety for those Queenslanders with extraordinary hearts to please put their hands up. Thank you to all those unsung heroes out there who have given the ultimate gift by becoming foster carers.

I also want to thank the minister for her own extraordinary work. With around 10,000 children in need of out-of-home care and just over half that number of foster-care families, it is a tough job, which is why I was astounded last sitting week when opposition members came in here thinking they had all the answers. This is the same party that cut funding to the department of child safety when it was in government, the same party that stood by while staffing levels dropped and case loads did the opposite. Those opposite do not have all the answers. None of us do when it comes to child safety.

As long as there is domestic and family violence, as long as there are drugs and alcohol, as long as mental health problems exist there will always be challenges around protecting every vulnerable child. What we can do, and what I know our government will continue to do every day, is to work our hardest to try first and foremost to work with parents to help them make the best choices for children. Where they cannot or will not, we will fund, recruit and train the best support networks possible, from child safety workers to foster carers, for those children who, through no fault of their own, can no longer live with mum and dad.

Bundaberg Electorate, Hooning


 **Mr BATT** (Bundaberg—LNP) (7.12 pm): We must put the brakes on hooning. It is a major issue within my community of Bundaberg and over recent months the problem has escalated dramatically, keeping countless residents awake at all hours of the night. With the easing of COVID-19 restrictions I have recommenced my mobile offices. Over the last three weeks I have spoken to dozens of Bundy residents at Avoca, at the Shalom Sunday Markets, Centenary Park and Lions Memorial Park who have told me they are at their wit's end with hooning taking over our streets. One resident even told me she constantly worries a car is going to come crashing through her bedroom window in the middle of the night. Hooning is not a game; hooning is selfish and extremely dangerous.

Just last week there was a terrible fatal accident on one of Bundy's main thoroughfares. A visiting 63-year-old Sunshine Coast man was walking on the footpath along Bourbong Street when a stolen vehicle driving erratically and at high speed allegedly lost control, mounted the kerb and tragically hit him, causing injuries which made him lose his life. This devastating, tragic and heartbreaking incident truly shows that speeding and dangerous driving kills. Unfortunately, hooning is an increasing problem that cannot be eradicated quickly, but there are things we can do to help reduce it.

As Bundy's state MP I regularly meet with local police to discuss issues within our community and I know hooning is a major focus for them. Our local officers want to increase patrols in hotspot areas but they cannot be everywhere at once. As a former police officer of 23 years, I know how helpful specific information is, and that is why I always encourage residents to try to record vehicle registration details when they can. I know this can be very difficult, especially in the dark of night, but this information makes a world of difference. I also encourage residents to keep a record of any patterns of specific days and times of the week when hooning occurs in their area and share those details with police by calling 13HOON or completing the online form. That way our police can target certain locations at certain times. In the long term though, more needs to be done.

Bundy needs more CCTV cameras and we need tougher penalties. Earlier this month we announced our LNP plan to take back our streets. A future LNP government will invest in covert CCTV cameras which provide a direct feed to police stations and officer iPads across the state. We will fund the rollout of antiskid road treatments which literally shred the tyres of dangerous drivers but cause no damage to those driving appropriately. We will introduce a new offence that will apply to members of established hoon gangs, imposing an additional three-year driving ban on hoons whose cars are impounded, immobilised or confiscated, rising to five years for repeat offenders. I know how much hooning is impacting my community, and as Bundy's voice in this place I will continue doing all I can to help reduce it.


North West Freeway Proposal

 **Hon. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy) (7.15 pm): Tonight I will address the North West Freeway proposal, the Trouts Road corridor, from Carseldine to Shand Street and to South Pine Road. First envisioned in the 1960s, it again rears its ugly head under a joint study by the LNP federal government and the Brisbane City Council. It is interesting that the corridor is owned in independent sections by the Brisbane City Council and the state government. This is important, as the only block to a tollway is the state Labor government. Yes, if the LNP ever were to achieve power at the local, state and federal levels this would be a green light to this freeway proposal.

As I have said, the LNP study is underway, but options will not be finalised until late 2020. That is right: after the state election. This means the LNP freeway decision will only be made public after the state election. This means that the member for Everton and the candidate for Aspley can duck and weave all the way to the state election. We will see their true plans only after we have voted. What do the communities of Stafford, Aspley and Everton think of increased noise, congestion and pollution? They hate it. BrizCommuter says 'a freeway along this corridor is poor value for money as there is nowhere for cars to go once they hit Samford Road.'

The only block to this freeway is a state Labor government. I have continually stated that I will never let our community be destroyed by such a motorway. I have been criticised by the LNP Brisbane City Council for this stance many times. This is yesterday's solution for future traffic chaos in Stafford, Everton and Aspley. We need infrastructure for recovery, infrastructure that is fit for purpose, appropriate and wanted. Any money here could be spent on real recovery from COVID-19. We have already seen \$10 million wasted on a study on a motorway that no-one in my area wants. I am just frightened that there is more to follow, more wastage of money on this proposal by an LNP government. As I said before, with the tenures in place, the only block to this proposal is a state Labor government with the strong member for Aspley and myself blocking this ridiculous proposal.

Members of Parliament, Representation


 **Mr DAMETTO** (Hinchinbrook—KAP) (7.18 pm): I rise to speak on an important issue that affects us all in this chamber: why are we here? As I look around this place I see all walks of life: doctors, lawyers, union officials, small business owners, miners, railway workers and even ex-military staff. I do not intend to pass judgement on anyone here, but we have come to a point where there is a sadness in Queensland politics and what it has become. The divide grows between the south-east corner and the regions and I feel that the major parties are more concerned with bickering than delivering. We have a government and departments paralysed by green bureaucracy, so out of touch with regional Queensland that it has caused a level of dissatisfaction within the Labor Party in the regions I have never seen before. Why is every project wrapped in what I call white collar welfare? Millions of dollars are being burnt or wasted on business cases and economic impact studies before a cent is even delivered.

Unfortunately, we have an opposition, or a so-called alternative government, that is more concerned with attacking the crossbench out in the field than working hard on one day becoming government. Bill after bill, the Katter's Australian Party has backed good legislation from both sides of the House. We have tried to show both sides of the House that that is the kind of representation that Queenslanders expect.

The KAP continues to grow our footprint in North Queensland because of our hard work and honesty. We do what we say and we say what we do. It comes back to one thing: common sense. We listen to people in the community, we know what they want and then we work towards a positive outcome. In this House we have put forward bills that stood up for our farmers on Labor's vegetation management laws and reef legislation. We have fought hard for the rights of the most vulnerable groups in our communities. We have fought for the vision-impaired. We have worked towards introducing a bill to apply pressure to force government change.

The KAP has a clear message to deliver for regional Queensland: we are not going anywhere. The regions are sick of the antics of the major parties, which forget about us—unless it is election time, of course. The KAP will continue to be a voice for forgotten Queenslanders. By taking for granted and disregarding the KAP, they disregard the people in regional areas. Our great state is only as strong as the people who lead it and we should never forget why we were elected in the first place. Queenslanders are looking for leaders to build our regions. Together this Legislative Assembly can achieve great things for Queenslanders and unlock the full potential of Queensland. The KAP has always stood willing and ready to do that. I ask the question: who will join us?

Redlands Electorate

 **Ms RICHARDS** (Redlands—ALP) (7.21 pm): Queensland continues to lead the way in uniting and recovering from the challenges that the COVID-19 global pandemic has presented. Our economic recovery plan continues full steam ahead, supporting local businesses, delivering new infrastructure and creating jobs. After the last sitting it was wonderful to have the Deputy Premier join the member for Capalaba and me to announce a new \$50 million much needed Redland Hospital carpark. I am pleased to say that tenders have already been sought. Last week it was also wonderful to meet with Dr Lucy

Ooi and her ophthalmology team. The hospital will provide a new service to treat Redlands patients closer to home. That is a fantastic new service for our community. In stark contrast to those opposite who closed beds and sacked frontline staff, we will continue to invest in our Redland Hospital.


At Victoria Point High School, the \$2 million hall expansion project is currently under construction. That will be fantastic for both the school and our local community. It builds on the great work completed last year with our \$1 million new resource centre upgrade. Design works are well underway on the Redlands District Special School's \$9 million new learning precinct and the Thornlands State School's \$250,000 administration refurbishment. Importantly, design and tendering works are underway on the hard-fought-for air conditioning of all our Redland schools.

Works have kicked off on Cleveland-Redland Bay Road, starting at Boundary Road and currently working up to Magnolia Parade. That work will continue with the long-awaited Anita Street upgrade, which will see dual laning commence and move north as part of our \$60 million stage 1 works. That includes \$15 million under the COVID investment program. I have received a project update for the \$34 million worth of new ferry terminals that will be delivered concurrently for our southern Moreton Bay islands. Construction documentation is being finalised and tenders are expected to be called at the end of August. It is all happening in the Redlands at the moment. Those projects will transform our islands, the arrival experience and the movement experience for locals and visitors.

Our government will always invest in skills and jobs creation. I am so proud to be part of the Palaszczuk government. Our government has reinstated the Skilling Queenslanders for Works program, which was cut by the Newman LNP government. In just on two years we have seen an investment of over \$1.5 million in programs in the Redlands, delivering new and improved community assets and, at the same time, providing skills, training and employment pathways for our community.

Last week it was fantastic to have Minister Fentiman visit Redlands. She was able to check out the Redlands Rugby League Football Club, which is looking fantastic under the Skilling Queenslanders for Works upgrade. The clubhouse looks terrific. It has been a catalyst for the local community to get in and back the rugby club. They have just completed the new Parrots Perch Hill Bar, which looks fantastic. The club is looking topnotch. The minister and I also had the chance to visit Jeff and Darlene from Salads Made Fresh. During COVID, our adaptation grants have been fantastic for the Redlands. The government has provided \$22.6 million in QRIDA small business loans and over \$220,000 in small business grants for the Redlands. As I said, we are delivering in spades. I will keep working hard for my community. The Redlands is going great guns.

Theodore Electorate, Road Infrastructure

 **Mr BOOTHMAN** (Theodore—LNP) (7.24 pm): I rise to speak about an issue that is certainly front and centre for my constituents: exit 57. Recently, a television crew came to do a story about the exit. They were certainly astonished at the number of vehicles doing U-turns in a local pub car park, all because the department removed the right-hand-turn lane from old Pacific Highway coming from Bunnings. The reporter asked, 'Does this happen all day?' I said, 'Yes, it happens all day, every day.' Every 15 seconds a car did a U-turn through the car park. When the member for Broadwater was travelling to attend the press conference, he was delayed in traffic on Hope Island Road. Every single day Hope Island Road carries extensive traffic caused by a lack of foresight or vision to build a proper intersection. The residents use alternative roads such as Michigan Drive that are not designed to take such volumes of traffic. Residents continuously complain to me about the increased traffic on local thoroughfares.

We have to take into consideration the massive amount of development in my local area. The Queensland government Statistician's Office estimates a population increase of around 15,000 people moving into the area around exit 57 by 2031. I will break that down. We will have an extra 5,000 people around Hope Island, 1,700 people around Oxford—which does not include the redevelopment of the acreage lots—4,000 people around Helensvale and, according to the data, around 7,000 people in the Upper Coomera area.

Residents are desperately looking for a permanent solution that has some vision. The member for Broadwater and I have set up a petition to highlight this problem. We need a long-term solution that allows free-flowing traffic, instead of short-term and short-sighted bandaid fixes. Residents are frustrated that the government continues to react, rather than being proactive. We need to invest in infrastructure that has the capacity to take on population growth. A solution must include bypasses and flyovers that allow for the continuing movement of traffic, avoiding queues at traffic signals. Most importantly, residents continuously tell me that we need to plan for the future and build capacity in our roads to take into account the increasing population in our local area.

Algester Electorate, Jobs and Infrastructure



Hon. LM ENOCH (Algester—ALP) (Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef, Minister for Science and Minister for the Arts) (7.27 pm): As the Palaszczuk government implements our plan for economic recovery, we are completely focused on jobs for Queenslanders. With job-creating infrastructure projects rolling out across the state, our commitment to unite and recover for Queensland jobs is clear. My electorate of Algester is fortunate enough to welcome some of those great infrastructure projects, from the \$30 million upgrade to Beaudesert Road, Algester Road and Illaweena Street, to the \$11.8 million three-storey learning centre at Pallara State School. Those are the projects that will create local jobs, while also delivering real benefits for our community.

The Beaudesert Road, Algester Road and Illaweena Street upgrade will see a much needed solution to a very busy and critical intersection. The proposal looks to include widening the Beaudesert Road intersection approaches from four to six lanes, signalling slip lanes and improving pedestrian and bike-riding facilities. Together with the new three-storey teaching facility at Pallara State School, more than 60 jobs will be supported. The Pallara State School building will also support more than 21,000 hours of trainee and apprentice employment, further supporting local apprentices to achieve their qualifications.

In addition to classrooms at Pallara State School, another great Algester electorate school, the Calamvale Community College, started the year with six new classrooms and an \$80,000 refurbishment of the prep learning spaces, supporting local jobs and helping cater for their growing number of students. That is on top of all classrooms, libraries and staffrooms in state schools across the Algester electorate receiving air conditioning, which is a program of work that has supported dozens of jobs in our region. As a former teacher I believe in the power of education. A world-class teaching environment is critical to support a child's learning.

However, the infrastructure investment in Algester does not stop there. At a time when job creation is critical, we are also generating further employment with the Greenbank RSL park-and-ride upgrade, which will see 600 additional parking spaces, more bus bays and a service-road link. The Greenbank RSL park-and-ride will generate 50 local jobs, with early works being undertaken by local company Logan City Demolitions, which is based in Browns Plains. Last week I was fortunate enough to meet with the owner and director of Logan City Demolitions, a fine young woman named Jennifer, who has lived in the area since she was a young child. Winning a contract for a local project like that is significant for her company. It shows how government investment can directly support local small businesses and their communities.

It has been fantastic to meet with the locals who are doing this work and to hear firsthand about how local infrastructure projects will support their businesses and the future of Queensland. With millions of dollars being invested in local projects, our government is supporting tradies, apprentices and small businesses as we unite and recover right across Queensland, including in my own electorate of Algester.

The House adjourned at 7.30 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Andrew, Bailey, Bates, Batt, Bennett, Berkman, Bleijie, Bolton, Boothman, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Costigan, Crandon, Crawford, Crisafulli, D'Ath, Dametto, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Frecklington, Furner, Gerber, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hart, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Hunt, Janetzki, Jones, Katter, Kelly, King, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Linard, Lister, Lui, Lynham, Madden, Mander, McArdle, McCallum, McDonald, McMahon, McMillan, Mickelberg, Miles, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Mullen, Nicholls, O'Connor, O'Rourke B, O'Rourke C, Palaszczuk, Pease, Perrett, Pitt, Powell, Power, Pugh, Purdie, Richards, Robinson, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Trad, Watts, Weir, Whiting, Wilson