



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, 11 August 2020

Subject	Page
ASSENT TO BILLS	1821
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 23 July 2020, from His Excellency the Governor, to the Speaker advising of assent to certain bills on 21 July 2020.....	1821
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 23 July 2020, from His Excellency the Governor, to the Speaker advising of assent to certain bills on 23 July 2020.....	1822
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	1822
Griffith, Sir S.....	1822
PRIVILEGE	1822
Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House	1822
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Bundle of correspondence relating to the allegation by the Leader of the Opposition, Mrs Deb Frecklington MP, of a contempt of parliament by the member for South Brisbane, Ms Jackie Trad MP.....	1823
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	1823
Electorate Offices, Telephone System Upgrade	1823
PETITIONS	1823
TABLED PAPERS	1825
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	1828
Coronavirus, Update	1828
Coronavirus, Economic Update	1828
Coronavirus, Health Update	1829
Coronavirus, Economic Update	1830
School Infrastructure	1831
Unite and Recover Community Stimulus Package	1831
Cross River Rail	1832
Cross River Rail	1833
Electricity Prices	1834

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 11 August 2020

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL; BIODISCOVERY AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	1834
Cognate Debate	1834
QUEENSLAND FUTURE FUND BILL; ROYALTY LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	1834
Cognate Debate	1834
PERSONAL EXPLANATION	1835
Comments by Member for Everton, Correction and Apology	1835
ETHICS COMMITTEE	1835
Reports	1835
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Ethics Committee: Report No. 200, 56th Parliament—Matter of privilege referred by the Speaker on 12 February 2019 relating to alleged contempt by a Member.	1835
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Ethics Committee: Report No. 201, 56th Parliament—Matter of privilege referred by the Registrar on 23 October 2019 relating to an alleged failure to register an interest in the Register of Members' Interests.	1835
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Ethics Committee: Report No. 202, 56th Parliament—Matter of Privilege referred by the Registrar on 25 February 2020 relating to an alleged failure to register an interest in the Register of Members' Interests.	1835
LEGAL AFFAIRS AND COMMUNITY SAFETY COMMITTEE	1835
Information Commissioner Report	1835
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Information Commissioner Report 2: 2020-21—Disclosure logs—Queensland government departments.	1835
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	1835
Cross River Rail	1836
Cross River Rail	1837
Electricity Prices	1837
Cross River Rail	1838
Gold Coast, Transport Infrastructure	1839
Cross River Rail	1840
Coronavirus, Health Response	1840
<i>Tabled paper:</i> LNP online petition page, titled 'Open Qld's Borders'	1841
Cross River Rail	1841
Coronavirus, Economic Response	1842
Coronavirus, Diplomatic Exemption from Restrictions	1842
Tourism Industry	1843
Cross River Rail	1844
School Infrastructure	1844
Coronavirus, Diplomatic Exemption from Restrictions	1845
Electricity Prices	1845
CopperString 2.0	1846
Works for Queensland	1846
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Extracts, undated, from the Facebook page of the member for Ninderry, Mr Dan Purdie MP, regarding sporting grants in his electorate [1309].	1846
Coronavirus, Queensland Border Checks	1847
Logan and Gold Coast, Road and Transport Infrastructure	1847
MOTION	1848
Business Program	1848
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to.	1853
Resolved in the affirmative.	1853
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL; BIODISCOVERY AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	1853
Second Reading (Cognate Debate)	1853
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Natural Resources, Agricultural Industry Development and Environment Committee: Report No. 6, 56th Parliament—Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020, government response.	1853
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020, erratum to explanatory notes.	1854
MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST	1866
Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance	1866
Liberal National Party, Performance	1868
Queensland Economy; Ethics Committee Report, Apology	1869
Electricity Prices	1870
Coronavirus, Queensland Border Checks; Aged Care	1871
Coronavirus, Queensland Border Checks	1872
Bruce Highway	1872
Aspley Electorate, Infrastructure	1873
Rural Finance; Charters Towers, Dialysis; Water Infrastructure	1874
Gold Coast, Transport Upgrades	1875
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from the <i>Gold Coast Bulletin</i> , dated 7 December 2017, titled 'Scanlon: Labor are "crystal clear" on M1'	1876
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL; BIODISCOVERY AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	1877
Second Reading (Cognate Debate)	1877
Division: Question put—That the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill be now read a second time.	1893
Resolved in the affirmative.	1893

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 11 August 2020

Consideration in Detail	1893
Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill	1893
Clauses 1 to 60, as read, agreed to.	1893
Clause 61—.....	1893
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020, explanatory notes to Hon. Leeanne Enoch's amendments.....	1894
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020, statement of compatibility with human rights contained in Hon. Leeanne Enoch's amendments.....	1894
Amendments agreed to.	1894
Insertion of new clauses—.....	1895
Amendment agreed to.	1895
Clauses 61 to 118 and schedule, as amended, agreed to.	1896
Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill.....	1896
Clauses 1 to 39 and schedule, as read, agreed to.	1896
Third Reading (Cognate Debate).....	1896
Division: Question put—That the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, as amended, be now read a third time.	1896
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1896
Long Title (Cognate Debate).....	1896
Amendment agreed to.	1896
MOTION	1897
Member for Everton, Finding of Contempt.....	1897
FOREST WIND FARM DEVELOPMENT BILL	1899
Second Reading	1899
<i>Tabled paper:</i> State Development, Tourism, Innovation and Manufacturing Committee: Report No. 1, 56th Parliament—Forest Wind Farm Development Bill 2020, government response.	1899
CORRECTIVE SERVICES (COVID-19 EMERGENCY RESPONSE) REGULATION.....	1905
Disallowance of Statutory Instrument	1905
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to.	1915
Resolved in the negative.	1915
ANTI-DISCRIMINATION (RIGHT TO USE GENDER-SPECIFIC LANGUAGE) AMENDMENT BILL	1915
Second reading	1915
Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a second time.	1919
Resolved in the negative under standing order 106(10).	1919
ADJOURNMENT	1919
Inala Electorate; Correction to <i>Record of Proceedings</i>.....	1919
Southern Downs Electorate, Queensland Border Closure	1920
Bulimba Electorate, School Infrastructure; Correction to <i>Record of Proceedings</i>, Apology.....	1921
State Election	1921
Economou, Mr A; Commonwealth Bank of Australia	1922
Coomera Electorate, State Election	1922
Algester Electorate, Coronavirus Response	1923
Queensland Greens, State Election	1924
Coronavirus, Small Business	1924
Coronavirus, Queensland Border Closure	1925
ATTENDANCE	1926

TUESDAY, 11 AUGUST 2020



The Legislative Assembly met at 9.30 am.

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

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I respectfully acknowledge that we are sitting today on the land of Aboriginal people and pay my respects to elders past and present. I thank them, as First Australians, for their careful custodianship of the land over countless generations. We are very fortunate in this country to have two of the world's oldest continuing living cultures in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples whose lands, winds and waters we all now share.

ASSENT TO BILLS



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have to report that I have received from His Excellency the Governor 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: 21 July 2020

A Bill for an Act to amend the Gaming Machine Act 1991, the Keno Act 1996, the Liquor Act 1992, the Photo Identification Card Act 2008, the Summary Offences Act 2005, the Tobacco and Other Smoking Products Act 1998, the Transport Infrastructure Act 1994, the Transport Legislation (Road Safety and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2019, the Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act 1994, the Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995, the Transport Planning and Coordination Act 1994 and the Wine Industry Act 1994 for particular purposes

A Bill for an Act to amend the Rail Safety National Law (Queensland) Act 2017, the State Penalties Enforcement Regulation 2014, the Traffic Regulation 1962 and the Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995 for particular purposes

A Bill for an Act to amend the Corrective Services Act 2006, the Criminal Code, the Criminal Law Amendment Act 1945, the Hospital and Health Boards Act 2011, the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992, the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004, the Public Health Act 2005, the Racing Integrity Act 2016, the Racing Integrity Regulation 2016, the Summary Offences Act 2005, the Weapons Act 1990, the Weapons Categories Regulation 1997 and the Weapons Regulation 2016 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

23 July 2020

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 23 July 2020, from His Excellency the Governor, to the Speaker advising of assent to certain bills on 21 July 2020 [[1278](#)].

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: 23 July 2020

A Bill for an Act to amend the Architects Act 2002, the Building Act 1975, the Building Industry Fairness (Security of Payment) Act 2017, the Professional Engineers Act 2002, the Queensland Building and Construction Commission Act 1991, the Retirement Villages Act 1999 and the Acts mentioned in schedule 1 for particular purposes, and to repeal the Retirement Villages (Transitional) Regulation 2019

A Bill for an Act to amend the Ministerial and Other Office Holder Staff Act 2010, the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001, the Parliamentary Service Act 1988 and the Queensland Independent Remuneration Tribunal Act 2013 for particular purposes

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

Yours sincerely


Governor

23 July 2020

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 23 July 2020, from His Excellency the Governor, to the Speaker advising of assent to certain bills on 23 July 2020 [[1279](#)].

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT


Griffith, Sir S

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, 9 August marked the 100th anniversary of the passing of Sir Samuel Griffith, former premier of Queensland. Sir Samuel Griffith was also a distinguished jurist as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Queensland and the first Chief Justice of the High Court of Australia. For his time, Sir Samuel Griffith took significant steps to effect social progress in Queensland. As Premier of Queensland—1883 to 1888 and 1890 to 1893—and a minister for several significant portfolios, there is no doubt Sir Samuel Griffith reshaped the Queensland political landscape and there is no doubt that Sir Samuel Griffith had his supporters and detractors. His legacy is still debated today.

To mark this anniversary, the official parliamentary portrait of Sir Samuel Griffith will be displayed from this week in the level 3 Annex foyer along with artefacts relating to his legislative achievements. Artefacts will include his handwritten bill drafts, photos and political cartoons which will provide some insight into this remarkable Queenslander and his long and distinguished career. The Queensland parliament will also conduct a joint historical seminar with the Royal Historical Society of Queensland. Originally planned for this August, it will now be held early next year and include presentations by professional historians exploring Sir Samuel Griffith's extensive, and often contentious, parliamentary contribution. I encourage all members to visit this display and reflect on Sir Samuel Griffith's contribution to Queensland political history.

PRIVILEGE

Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, on 24 June 2020 the Leader of the Opposition wrote to me alleging that the member for South Brisbane deliberately misled the House on 18 June 2020. The matter relates to a statement made by the member for South Brisbane during debate on the Electoral and Other Legislation (Accountability, Integrity and Other Matters) Amendment Bill with respect to the purchase of a property at Woolloongabba. The member stated—

I was six weeks late in formally finalising the declaration of this property but had provided information verbally and in written form to the Clerk, but I had not signed form 3. This was a six-week lag.

In her letter to me, the Leader of the Opposition contended that this statement was misleading because it contradicted earlier statements by the member for South Brisbane that she was first informed of the property purchase on 29 March 2019. I sought further information from the member for South Brisbane about the allegation made against her, in accordance with standing order 269(5). Subsequently, the member for South Brisbane rose and gave an explanation and apology in the House on 16 July 2020. The member for South Brisbane's apology is recorded at page 1820 of the *Record of Proceedings*. Accordingly, it is my opinion that the member for South Brisbane has made an adequate apology under standing order 269(4) and I will not be referring the matter. I seek leave to incorporate the ruling circulated in my name.

Leave granted.

SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED DELIBERATELY MISLEADING THE HOUSE

On 24 June 2020, the Leader of the Opposition wrote to me alleging that the Member for South Brisbane deliberately misled the House on 18 June 2020.

The matter relates to a statement made by the Member for South Brisbane during debate on the Electoral and Other Legislation (Accountability, Integrity and Other Matters) Amendment Bill with respect to the purchase of a property at Woolloongabba.

The Member stated, 'I was six weeks late in formally finalising the declaration of this property but had provided information verbally and in written form to the Clerk, but I had not signed form 3. This was a six-week lag'.

In her letter to me, the Leader of the Opposition contended that this statement was misleading because it contradicted earlier statements by the Member for South Brisbane that she was first informed on the property purchase on 29 March 2019.

I sought further information from the Member for South Brisbane about the allegation made against her, in accordance with Standing Order 269(5).

The Member for South Brisbane rose and gave an explanation and apology in the House on 16 July 2020 during the Adjournment Debate. She said:

To clarify, I was six weeks late in providing a draft declaration with the details necessary for the Clerk to provide advice regarding the declaration of this property, having already advised him of such verbally, and it was another two weeks before I signed and submitted a form 3, which was required 30 days after the date of the settlement of the property on 26 April 2019. There was no intention to mislead. I apologise to the House if this has caused confusion.

The Member for South Brisbane's explanation and apology is recorded at page 1820 of the Record of Proceedings for 16 July 2020.

On the information before me, I consider that the Member for South Brisbane has made an adequate apology under Standing Order 269(4).

Therefore, I have decided that the matter does not warrant the further attention of the House via the Ethics Committee and I will not be referring the matter.

I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

Tabled paper: Bundle of correspondence relating to the allegation by the Leader of the Opposition, Mrs Deb Frecklington MP, of a contempt of parliament by the member for South Brisbane, Ms Jackie Trad MP [\[1280\]](#).

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Electorate Offices, Telephone System Upgrade



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I am acutely aware of the frustration of many members and their electorate office staff regarding the new telephony system that commenced rolling out to electorate offices in late June. The Clerk directed that the rollout cease in early July after technical issues were identified. Unfortunately, the new system had been rolled out to 42 offices before the Clerk's direction.

The top tier issue has been the technical problems being experienced by electorate offices—call quality and call reliability are sometimes inconsistent, including things like call silence, drop outs and poor quality connections. They are all experienced on some occasions. The system has, since early July, been the subject of numerous investigations and variable solutions and patches. The Parliamentary Service has been meeting regularly with the provider and working with the provider and other third parties to find solutions to the technical issues.

I take the opportunity today to assure members that the Clerk and I are very aware of the issues and the frustrations being experienced by members, staff and members of the public attempting to contact their elected representatives. Any and all options to restore a stable telephony system to members are being explored, and the Clerk is reporting to me and the Committee of the Legislative Assembly on the matter. As all members will appreciate, there are myriad technical, logistical and contractual issues to address. Your patience and understanding is appreciated.

PETITIONS

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

Alexandra Headland, M2M Cycleway Plan

Ms Simpson, from 1,951 requesting the House to scrap the proposed M2M cycleway plan at Alexandra Headland; keep carparks east of Alexandra Parade; improve foot paths for cyclists and pedestrians; consult fully with all beach user groups; and improve the natural environment with better landscaping rather than metal fences [\[1281\]](#).

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

Rainbow Beach, Tyre Inflation Facility

Mr Perrett, from 1,451 petitioners, requesting the House to build and administer a free 24 hour Tyre Inflation Facility at Rainbow Beach to service Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service customers' requirements [\[1282, 1283\]](#)

Queensland Air Museum

Mr McArdle, from 4,158 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure an extension of the current lease is granted to the Queensland Air Museum to extend their footprint to house more aircraft and construct buildings for education and interactive facilities [[1284](#), [1285](#)].

Caloundra City Private School, Road Safety

Mr McArdle, from 728 petitioners, requesting the House to install 40 km flashing-light signage combined with pedestrian crossings at Caloundra City Private School [[1286](#), [1287](#)].

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

Logan Village, Roads

From 906 petitioners, requesting the House to not proceed with the Department of Transport and Main Roads proposal dated May 2020 to turn the main street of historic Logan Village into four-lanes and to develop an alternative in consultation with the community [[1288](#), [1289](#)].

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

Upper Coomera, Riverbank Repair

Mr Boothman, from 447 petitioners, requesting the House to prioritise and partnership with local government to share repair works to the riverbank upstream from the John Muntz Bridge at Upper Coomera [[1290](#)].

Pialba-Burrum Heads Road and Serenity Drive-Drury Lane Intersection

Mr Saunders, from 365 petitioners, requesting the House to configure the traffic lights and other road infrastructure at the Pialba-Burrum Heads Road and Serenity Drive/Drury Lane intersection to allow all possible turns and traffic direction [[1291](#)].

Oxenford, Intersection Upgrades

Mr Boothman, from 236 petitioners, requesting the House to prioritise safety upgrades to fix the dangerous intersections at Tamborine Oxenford Road and Michigan Drive; and Tamborine Oxenford Road into Georgina Street, Oxenford [[1292](#)].

Tugun and Bilinga, Oceanway

Mrs Gerber, from 1,047 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure a full Environmental Impact Assessment is undertaken before the installation of 6.2 metre light poles on the Oceanway adjacent to the beach between Tugun and Bilinga [[1293](#)].

Pimpama Railway Station

Mr Crandon, from 1,152 petitioners, requesting the House to fast track construction of the Pimpama Railway Station [[1294](#)].

Driving Schools, Driving Test Booking Restrictions

Mr Molhoek, from 210 petitioners, requesting the House to revoke the current policy restricting driving schools from being able to book their own students for tests [[1295](#)].

Northern Gold Coast, Hooning

Mr Crandon, from 1,194 petitioners, requesting the House to implement all resources available to stop hooning in the Northern Gold Coast [[1296](#)].

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

Toondah Harbour Priority Development Area

From 6,063 petitioners, requesting the House to establish an independent commission of inquiry to investigate plans for residential and associated development on land and waters in the Toondah Harbour Priority Development Area [[1297](#)].

Repairable Write-Off Scheme

From 192 petitioners, requesting the House to consider the recommendations of the review of the repairable write off scheme in Queensland and fast track their implementation [[1298](#)].

Coomera Connector, Route

From 382 petitioners, requesting the House to remove the currently proposed northern section of the Coomera Connector project from maps until a final decision is made regarding the route [[1299](#)].

Toowong, Department of Housing Lease

From 900 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure the Department of Housing lease on Atira at 33 Glen Road Toowong is not extended beyond January 2021 [[1300](#)].

Yalingbila Bibula Whale Interpretive Centre

From 3,025 petitioners, requesting the House to repeal the decision granting the designation for the Yalingbila Bibula Whale Interpretive Centre at Point Lookout [[1301](#)].

Kuranda Range Road

From 1,076 petitioners, requesting the House to alter overtaking lanes, reduce the speed limit and investigate additional wildlife safety solutions for the Kuranda Range Road section of the Kennedy Highway, Kuranda [\[1302\]](#).

School Based Traineeships

From 498 petitioners, requesting the House to recognise competency of student's skills and relax the 100-day paid day requirement of the school-based traineeship due to COVID-19 related delays and return to the 50-day requirement to enable all students to finish their traineeships [\[1303\]](#).

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—

17 July 2020—

[1208](#) Response from the Minister for Employment and Small Business and Minister for Training and Skills Development (Hon. Fentiman), to an ePetition (3331-20) sponsored by the member for Clayfield, Mr Nicholls, from 737 petitioners, requesting the House to reopen all business grant rounds; provide easier access for micro and small businesses to access grants; and expedite the process for awarding these grants

20 July 2020—

[1209](#) Transport and Public Works Committee: Report No. 41, 56th parliament—Inquiry into Transport Technology

21 July 2020—

[1210](#) Economics and Governance Committee: Report No. 43, 56th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 20 May 2020 and 16 June 2020

[1211](#) State Development, Tourism, Innovation and Manufacturing Committee: Report No. 2, 56th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 21 May 2020 and 16 June 2020

23 July 2020—

[1212](#) Department of Transport and Main Roads: Maritime Safety Queensland—Marine incidents in Queensland, 2019

24 July 2020—

[1213](#) Letter, dated 24 July 2020, from the Deputy Premier, Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services, Hon. Dr Steven Miles, to the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, Hon. Curtis Pitt, enclosing a report titled 'Investigation report: Metro South Hospital and Health Services—Rapid Offload Patient Information document'

[1214](#) QWorkplace Solutions report—Investigation report: Metro South Hospital and Health Services—Rapid Offload Patient Information document, prepared by Paula Hctor, dated 19 June 2020

30 July 2020—

[1215](#) Mt Gravatt Showgrounds Trust—Annual report year ended 30 April 2020

31 July 2020—

[1216](#) Queensland Agricultural Training Colleges—Final Report for the period 1 July 2019 to 29 February 2020

[1217](#) Queensland Law Reform Commission Report No. 78—Review of consent laws and the excuse of mistake of fact, June 2020

3 August 2020—

[1218](#) COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020, Local Government Act 2009: Local Government (COVID-19 Emergency Response) Regulation 2020, No. 147

[1219](#) COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020, Local Government Act 2009: Local Government (COVID-19 Emergency Response) Regulation 2020, No. 147, explanatory notes

[1220](#) COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020, Local Government Act 2009: Local Government (COVID-19 Emergency Response) Regulation 2020, No. 147, human rights certificate

[1221](#) Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee: Report No. 39, 56th Parliament—Disability Services and Other Legislation (Worker Screening) Amendment Bill 2020

[1222](#) Natural Resources, Agricultural Industry Development and Environment Committee: Report No. 6, 56th Parliament—Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020

[1223](#) Natural Resources, Agricultural Industry Development and Environment Committee: Report No. 7, 56th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 20 May 2020 and 16 June 2020

4 August 2020—

[1224](#) Auditor-General Report 1: 2020-21—Family support and child protection system

7 August 2020—

- [1225](#) Economics and Governance Committee: Report No. 44, 56th Parliament—Queensland Future Fund Bill 2020
- [1226](#) Economics and Governance Committee: Report No. 45, 56th Parliament—Royalty Legislation Amendment Bill 2020
- [1227](#) Queensland Rural and Industry Development Authority—Queensland Rural Debt Survey 2019

10 August 2020—

- [1228](#) Queensland Police Service: Annual report for assumed identity authorisation and use—2019-2020

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS (SO 32)

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

The following statutory instruments were tabled by the Clerk—

Public Records Act 2002:

- [1229](#) Public Records (Paradise Dam) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 133
- [1230](#) Public Records (Paradise Dam) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 133, explanatory notes
- [1231](#) Public Records (Paradise Dam) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 133, human rights certificate

Residential Services (Accreditation) Act 2002:

- [1232](#) Residential Services (Accreditation) (Extension of Transitional Provision for Retirement Villages) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 134
- [1233](#) Residential Services (Accreditation) (Extension of Transitional Provision for Retirement Villages) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 134, explanatory notes
- [1234](#) Residential Services (Accreditation) (Extension of Transitional Provision for Retirement Villages) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 134, human rights certificate

Heavy Vehicle National Law and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2019:

- [1235](#) Heavy Vehicle National Law and Other Legislation Amendment (Postponement) Regulation 2020, No. 135
- [1236](#) Heavy Vehicle National Law and Other Legislation Amendment (Postponement) Regulation 2020, No. 135, explanatory notes
- [1237](#) Heavy Vehicle National Law and Other Legislation Amendment (Postponement) Regulation 2020, No. 135, human rights certificate

Environmental Offsets Act 2014, Marine Parks Act 2004, Nature Conservation Act 1992, State Penalties Enforcement Act 1999:

- [1238](#) Nature Conservation (Animals) Regulation 2020, No. 136
- [1239](#) Nature Conservation (Animals) Regulation 2020, No. 136, explanatory notes
- [1240](#) Nature Conservation (Animals) Regulation 2020, No. 136, human rights certificate
- [1241](#) Nature Conservation (Animals) Regulation 2020, No. 136, decision regulatory impact statement

Environmental Offsets Act 2014, Nature Conservation Act 1992, State Penalties Enforcement Act 1999:

- [1242](#) Nature Conservation (Plants) Regulation 2020, No. 137
- [1243](#) Nature Conservation (Plants) Regulation 2020, No. 137, explanatory notes
- [1244](#) Nature Conservation (Plants) Regulation 2020, No. 137, human rights certificate

Forestry Act 1959, Marine Parks Act 2004, Nature Conservation Act 1992, Recreation Areas Management Act 2006, State Penalties Enforcement Act 1999:

- [1245](#) Nature Conservation (Protected Areas Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 138
- [1246](#) Nature Conservation (Protected Areas Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 138, explanatory notes
- [1247](#) Nature Conservation (Protected Areas Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 138, human rights certificate

Animal Care and Protection Act 2001:

- [1248](#) Animal Care and Protection (Use of Electrical Device on Horses) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 139
- [1249](#) Animal Care and Protection (Use of Electrical Device on Horses) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 139, explanatory notes
- [1250](#) Animal Care and Protection (Use of Electrical Device on Horses) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 139, human rights certificate

Legal Profession Act 2007:

- [1251](#) Legal Profession (Society Rules) Amendment Notice (No. 2) 2020, No. 140
- [1252](#) Legal Profession (Society Rules) Amendment Notice (No. 2) 2020, No. 140, explanatory notes
- [1253](#) Legal Profession (Society Rules) Amendment Notice (No. 2) 2020, No. 140, human rights certificate

Guardianship and Administration and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2019:

- [1254](#) Guardianship and Administration and Other Legislation Amendment (Postponement) Regulation (No. 2) 2020, No. 141
- [1255](#) Guardianship and Administration and Other Legislation Amendment (Postponement) Regulation (No. 2) 2020, No. 141, explanatory notes
- [1256](#) Guardianship and Administration and Other Legislation Amendment (Postponement) Regulation (No. 2) 2020, No. 141, human rights certificate

Justice and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2020:

- [1257](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 142
- [1258](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 142, explanatory notes

Agents Financial Administration Act 2014, Appeal Costs Fund Act 1973, Associations Incorporation Act 1981, Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 2003, Body Corporate and Community Management Act 1997, Building Units and Group Titles Act 1980, Casino Control Act 1982, Charitable and Non-Profit Gaming Act 1999, Civil Partnerships Act 2011, Collections Act 1966, Cooperatives Act 1997, Coroners Act 2003, Criminal Code Act 1899, Debt Collectors (Field Agents and Collection Agents) Act 2014, Dispute Resolution Centres Act 1990, Electoral Act 1992, Evidence Act 1977, Funeral Benefit Business Act 1982, Gaming Machine Act 1991, Interactive Gambling (Player Protection) Act 1998, Introduction Agents Act 2001, Jury Act 1995, Justices Act 1886, Justices of the Peace and Commissioners for Declarations Act 1991, Keno Act 1996, Land Court Act 2000, Legal Profession Act 2007, Liquor Act 1992, Lotteries Act 1997, Motor Dealers and Chattel Auctioneers Act 2014, Partnership Act 1891, Penalties and Sentences Act 1992, Property Law Act 1974, Property Occupations Act 2014, Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2009, Recording of Evidence Act 1962, Retail Shop Leases Act 1994, Right to Information Act 2009, Second-hand Dealers and Pawnbrokers Act 2003, Security Providers Act 1993, Status of Children Act 1978, Supreme Court of Queensland Act 1991, Tattoo Industry Act 2013, Tourism Services Act 2003, Wagering Act 1998, Wine Industry Act 1994:

- [1259](#) Justice Legislation (Fees, Allowances and Other Amounts) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 143
- [1260](#) Justice Legislation (Fees, Allowances and Other Amounts) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 143, explanatory notes
- [1261](#) Justice Legislation (Fees, Allowances and Other Amounts) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 143, human rights certificate

Electoral Act 1992:

- [1262](#) Electoral Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 144
- [1263](#) Electoral Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 144, explanatory notes
- [1264](#) Electoral Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 144, human rights certificate

State Buildings Protective Security Act 1983:

- [1265](#) State Buildings Protective Security Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 145
- [1266](#) State Buildings Protective Security Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 145, explanatory notes
- [1267](#) State Buildings Protective Security Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 145, human rights certificate

Disability Services Act 2006:

- [1268](#) Disability Services (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 146
- [1269](#) Disability Services (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 146, explanatory notes
- [1270](#) Disability Services (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 146, human rights certificate

Major Events Act 2014:

- [1271](#) Major Events (Motor Racing Events) (Townsville 400) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 148
- [1272](#) Major Events (Motor Racing Events) (Townsville 400) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 148, explanatory notes
- [1273](#) Major Events (Motor Racing Events) (Townsville 400) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 148, human rights certificate

Rural and Regional Adjustment Act 1994:

- [1274](#) Rural and Regional Adjustment (COVID-19 Taxi and Limousine Industry Assistance Scheme) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 149
- [1275](#) Rural and Regional Adjustment (COVID-19 Taxi and Limousine Industry Assistance Scheme) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 149, explanatory notes
- [1276](#) Rural and Regional Adjustment (COVID-19 Taxi and Limousine Industry Assistance Scheme) Amendment Regulation 2020, No. 149, human rights certificate

REPORT BY THE CLERK

The following report was tabled by the Clerk—

- [1277](#) 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—

Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2019

Amendments made to Bill

Short title and consequential references to short title—

Omit—

'Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2019'

Insert—

'Transport Legislation (Disability Parking and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2020'

Ministerial and Other Office Holder Staff and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018

Amendments made to Bill


Short title and consequential references to short title—*Omit—*

'Ministerial and Other Office Holder Staff and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018'

Insert—

'Ministerial and Other Office Holder Staff and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020'

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**Coronavirus, Update**

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.41 am): Today marks 203 days since Queensland's first case of COVID-19. Six lives have been tragically lost, but many, many more have been saved. As I say constantly, the credit for Queensland's response to COVID belongs to each and every Queenslanders.


I can report that overnight we have had no new cases. We have done 6,524 tests over the last 24 hours. Recently we learned just how much we value our days without new cases. We had a three-month streak of no community transfer until the selfishness of a few undid the hard work of the many. Anxiety crept back into Queensland. Thank God the people of Queensland, especially those in Logan, Springfield and Ipswich, responded exactly as a united community should.

When COVID came, these Queenslanders came in their thousands to be tested, to protect their schools and communities, their cafes and small businesses, and especially the elderly and frail in hundreds of nursing homes. Even if it meant queuing for hours, that is what they were prepared to do to stop this disease in its tracks—and that is exactly what they have done to date.

Yesterday we learned that two teenagers had not fully declared they had been in Sydney and came into our state. They were stopped in Noosa. I thank the police for the great work they did in tracking them down. They have tested negative for COVID-19. I want to again thank our police and emergency workers at our borders, which includes airports and train stations. A total of seven people have been placed in quarantine from train stations. The number from airports and roads is much, much higher.

Without being complacent, Queenslanders enjoy a level of freedom that many Australians do not—and that is just a simple fact. So what do we do with this? At this time of year 400,000 people would normally pack into the Ekka and give their families a once-a-year treat worth millions to our economy. We might not have the Ekka this year, but we got a taste of the westerlies yesterday! Since we cannot go there, we go everywhere else. We can support our tourism operators, our cafes and restaurants, and theme parks right throughout Queensland. Ask yourself: where have I always wanted to go in Queensland? We have to remain vigilant and cautious, but now is the time to support one another.

Coronavirus, Economic Update

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.43 am): Our aim as a government is unequivocal: to protect the health and lifestyle of Queenslanders, create and sustain jobs, and work together on our ongoing plan to continue recovering from the global impact of COVID-19. In May we released stage 1 of a comprehensive economic recovery strategy that continues to grow and adapt to the needs of industry, small business and the workforce.

In June, stage 2 included support for tourism, construction, resources and agriculture, plus a second round of \$100 million for small business grants. Then last month we extended Back to Work and Skilling Queenslanders for Work, plus jobs in the Great Barrier Reef catchments.

Today I can announce more good news for our economic recovery. Today I am announcing a tradies jobs bonanza. Our state schools right across Queensland are set for improvement and maintenance works, with local tradies needed to build, paint and repair facilities—projects like the refurbishment of classrooms and libraries, the creation of outdoor learning spaces, the refurbishment of tennis courts, the repairing of paths and walkways, as well as new and refurbished playgrounds.

This is a \$220 million investment on top of a billion dollars announced for new schools and new classrooms across the state in 2020. It will support 720 jobs throughout Queensland as schools engage with local businesses to get this vital work done as quickly as possible.

That means, for example, in the Cook electorate, over \$2.8 million will be spent at 47 schools; in the Caloundra electorate, \$700,000 for school works; in the Mackay electorate, \$1.3 million will be spent on school improvement works; and in the Traeger electorate over \$2.2 million will go towards school works—just to name a few.

Today I can also announce the 63 successful projects as part of the \$50 million Unite and Recover Community Stimulus Package for South-East Queensland councils, meaning even more jobs for tradies. These projects across 12 council areas will support various projects in the south-east including upgrades to roads, parklands, tourism infrastructure, active transport and community sports facilities. Most importantly, it will create or support around 1,565 jobs.

Some examples of the successful projects include: improvements to the Beenleigh CBD; building a new BMX precinct at Brendale; revitalising the Mooloolaba foreshore; the green sealing of roads on Russell and Macleay islands; improvements to the popular Brisbane Valley Rail Trail in the Somerset region; upgrading the facade of the Ipswich Civic Centre; upgrades to the Noosa Netball Association facilities; and significant works to improve the tourist experience at the Lake Moogerah Caravan Park and camping facilities in the Scenic Rim.

This builds on the \$50 million boost South-East Queensland councils received under our \$200 million COVID Works for Queensland program for 88 projects creating nearly 1,000 jobs. The aim of both packages is simple: to get shovel ready projects going quickly and supporting jobs in communities that we know have been doing it tough as a result of the global pandemic.

I also want to update the House about some of our other initiatives that have been recently announced: a \$200 million infrastructure initiative to accelerate the recovery plan. The Building Acceleration Fund will work with councils and industry to increase construction activity and support long-term jobs. There is a \$150 million package to support universities impacted by COVID-19. This is about keeping our universities open, safeguarding their jobs, maintaining research and educating local students.


There is assistance for Gold Coast theme parks from our \$1 billion industry support package. This is to ensure that they can stay open, continue to employ people and keep attracting Queenslanders to the Gold Coast.

We are going it alone without the federal government, with \$195 million to deliver stage 2 of the pipeline for Townsville, meaning hundreds of jobs. The raising of the Burdekin Falls Dam has been declared a coordinated project. The construction tender has been announced for the Rookwood Weir, supporting 140 local jobs—a much needed project for Central Queensland.

We have injected more than \$30 million into more than 130 community health service groups. This is to ensure their vital services can continue to support Queenslanders during the pandemic and into the future. We secured the Super Netball competition, adding to the AFL.

We have been working with industry and our regions every step of the way during this recovery. Of course there is more to do. We will not stop. There is no time or room for complacency about our health or about our economy. We will build on the more than \$6 billion in initiatives announced to date, with an agenda and actions to ensure Queensland comes out of this pandemic stronger and better than ever.

Coronavirus, Health Update

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (9.49 am): I rise to give an update on the management of COVID-19 in our state. There are no new cases of COVID-19 to report overnight. It is now 10 days since the last locally acquired case: a woman who dined in the same restaurant as another woman who had been to Melbourne. The results of tests conducted on two young women who are believed to have travelled from Sydney when it was a hotspot but before the border with New South Wales was closed were negative. Until recently Queensland had been the envy of the world, with 63 straight days of zero community transmission, but we all know it does not take much to spark an outbreak. That is why it was devastating to find out that two individuals broke the rules by travelling to Melbourne and back to the southern suburbs, risking Queenslanders' lives. Despite challenges in the past few weeks, Queensland remains on top of COVID-19.


As of this morning our total number of cases remains at 1,089; 11 of those are active. That is why we have been able to open our state up, allowing businesses to open and Queenslanders to get back to work. That is not the case in other parts of Australia. There have now been almost 20,000 cases

Australia wide. Tragically, 37 people died in Melbourne last weekend alone. We have just heard that another 19 people died yesterday. There have been roughly twice as many deaths in this second wave as the first. There are outbreaks connected to schools, family groups, restaurants, churches and workplaces. More than 700 healthcare workers have been infected. The city of Melbourne has gone from lockdown to a curfew, costing the Australian economy billions and leaving the residents of our second-largest city unable to work normally. While that is bad, news from across the world is even more tragic. America has now had over five million cases and more than 160,000 deaths. Globally we are up to almost 20 million cases and over 730,000 deaths. It took six months to get to 10 million cases but just 43 days to double to 20 million.

The outcomes in Queensland are due to a few important things. It is testament to the hard work and planning of our health service that we remain in control of this disease and able to focus on recovery. Thanks to our response over the past fortnight we have avoided a potential disaster. The Melbourne-Logan cluster was thankfully confined to just five positive cases. We have proven that we will not accept rule breakers. Even in the NRL players and staff must follow the rules or stiff penalties apply, no matter what position they hold. Queenslanders have been exceptional throughout this pandemic. Thanks to an extraordinary rush in the past two weeks we have passed 683,824 tests.

We cannot forget, though, that Australia—and especially Victoria—is in the thick of a major health crisis that will take a long time to resolve. The case numbers are alarming and the death toll is horrific. Anyone who questions our tough measures, be it border restrictions, mandatory quarantining or the capping of gatherings, should take note of what is happening in other parts of our country. Lives are being lost or devastated not just by the disease but also the ramifications of a further shutdown. We will do everything we can to ensure that does not happen here, because every Queensland life matters and because there are no new jobs in a second wave.

Coronavirus, Economic Update

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Treasurer, Minister for Infrastructure and Planning) (9.53 am): While the Palaszczuk Labor government's response to COVID-19 continues to keep Queenslanders protected, the economic impact of this wicked virus will have an effect on our economy for years to come. For example, the full economic impact of Victoria's stage 4 restrictions is yet to be determined. Last week the Prime Minister said that the cost to Australia's economy will be \$7 billion to \$9 billion but could be as high as \$10 billion to \$12 billion. Twenty per cent of that cost would be borne outside of Victoria. For Queensland, on a population basis that would mean an economic impact of up to \$480 million just in this quarter caused by events in just one Australian state.


Similarly, we know there will be an economic consequence as a result of our necessary decision to close the borders to people from New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory with very limited exemptions, but that cost will be far smaller than what Queensland would endure should we be required to reimpose more significant restrictions on more businesses within our state. Thankfully, recent data from the Australian Bureau of Statistics shows signs of a tentative improvement in our domestic economy.

The value of new lending for dwellings in June in Queensland increased by 19 per cent—higher than any other state and three times higher than the national average. Early data indicates there has been a strong response by Queenslanders to home building and renovation programs, indicating the appeal of the \$45,000 available to some buying a new first home in regional Queensland through the combination of HomeBuilder, the Palaszczuk government's \$5,000 regional building boost and our state's \$15,000 First Home Owners' Grant. Retail sales in Queensland increased by 1.5 per cent over the 12 months to June—the largest increase among eastern states—in contrast to a 2.4 per cent decline nationally. While the number of jobs has fallen by 5.6 per cent across Australia since mid-March, the five per cent fall in Queensland is the smallest fall among the eastern states and the third-best result in the country behind Western Australia and the Northern Territory. Queensland was the only state or territory to see a fall in its unemployment rate in June.

I have spoken before about how Queensland's diversified economy, and in particular our mining and agriculture sectors, have helped us weather the COVID storm. The last trade data from the ABS shows the value of Queensland's merchandise exports is \$77.3 billion in the 12 months to June 2020—still more than New South Wales and Victoria combined—and Queensland's tax settings remain competitive, with the average Queenslander paying \$700 less each year than the average citizen in the rest of Australia.

We have a long way to go. Our economic recovery depends on the continuing vigilance of Queenslanders in maintaining good hygiene, observing social distancing, getting tested at the slightest sign of symptoms, and maintaining the integrity of our border and quarantine processes. As we continue to deliver our plan to unite and recover for Queensland jobs, Queensland is as well placed as anywhere in the world to emerge from the shadow of COVID stronger and more resilient than before.

School Infrastructure

 **Hon. G GRACE** (McConnel—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Industrial Relations) (9.56 am): As the Premier mentioned earlier, Queensland state schools are about to undergo a refurbishment and upgrade bonanza. Local tradies will soon be building, painting and repairing facilities at schools across the state in addition to the many works currently taking place. This \$220 million investment will support 720 jobs as schools engage with local businesses to get this vital work done as soon as possible. Tradies will be upgrading classrooms, building new outdoor learning spaces, painting and upgrading amenities blocks and improving playgrounds across Queensland.


In Townsville we will be investing \$600,000 to modernise the science lab at the William Ross State High School. In Far North Queensland we will upgrade the science lab at the Kuranda District State College, worth a total of \$240,000. Frenchville State School in Central Queensland will be glad to see almost \$1 million allocated for a new roof over the sports complex. There is \$950,000 for security upgrades at Caloundra State High School on the Sunshine Coast, and we are investing \$400,000 for upgrades at Nerang State High School on the Gold Coast. These are just a small selection of the hundreds of projects that we will begin in the coming months with more to come.

It is no secret that the global economy is doing it tough right now, but Queensland's economic recovery starts with government investment in projects in key industries like education and construction, because we know that by investing in infrastructure we can create jobs and support our local economy first. When it comes to building the schools of the future the record of the Palaszczuk government is unmatched, with eight new schools built under budget—under budget—and open on time for day 1 of the 2020 school year, worth nearly half a billion dollars.

Our \$235 million Renewing Our Schools program of works is supporting more than 700 jobs in Cairns, Townsville, Proserpine, Serena, Bundaberg, Toowoomba and Brisbane, to name a few. The \$477 million Cooler Cleaner Schools program will air-condition every classroom, staffroom and library in every Queensland state school by June 2022, and we are putting 180,000 solar panels on school rooftops to offset those costs.

Let us not forget the five new schools that will open their doors in 2021, with four more to follow in 2022 and 2023. More schools, more teachers and better facilities all mean a world-class education for our students, delivered by the Palaszczuk government, giving every child a great start.

Unite and Recover Community Stimulus Package

 **Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (Minister for Local Government, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (10.00 am): As the Premier announced earlier, 1,500 jobs across South-East Queensland will be created or supported through the delivery of 63 projects under the Palaszczuk government's \$50 million Unite and Recover Community Stimulus Package for SEQ councils. This package is part of the Palaszczuk government's \$6 billion plan to unite and recover for Queensland jobs, and the positive effects of funding will be felt almost immediately. This package is an integral part of Queensland's plan to stimulate the economy at a time when economies across the globe are being forced to realign.


The Unite and Recover Community Stimulus Package will help our councils build new and upgraded infrastructure and give their local economies a boost. From Noosa to the Gold Coast and from Toowoomba to Moreton Bay, councils estimate more than 1,500 jobs will be created or supported through 63 projects for their communities. The projects approved under the program include: 48 projects to all 12 SEQ local governments, totalling \$24 million, under the allocation component of the program; and 15 projects to 11 local governments, totalling \$26 million, in new investment under the competitive funding pool.

I am very pleased with the types and quality of the projects that have been submitted as part of this process. These include \$1.5 million for Moreton Bay Regional Council to develop a new facility for the Pine Rivers BMX Club, a terrific local club that is the breeding ground for world champions, including the nine-time world champion, young Tom Tucker. I inspected the site with Mayor Flannery and the member for Pine Rivers to hear from the club members themselves about what the project will mean to them—club members including young Tom.

There is \$2.5 million to accelerate the green seal roads project on the Southern Moreton Bay Islands, seeing a further 8.3 kilometres of roads sealed in that area, something I know the community and the member for Redlands has been advocating very strongly for over a long period. Projects also include improvements to the Brisbane Valley Rail Trail, the Loganlea Road healthy street project, revitalising the Mooloolaba foreshore, Eildon Hill Reservoir improvements and Fairways Park stage 1C construction—just to name a few of the 63 terrific projects.

These are just some of the examples of the projects that will deliver jobs now, sustain jobs in the future and provide real community benefit in the long term. This is yet another example of how the Palaszczuk government is working in close partnership with local governments as we unite and recover.

Cross River Rail

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Cooper—ALP) (Minister for State Development, Tourism and Innovation) (10.02 am): The Palaszczuk government is getting on with the job of delivering Queensland's largest infrastructure project—Cross River Rail. Right now there are four roadheaders excavating new underground stations at the Gabba and Roma Street, where 70 metres of tunnel excavation has already been completed. We now have construction work underway at eight sites across the city and have completed piling works at the Gabba and Roma Street. The Cross River Rail project is pumping more than \$4 million a day into the Queensland economy and into the pay packets of Queenslanders across the state.

In relation to media reports today, I can advise that when the government made the decision to build Cross River Rail we decided on the design that delivered the best option for more commuters across the south-east. By delivering the new Boggo Road station, we will create a new interchange for travellers coming from both the Gold Coast and Cleveland lines, enabling them to connect directly to the new underground and new Cross River Rail stations. I can confirm that the government did examine the benefits and disadvantages of the proposed alternative, known as New Dutton station. However, we decided against this option as we believed the modelling showed it did not deliver ultimately a superior option for commuters.

Mr Mander: That's not what the experts say.

Ms JONES: Well, you would not have built it at all. Not \$1, knocked at every stage of the way—

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, Minister.

Ms JONES: For example, Bayside and eastern suburb residents on the Cleveland line—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members to my left.

Ms JONES: For example, Bayside and eastern suburb residents on the Cleveland line would have been significantly disadvantaged by the New Dutton station compared to the Boggo Road interchange that we are delivering.

Mr Mander interjected.

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

Ms JONES: I am advised that modelling showed that a commuter coming from Cannon Hill, for example, in the electorate of Chatsworth, would have to get off the train at Park Road and walk up to nine minutes away from the city, backtracking to the New Dutton station in order to connect to the Cross River Rail underground. The government did not think this was a suitable solution for those residents, given the significant growth that is happening—

Mr Mander interjected.


Mr SPEAKER: Member for Everton, I have just asked you to cease your interjections. You are warned under the standing orders.

Ms JONES: I might say that again. I am advised that modelling showed that a commuter coming from Cannon Hill would have to get off the train at Park Road and walk up to nine minutes away from the city, backtracking to the New Dutton station in order to connect to the Cross River Rail underground. The government did not think this was a suitable solution, given the significant growth that is happening in the eastern corridor and bayside suburbs. In contrast, the Boggo Road interchange delivers both Gold Coast and Cleveland line commuters with a direct connection straight to the underground. The new Boggo Road station will become the second busiest interchange in the state.

I also can advise that, regardless of which option was chosen for the new station location, it would have required detailed engineering design to connect the new Cross River Rail infrastructure back into the existing brownfield rail network. Project engineers are developing these detailed designs by working closely with Queensland Rail and the Department of Transport and Main Roads. This design work has progressed to an advanced stage, and engineers are now confident that a design solution can be achieved and finalised to meet QR standards. We are getting on with the job of delivering this vital infrastructure project which will transform our city and improve commuter times for commuters across the south-east.

Mr SPEAKER: Members to my left, I appreciate there may be some thoughts and commentary on the issue. There will be other and more appropriate opportunities for you to raise those.

Cross River Rail

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (10.06 am): Economies worldwide are enduring the worst economic downturn in generations, and Queensland's economy is no different. Given the global uncertainties, every job counts right now. Thousands of workers are heading to work today because of our strong pipeline of projects and commitment to infrastructure as part of our economic plan to unite and recover and create jobs in our state.

Tunnelling has started for Cross River Rail—a transformational infrastructure project to bust congestion in South-East Queensland by expanding our rail system with direct access to the heart of the Brisbane CBD for the first time. Cross River Rail would be opening this year if the anti public transport brigade of those opposite had not cut the project in 2012. Thousands of construction workers on Cross River Rail would not have jobs if those opposite had their way.

Labor backs commuters and we back jobs, which is why we chose a Cross River Rail route that benefits the greatest number of passengers consistent with our 2017 commitment. Building an alternate station—the proposed New Dutton station—would have disconnected the easy current transfer at Park Road station for Cleveland line commuters from the Cross River Rail line. As was outlined by the Minister for State Development, separating the Cleveland and Gold Coast lines would have forced commuters travelling between those lines who currently have an easy transfer at Park Road to walk nine minutes away from the city to catch their connecting train. That would have disadvantaged a catchment of hundreds of thousands of people living in Brisbane's eastern and bayside suburbs on the Cleveland line, from Buranda all the way out to Cleveland via Wynnum—18 stations affected, the whole line. It would have been a disincentive for them to use the train at all. It was a poor quality option that ignored the needs of bayside and eastern suburb commuters, which is why our government did not support it.

Ms Simpson interjected.

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

Mr BAILEY: The option we have chosen was considered cost neutral and will be delivered within budget. Queensland Rail has confirmed that all technical aspects—

Mr Crisafulli interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The member for Broadwater will cease his interjections. Members to my left, comments will come through the chair.


Mr BAILEY: Queensland Rail has confirmed that all technical aspects are being resolved, a usual part of delivering transport infrastructure. Despite the challenges of COVID-19—

Mr Hart interjected.

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

Mr BAILEY: Despite the challenges of COVID-19 we continue to deliver record investment in roads and transport infrastructure for Queenslanders: more than \$2.3 billion for four M1 upgrades and more than \$3.5 billion for the Bruce Highway and rail upgrades between Brisbane and Gympie. In addition, work is about to start on stage 3 of the Gold Coast Light Rail and funding has been committed for the stage 4 business case to take it to Coolangatta via the airport. Together, these projects will transform how Queenslanders connect and travel in our state. Queenslanders can depend on the Palaszczuk Labor government to continue delivering major projects that guarantee jobs and give Queensland businesses confidence. We build; we do not cut.

Electricity Prices

 **Hon. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy) (10.10 am): Queensland has an economic strategy for recovery and that includes providing relief for Queensland families and small businesses, and we are delivering. More than two million Queensland households and around 170,000 small businesses have received financial relief from their power and water bills with more financial relief to come. These rebates have been automatically applied to power bills as the fastest way to distribute important relief to Queenslanders as we unite and recover. What does that mean for households? It is like Christmas, according to 79-year-old Nell Healy from Rockhampton. I met Nell a couple of weeks ago. She showed me the new washing machine she was able to afford because of the savings on her power bill. I would like to wish Nell and her granddaughter the best of luck when they make that parachute jump in October for Nell's 80th birthday.

Pensioners Russell and Mary in Maryborough keep a close eye on their finances. According to Russell, Mary is the treasurer and she says the \$200 relief has allowed them to spend on little luxuries like a coffee and cake when they are out shopping. As Mary was quick to point out, that is more money with their local businesses in Maryborough. There is more good news for Queenslanders. There is another \$50 million credit on household bills to follow next month. Together, these relief payments mean \$250 off household power bills this year, and there is another \$50 dividend locked in for the 2021-22 financial year.


Let me put this on the record. These \$50 dividends are a payment to Queenslanders as shareholders in the state's publicly owned energy businesses. Public ownership also helps deliver Queensland's energy trifecta: the lowest average prices on the eastern seaboard, reliable supply and, unlike those opposite, a planned transition to a renewable future—50 per cent by 2030.

These are unprecedented times. The economic fallout from the pandemic is affecting families and household budgets around the world, not just in Queensland. As always, I encourage any Queenslanders needing assistance to pay their power bill to contact their retailer to discuss their options. Our COVID-19 economic relief package is making a tangible difference to the lives of people all over Queensland just like Nell, Russell and Mary.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

BIODISCOVERY AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Cognate Debate

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

That, in accordance with standing order 172, the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the Biodiscovery and Other Legislation 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.


Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

QUEENSLAND FUTURE FUND BILL

ROYALTY LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Cognate Debate

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (10.13 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

That, in accordance with standing order 172, the Queensland Future Fund Bill and the Royalty Legislation 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.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.


PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Comments by Member for Everton, Correction and Apology

 **Mr MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (10.14 am): On 16 June I made a statement which said Queensland is the only state without a budget. On reflection, I acknowledge that this remark was unintentionally misleading. What I meant to say was Queensland will be the only state without a budget. I apologise for this unintentional error.

ETHICS COMMITTEE

Reports

 **Mr KELLY** (Greenslopes—ALP) (10.14 am): I table Ethics Committee report No. 200, titled *Matter of privilege referred by the Speaker on 12 February 2019 relating to alleged contempt by a member*.

Tabled paper. Ethics Committee: Report No. 200, 56th Parliament—Matter of privilege referred by the Speaker on 12 February 2019 relating to alleged contempt by a Member [\[1304\]](#).

I also table Ethics Committee report No. 201, titled *Matter of privilege referred by the Registrar on 23 October 2019 relating to an alleged failure to register an interest in the Register of Members' Interests*.

Tabled paper. Ethics Committee: Report No. 201, 56th Parliament—Matter of privilege referred by the Registrar on 23 October 2019 relating to an alleged failure to register an interest in the Register of Members' Interests [\[1305\]](#).


Finally, I table Ethics Committee report No. 202, titled *Matter of privilege referred by the Registrar on 25 February 2020 relating to an alleged failure to register an interest in the Register of Members' Interests*.

Tabled paper. Ethics Committee: Report No. 202, 56th Parliament—Matter of Privilege referred by the Registrar on 25 February 2020 relating to an alleged failure to register an interest in the Register of Members' Interests [\[1306\]](#).

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

LEGAL AFFAIRS AND COMMUNITY SAFETY COMMITTEE

Information Commissioner Report

 **Mr RUSSO** (Toohey—ALP) (10.15 am): As chair of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee, I lay upon the table of the House report No. 2 to the Queensland Legislative Assembly for 2020-21, by the Office of the Information Commissioner titled *Disclosure logs—Queensland government departments*.

Tabled paper. Information Commissioner Report 2: 2020-21—Disclosure logs—Queensland government departments [\[1307\]](#).

The report outlines how well Queensland government departments meet the requirements for operating disclosure logs. I table the report in accordance with the requirements in section 184(5) of the Right to Information Act 2009 and section 193(5) of the Information Privacy Act 2009. I commend the report to the House.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, question time will conclude today at 11.16 am.

Cross River Rail

Mrs FRECKLINGTON (10.16 am): My first question is to the Premier. A whistleblower has exposed that the Labor government overruled expert engineering and safety advice about Cross River Rail in favour of the member for South Brisbane's own plan for Dutton Park and Boggo Road stations. Why did the Labor government overrule this expert advice which, according to the whistleblower, could waste up to \$1 billion worth of taxpayers' money?

Mrs D'ATH: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I believe there are imputations in that question. I ask you to rule on it.

Mr SPEAKER: If you are disputing whether the facts in the question are correct or not, that is to do with the authenticity of the question not that there are imputations in the question. If you are disputing that, that is an opportunity for the Premier to provide an answer which disputes those facts.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. Let me say from the outset that this government will build Cross River Rail. Those opposite were against Cross River Rail. The federal government gave us zero dollars towards Cross River Rail, the largest construction project in South-East Queensland: jobs, jobs and more jobs, including for apprentices. Over 7,000 people will be employed. It will also mean faster travel times for people coming from the south-east into the city.

What we see at the moment is large-scale infrastructure happening on brand new underground railway stations. The first one in over 120 years is being built in Albert Street by this government. This government backs Queenslanders and we back jobs for Queenslanders. This project would not be happening if the LNP was in office. Nothing would be happening because we know what the opposition would have done. They would have opened the borders and Queensland could have been in the position of Victoria. I look forward to seeing the opposition's petition. Where is their petition?

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance under the standing orders. The question was specifically about the Cross River Rail budget blowouts, not borders or COVID. It was about budget blowouts under the Palaszczuk Labor government, and the Premier is way off the mark.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Kawana. I have ruled in terms of the Leader of the House's point of order, which related to the facts. If they are disputed, the Premier may wish to correct those. I ruled the question in order regarding imputations; however, I ask the Premier, under standing order 118(b), to come back to the question as asked.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Let me say very clearly: in Victoria, construction has been reduced to 25 per cent. In Queensland, construction is happening at 100 per cent. The opposition wants to put all of that at risk.

We will continue to build Cross River Rail. I have read some of those reports today. I say very clearly: if the government had not pursued the intermodal connection at Boggo Road, commuters from the electorates of Chatsworth and Cleveland would have had to walk eight or nine minutes to get to a station. How is that for the elderly? How is that for people with a disability? If that had been the case, the members for Chatsworth and Cleveland would have come in here complaining. Over 500,000 commuters will have the benefit of hopping on Cross River Rail and not having to get off at a train station and walk for eight or nine minutes.

Mrs Frecklington: How embarrassing.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The only embarrassment is the Leader of the Opposition circulating a petition to open the borders. That is the embarrassment for Queensland.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Member for Mudgeeraba, you protest too much.

Mr SPEAKER: Through the chair, Premier.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Yes, you all forget that.

Mr SPEAKER: The Premier's time has expired. Please resume your seat.

Ms Bates interjected.

Ms Palaszczuk interjected.

Ms Bates: You're welcome.

Mr SPEAKER: The member for Mudgeeraba will put her comments through the chair—unless she is saying that I am welcome.

Ms Bates: You're welcome.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Mudgeeraba.

Cross River Rail

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: My second question is to the Premier. Secret briefing notes show that Labor overruled advice from the government's own experts about making Cross River Rail safer, cheaper and technically better. Can the Premier explain why the Labor government approved a project against expert advice that could have saved money, connected with the Brisbane Metro and provided full disabled access to the Princess Alexandra Hospital?

Ms PALASZCZUK: The minister responsible for Cross River Rail gave a detailed statement to the parliament, as did the Minister for Transport. The Leader of the Opposition might want to familiarise herself with the Boggo Road station information sheet from February 2017 which was our commitment to Queenslanders. Our commitment to Queenslanders was to build the intermodal section, and that is exactly what we will do. That is exactly what we decided and that is exactly what we are going to do.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, you have asked your question; you do not get a chance to ask another one.

Ms PALASZCZUK: We look forward to the day that the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Everton stand up and tell us how they will pay for their multibillion dollar promises—\$13 billion to date. The only way they can do that is to sell our electricity assets. If you want to talk about a bungle, what about when they went to that election promising to sell the assets? That worked very well for them, didn't it?

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members to my left! The Premier has the call.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Of course, the LNP would put all of our construction at risk. They wanted to open the borders. That is what they wanted to do. They were screaming and yelling at us, moving motions, talking in this House.

Mr Minnikin: Oops! Ha, ha!

Ms PALASZCZUK: You may laugh now, member for Chatsworth—

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

Ms PALASZCZUK: It is only this government that is focused on the economic recovery for Queenslanders, and that is what we will continue to deliver. We are getting on with the job. Our announcement today of more infrastructure—upgrades to our schools and Works for Queensland—is about jobs for tradies and keeping people in work.

Whilst I am on my feet, I want to say to the people of Victoria: Queensland does stand with you during this time. We know that this could have happened anywhere in the country. I thank all of our emergency services personnel for the great job they are doing. Because of the great job they are doing, we are able to get on with the job and build the critical infrastructure needed for Queensland, including Cross River Rail and our \$50 billion worth of projects over the next four years. The LNP would have put all of that at risk. Only a few days ago they took down their petition calling for the borders to be opened. They should table the petition that the Leader of the Opposition circulated.

Mrs Frecklington: Clueless.

Ms PALASZCZUK: You're embarrassing.

Mr SPEAKER: The Premier's time has expired. Premier, comments directed across the chamber are not parliamentary.

Ms PALASZCZUK: My apologies.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you for your apology. I ask that you put your comments through the chair.

Electricity Prices

Ms LUI: My question is of the Premier and Minister for Trade. Will the Premier update the House on the Queensland government's actions on electricity prices? Is the Premier aware of any alternative approaches?

Ms PALASZCZUK: We are well aware of what the LNP stands for, that is, to sell our electricity assets. We know very clearly that there is no way they can fund their unfunded election commitments without selling the power assets in our state. We also know that when they went to an election campaign—

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Kawana, I have asked you to cease your interjections on numerous occasions. You are warned under the standing orders.

Ms PALASZCZUK:—they promised that they would save Queensland families \$330 a year.

Mrs Frecklington: Meanwhile, in 2020.

Ms PALASZCZUK: We have to keep reminding Queenslanders of the mess those opposite made. They promised \$330 a year but what happened? Electricity prices skyrocketed by over 40 per cent. We also know that our government's key initiative of having 50 per cent renewables by 2030 has meant a huge investment in renewables across Queensland. When we came to office it was about seven per cent and now it is over 20 per cent. The other day I was very encouraged to see that the LNP had released a policy. That policy is to deliver 'cheaper electricity' and support green energy. A spellcheck? You might want to get the word 'electricity' right in the first instance.

Mr Perrett: What's the GST rate?

Ms PALASZCZUK: Suddenly—

Mr Minnikin: Oops!

Ms PALASZCZUK: No 'oops'; that is your oops.

Dr Miles: How many 'hectares' are there?

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is right. Suddenly, they have seen the light. They want to support green energy. They are flip-flopping again on policy. One minute they are against renewables; the next minute they are for renewables. One can only wonder what would happen after the election. What we know is that this government will keep our electricity assets in the hands of the people of Queensland.

As part of our economic recovery plan, we have made clear that every Queensland family gets a \$200 rebate on electricity. That is \$200 helping with cost-of-living pressures. We know that, under the LNP, selling the assets would drive up electricity prices. At the moment, Queensland has the lowest wholesale electricity prices on the eastern seaboard, because we kept our assets in public hands. We will continue to protect our public assets. We do not know how the opposition will fund its unfunded election commitments—over \$7 billion worth. We look forward to the day—that day is soon coming—when the member for Everton and the Leader of the Opposition declare to the public how they will fund \$7 billion in unfunded election commitments.

(Time expired)

Cross River Rail

Mr MANDER: My question without notice is to the Treasurer. Given the Treasurer has cancelled this year's budget, meaning no Capital Statement will be published, can the Treasurer guarantee that taxpayers will not be forced to fund the billion dollar blowout exposed by the Cross River Rail whistleblower?

Mr DICK: The people of Queensland can be confident in one thing: the Palaszczuk Labor government delivers on its promises and when it comes to capital works—

Dr Miles: We build.

Mr DICK:—we build.

Ms Palaszczuk: They cut.

Dr Miles: They cut.

Mr DICK: Not only do those opposite cut, and I take the interjections from the Premier and the Deputy Premier; they did build one thing, and we all remember what they built—a monumental tower to their own arrogance, a monumental representation of their own arrogance in 1 William Street. That is what they did. The member for Everton wants to talk about a billion dollar blowout. There is a monument to a billion dollar blowout on the other side of Alice Street. It is called 1 William Street.

Mr Mander: How much taxpayers' money did you pay for that?

Mr DICK: I will tell you how much money went into that, member for Everton; I take the interjection: a billion dollars went into a building that you built to your own arrogance, member for Everton.

Mr SPEAKER: Through the chair.

Mr DICK: The member for Everton and the member for Nanango were proudly sitting around the CBRC table. There they were not building the BaT tunnel, with the BaT tunnel remaining a piece of fiction like a *Batman* comic, and not putting one dollar, as the Minister for Main Roads says, into expanding the M1. They did not put one dollar into new hospitals in Queensland. In fact, their legacy was so poor that at the last election when I was the health minister they did not even have a health infrastructure policy. Not only did they build nothing when they were in government; they promised to build nothing when they were in opposition.

Now we are asked about a billion dollar blowout. Every day the people of Queensland look at that edifice that the member for Everton and the member from Nanango built to their own arrogance thinking that they would be in government for a generation and the people of Queensland judged them. They judged them accordingly. They saw what they said and they looked at what they did and they understood that they were unfit. Just as they heard what the Leader of the Opposition said about the borders and what she did about the borders, they knew that her judgement was completely and utterly flawed.

These members of the opposition are entirely without judgement. They are reckless on the borders. They are reckless with the health of Queenslanders. They were reckless and wrong on Virgin, and they will be reckless with the economy. There has been \$23 billion in promises and 973 days since the member for Everton became the shadow Treasurer and still he will not enunciate an economic plan or policy for this state. That is not just wrong; it is downright embarrassing and demonstrates again that the leadership of the LNP is entirely unfit to lead Queensland.

Gold Coast, Transport Infrastructure

Ms SCANLON: My question is of the Premier and Minister for Trade. Will the Premier update the House on how the Palaszczuk Labor government is investing in critical transport infrastructure on the Gold Coast while planning for the future?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Gaven for her question because there is only one side of this House that is delivering for the Gold Coast, and that is this Labor government. When it comes to light rail, stage 1 was built under a Labor government. Stage 2 was delivered for the Commonwealth Games. Stage 3 is under construction. Today I can announce that we have given approval for the business case that we announced on the Gold Coast for the planning to be undertaken from Burleigh all the way down to Coolangatta via the airport. That would mean that the Labor government would have delivered the entire light rail for the Gold Coast. If those opposite want to talk about delivering infrastructure for Queensland, there is only one side that delivers infrastructure for Queensland, and that is this side of the House. We are building the Cross River Rail. We are building more of the light rail, and we will continue to make sure that we create the jobs that are needed to go with it.

This builds on our huge investment into the M1, with the upgrade between Varsity Lakes to Tugun now underway supporting more than 850 jobs. The Gold Coast Light Rail from Broadbeach to Burleigh will create over 760 jobs. We will continue to make sure that we invest in that vital infrastructure. We know how important stage 2 was. We fast-tracked that work to ensure it was ready for the Commonwealth Games and now that connectivity all the way down to the airport to Coolangatta is going to transform the way people on the Gold Coast can commute from one end of the Gold Coast all the way to the other.

Those opposite are reckless. They do not know—

Mrs Frecklington: Back to the LNP! It really is our day!

Ms PALASZCZUK: I enjoy talking about the LNP. I do not know about everyone else in this House, but we on this side like talking about the LNP because we want to remind Queenslanders about what is at risk and we are happy to remind Queenslanders each and every day. I will tell members what we are focused on. We are focused on the health response when it comes to tackling COVID and we are focused on getting people back into work. While I am on my feet, if those opposite want to talk about blowouts, go and have a look at the \$1 billion 1 William Street that the LNP invested in, and we do not even own it. Do you want to talk about reckless? That is reckless. That is the only infrastructure project that you built when you were in office.

Mr SPEAKER: Through the chair, Premier.

Ms PALASZCZUK: You built a building for yourself. That is what you did.

(Time expired)

Cross River Rail

Mr MINNIKIN: My question is to the Minister for State Development. What will the southern area modification to Cross River Rail cost Queensland taxpayers?

Dr Miles interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order, Deputy Premier.

Mr Powell interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier is warned under the standing orders. The member for Glass House is warned under the standing orders.

Ms JONES: I can advise the House that any costs associated with the detailed design and alignment must be absorbed within the existing budget. We have said from day one that the southern alignment was going to be one of the most challenging areas of the project. We have engineers from Cross River Rail, Queensland Rail and TMR all working together on this. I cannot be any clearer than what I said in my ministerial statement that, regardless of which station was chosen, this alignment was going to have to be dealt with and we are dealing with it appropriately. As I said, any costs associated with finalising this detailed design work will have to be absorbed within the existing budget for Cross River Rail.

I am very proud to be part of a government that will be delivering much better commuter transport than the member for Chatsworth would, because if the member for Chatsworth and the other side had won at the last election then this would not be getting built. If we had taken their advice, his very own constituents would have had to get off and walk nine minutes to get to a Cross River Rail station—that is, walking backwards, kind of like Vince Lester. We did not think that was the right outcome. We absolutely looked at the alternative. We examined that alternative, and there were merits in some of that design, but ultimately our decision was to go with the Boggo Road station and an interchange—a true interchange—for all of the commuters on the Gold Coast line—the people those opposite are meant to be representing in this parliament—

Dr Miles interjected.

Ms JONES:—I take that interjection—as well as the Cleveland line. We know that in bayside and eastern suburbs we are seeing record growth. They are some of the fastest growing suburbs in our state.

We have listened to the advice. We examined the options and we believe that we have made the right decision in the best interests of commuters across South-East Queensland. The Premier is absolutely right to think about where we would be today. In Victoria we are seeing, as the Premier has said, an almost total shutdown of the construction industry. We are delivering \$4 million a day in economic activity through the Cross River Rail project. This means pay packets going home to families in some of the toughest economic times that our state has ever faced. We will continue to get on with the job. We are working very closely with all of our partners in the consortium and we will deliver world-class infrastructure for the people of Brisbane through the new underground that is Cross River Rail.

Coronavirus, Health Response

Mrs MULLEN: My question is to the Deputy Premier and Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services. Will the Deputy Premier update the House on how the Palaszczuk government has kept my community south of Brisbane safe from a COVID-19 outbreak and is he aware of any alternative approaches?

Dr MILES: I thank the member for Jordan for her question. In fact, I thank her and the government members in the Logan City area, the Ipswich City area and the southern suburbs of Brisbane for their leadership over the last couple of weeks. They have truly worked with us to keep their communities safe. We thank the staff of the Metro South HHS, the West Moreton HHS, Pathology Queensland, the State Health Emergency Coordination Centre and the Department of Health. Thanks to their fantastic efforts we have managed to stamp out that potential outbreak in the southern suburbs.

Until there is a vaccine or a treatment for COVID-19 we have to use the tools available to us and that is precisely what we have done over these last two weeks. We have traced every contact. We have tested widely. We have quarantined anyone who may have been exposed and, of course, we have continued to socially distance. Those are the tools that were used and thanks to a massive mobilisation

across the southside we can be cautiously optimistic that there will be no further community transmission from those cases which, of course, allows us to allow those businesses on the southside to stay open and allows people to keep going to work. That is exactly what this is all about: keeping people safe and letting our economy recover. We were only able to do that on the southside because we have rebuilt our front-line health services.

In just three years those opposite decimated health services in Metro South and West Moreton. In Metro South alone they cut 926 health staff, 299 of them nurses. Imagine where we would be. In West Moreton they cut 124 health staff, 92 of them nurses, not to mention the 69 pathology staff and the 177 public health staff cut by those opposite. We have only been able to respond the way we have because we have rebuilt those services and even more. We could not have done it without those staff.

We also could not have done it if the borders were open—if we were dealing with hundreds of outbreaks from Victoria—as those opposite would have us do. They called on us to open the borders not once, not twice, but 64 times. In fact, last week they were still petitioning for us to open the border. I notice they did not table that petition this morning so for the public record I will table it on their behalf.

Tabled paper: LNP online petition page, titled 'Open Qld's Borders' [1308].

Cross River Rail

Mr POWELL: My question is to the Minister for State Development. In light of the documents showing the member for South Brisbane overruled expert advice about the southern area modification in favour of her own plan for Dutton Park station, will the minister now review this decision which could waste up to \$1 billion of taxpayers' money?

Ms JONES: I thank the member for the question because it gives me another opportunity to reiterate the comments that I made in my ministerial statement this morning. As I said, we looked at that station as part of the deliberations of government. We looked at the advice and we came to the conclusion that the Boggo Road interchange, in line with our election commitment, actually delivered the best outcome for more commuters from right across South-East Queensland, remembering it is here that we have the existing Gold Coast line and Cleveland line.

Mrs Frecklington: Disabled access, there's the metro.

Ms JONES: You want to talk about disabled access? I was in Maryborough last week and guess what I was examining? I was examining the trains imported from India that did not meet specifications for people with disability.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms JONES: Are you serious? How much are we spending on that? I think it is \$80 million that we are spending to fix the trains that the Leader of the Opposition imported from India. Do not come in here and lecture about disability of all things. My goodness!

What I can say to the Leader of the Opposition is that the Downer workers who are working on upgrading those trains, the cheap alternative those opposite imported from India, not ones built here in Queensland by Queenslanders, are very happy to have that job. It is unfortunate that we have had to spend \$80 million to fix up their mess. Having said that, the Premier's decision to enable that to occur in Maryborough has created jobs in Maryborough, and the people of Maryborough are very happy to be employed in that work.

In regard to Cross River Rail, we examined that option, we looked at it, and the strong view was, given the commuters coming on the Gold Coast line—

An opposition member: Strong view.

Mr Powell: Very strong view!

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members to my left.

Ms JONES: Well, you had a very strong view on borders: 64 times. Sixty-four times! We did examine that option. We looked at all of the options from the different proponents and our view was, and it remains, that the Boggo Road interchange is the best option for more commuters from more train lines. We are transforming the way that people will be using public transport into the future. Remember, at the Boggo Road train station interchange there will be the Cleveland line and the Gold Coast line coming in and connecting directly to the underground Cross River Rail stations.

The alternative, as I explained in my ministerial statement, would mean that the member for Chatsworth's constituents would have to get off at Park Road and walk up to nine minutes back to the other station. We did not think that was a fair impost on those commuters. The whole point of Cross River Rail is to encourage more people to use public transport, to get cars off our roads and be congestion busting. That is actually what we are doing. While I am on my feet I do want to say, and I want to be very clear, that in regard to the southern area modification any changes will be absorbed within the existing budget.

Coronavirus, Economic Response

Mr MELLISH: My question is to the Treasurer, Minister for Infrastructure and Planning. Will the Treasurer update the House on how Queensland's plan to control the spread of COVID-19 is assisting the Queensland economy and is he aware of any alternative approaches?

Mr DICK: I thank the member for Aspley for his question. I know the member for Aspley follows what is happening in the Queensland economy very closely and he would be aware of the Deloitte Access Economics June quarterly outlook report. In that report Deloitte said if you cannot beat the virus you cannot open up and if you cannot open up your economy will struggle. It has been eight days since the last case of community transmission in Queensland. What a great result thanks to the great work of Queenslanders. Because of that success over the upcoming long weekend, Queenslanders can enjoy all of the great things that our state offers.

It would have been a very different story if the member for Nanango had been the premier. Sixty-four times the LNP called for the borders to be opened early, including on 30 June when the Leader of the Opposition declared, 'We know it's safe to open the borders because the Prime Minister has said it is safe to open the borders'. Let me make this clear to all members of the House and Queenslanders: we take our health advice from the Chief Health Officer, the best in the country, Dr Jeannette Young. We do not take our health advice from 'Scotty from marketing'.

With the long weekend coming up, the big question on the lips of all Queenslanders is will the LNP return to Noosa? I read with interest in the *Courier-Mail* about the LNP's \$25,000 trip to the exclusive island near Noosa owned by Virgin airlines founder Sir Richard Branson.

They hate his airline but they love his island—Makepeace Island. 'Make peace' is what they were trying to do—no doubt in all futility—when they were there. Makepeace Island with its landscaped gardens, a lagoon pool and a 15-person spa. First person in, the member for Chatsworth. If only the palm trees could talk. Of course, there were some notable absentees. Verity Barton was not there. There had been some earlier evictions. The member for Whitsunday was not there. Jann Stuckey was not there. It looked like the member for Nanango was going to be an eviction but she hung on, and then in true *Survivor* fashion the tribe spoke and the axe fell on the party president. Dave Hutchinson from mergers and acquisitions is out.

While the LNP is focused on themselves, we are focused on Queensland and what Queenslanders need. We are focused on the job of keeping Queenslanders safe and getting Queenslanders jobs. Every day that passes the starker the contrast becomes between the rabble of the opposition and the government led by the Premier. Between the double standard dithering of the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier, only one party can be trusted with the future of Queensland and that is Labor.

Coronavirus, Diplomatic Exemption from Restrictions

Ms BATES: My question is to the Premier. Last week the Premier said that she was furious about a fake diplomat entering Queensland and promised to address the issue at national cabinet. However, today it is reported that the Premier did not raise the issue of diplomatic immunity at the most recent national cabinet meeting. How can Queenslanders trust the Premier when she does not follow through on her promises?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I say to the member for Mudgeeraba that that is not true. I will not speak about national cabinet, but I will say that the issue that I did raise was the issue of people travelling domestically and not having access to that information. That is definitely what I raised at national cabinet and that is definitely an issue that national cabinet is continuing to look at. I reject the premise of the member's question. I will say this: at least the member for Mudgeeraba comes to briefings from the Chief Health Officer on COVID. I am advised that the Leader of the Opposition has not attended.

Ms Bates: The Premier hasn't either—not one.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I attend meetings with the Chief Health Officer all of the time. My time and the time of the Minister for Health is spent protecting Queenslanders. It is the biggest issue facing Queensland and the Leader of the Opposition could not be bothered to come to a briefing with the Chief Health Officer—twice.

Mrs Frecklington: How many times, Premier? Zero!

Ms PALASZCZUK: Here we go. It just shows that the opposition would not listen to the health advice. They are too busy. What else could the Leader of the Opposition be doing? We know that the LNP cannot travel to Sydney for a little getaway. We have the long weekend coming up, but they cannot go to wineries in Western Australia because that is locked away.

A government member: They can't go to Canada.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The member for Burleigh cannot go to Canada. It begs the question: where will the opposition be going this long weekend? It is about time that they supported Queensland. Obviously, as the Treasurer has said, someone found time to go to Makepeace Island—

Dr Miles: And the spa.

Ms PALASZCZUK:—and the spa. That is not at all cheap.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition is warned under the standing orders.

Ms PALASZCZUK: They cannot find time to come to a briefing with the Chief Health Officer and I think that says it all.

Tourism Industry

Ms PUGH: My question is of the Minister for State Development, Tourism and Innovation. Will the minister update the House on the importance of tourism in rebuilding Queensland's economy?

Ms JONES: I thank the honourable member for the question. I know she is a very passionate supporter of the tourism industry, which we know creates jobs right across Queensland. One of the proudest statistics for our government is that when we were elected around one in 12 Queenslanders were working in the tourism industry and before COVID-19 hit up to one in 10 people were working in the industry, including people who live in Mount Ommaney.

Mr Speaker, this one is for you: it will be one Ekk' of a long weekend coming up. I thank the Premier for listening to the tourism industry when it applied to move the public holiday to this Friday. As we said at the time to everybody at the RNA, we are really heartbroken that the Ekka has not been able to go ahead this year because of COVID-19. Like the Premier, I have gone every year of my life.

Mr Janetzki interjected.

Ms JONES: I take that interjection. We listened to the people of Queensland who said that it would be great if we moved to a long weekend just this once. I note that the tourism industry has often said that they would like it to be a long weekend every weekend, but the Premier, the government and I were very firm in saying that this is a one-off during COVID 19.

Already reports are coming in thick and fast that Queenslanders are taking advantage of the long weekend. People from South-East Queensland are going to stay in places right across the state. If you have not booked a holiday yet, we really encourage you to please book a holiday this long weekend and support our local tourism industry. I can also advise the House that since launching the Good to Go campaign, there have been more than 53 million impressions on our Visit Queensland page and advertising on social media channels with more than 2.6 million engagements. Today I am proud to announce that Queensland tourism businesses have received almost 130,000 direct leads from our new Queensland.com website.

We know that the tourism industry is doing it very tough right now and it will continue to do so while our national and state borders are closed, but we have acted in the best interests of Queenslanders. We will continue to stand shoulder to shoulder with the tourism industry as we roll out our record investment in tourism infrastructure and tourism spend, and we will work with them to ensure that we get jobs back online as soon as possible. This long weekend creates an opportunity for us to

provide a real boost to tourism businesses right across the state. If you have not booked your Ekka long weekend, now is the time to do so. I encourage all members of the House and all Queenslanders to stand by the tourism industry during these tough times. It is always there for us, rolling out the welcome mat when we want to go on holidays, regardless of where to—even to an LNP love-in.

Cross River Rail

Mr BLEIJIE: My question without notice is to the Minister for State Development, Tourism and Innovation. Will the minister tell the House: what is the total cost of the Cross River Rail project?

Ms JONES: It is already in the budget papers. The allocation in the state budget is \$5.4 billion for the project.

School Infrastructure

Mr POWER: My question is for the Minister for Education. Will the minister update the House on how the Palaszczuk government is investing in Queensland's schools as well as the schools of the future?

Mr Crisafulli: You have one job.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Broadwater. We have limited seating in the chamber.

Ms GRACE: I thank the member for the question, which goes to the heart of the infrastructure spend. Let me take a couple of minutes to catch my breath, as I had to catch my breath recently when I was at the Yarrabilba State Secondary College because it is fantastic.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock.

Mr Bleijie: The minister needs a drink of water.

Ms GRACE: I think I had better check the seal! I thank the member for Kawana for his generosity. It was really terrific to visit the school. The kids were amazing. They love every minute of it and the sports complex is the thing that they really love.

An opposition member interjected.

Ms GRACE: You now have me embarrassed; that is the problem. We officially opened the new \$6.4 million classroom block at the Park Ridge State High School. It is another wonderful building and the students very much enjoy the new facilities.

Mr Perrett interjected.

Ms GRACE: Do not worry: one day it will happen to you as well. At Yarrabilba the indoor sports facility is a real hit. The students in years 7 and 8 absolutely love it. The robotics room at the new critical thinking centre at Park Ridge State High School ensures that students will have the skills they need for the jobs of the future. Recently I was in Bundaberg where it was great to open the new \$12 million indoor sports facility at Bundaberg State High School. A new school is being built at Palmview, Baringa State Secondary College, which I visited with the Premier. At Pimpama the newly named Gainsborough State School is also wonderful.

Recently I took a look at the LNP website under their new president and I had to take another breath because there is nothing much on offer. It is the same old policies recycled from the Newman government. Let us look at their so-called plan, which was recycled by the member for Clayfield and now recycled for a third time by the Leader of the Opposition. As we know, their back to basics curriculum is just code for cuts to school programs and important subjects such as STEM. They have a policy to make English mandatory, but senior English is already mandatory and you need to get a sound achievement to get an ATAR score. Of course, they say they will reinstate independent public schools, but currently we have 250 of those schools.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I move that the honourable minister be further heard.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Kawana, but I believe you need to seek leave. There is no point of order.

Ms GRACE: In relation to air-conditioning every classroom, we are getting on with the job. We are doing that along with staffrooms and libraries. All we have is tired old policies from an opposition not fit to govern.

Coronavirus, Diplomatic Exemption from Restrictions

Mr JANETZKI: My question without notice is to the Premier. It is reported today that the exemption for diplomats and consular officials still exists with quarantine a mere option on their arrival into Queensland. Can the Premier explain why, despite promising to close this loophole last week, diplomats and consular officials can still walk straight into Queensland?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for the question. From the outset, can I say that if you are travelling on a diplomatic passport or if you are a consular official that is the responsibility of the federal government. Clearly, our Chief Health Officer is speaking to the other health officers and we are speaking with the federal government about this issue. We would like the issue to be rectified as quickly as possible.

There is a broader issue, which is the one that I raised at national cabinet, about the lack of availability of contact details when people travel domestically. I think this is a bigger issue. It is one that the other states and territories also recognise. To that extent, as I said earlier, that is why national cabinet is doing further work on this issue. I do not want to discuss any more details about that, because national cabinet conversations are private. Having the opportunity to see those flight manifests is very important when we are dealing with a global pandemic. Anything that we can do to protect Queenslanders is worth pursuing. If that means the federal government speaking with the airlines, then that needs to happen.

If the member is so keen to talk about consular and embassy officials, his first port of call should be the federal government. I am not the federal government; I am the state government. I am very keen to have the flight manifest details, which is what I have been asking for since February, to give our contract tracers the ability to trace as quickly and efficiently as possible. That is why it was on the national agenda and that is why more work is being done: so we can fix it, just as we have fixed the issues around freight, working collectively together. Truck drivers are now tested regularly, across the nation. We will work in a collective spirit to fix these issues as fast as practicable.

At the end of the day, it is about protecting Queenslanders. There is only one side of the House that is focused on protecting Queenslanders' health, taking the best health advice from our Chief Health Officer. I will not be lectured to by those opposite, who came into this House and demanded that I open the borders and put Queenslanders' health at risk. I will not forget that and Queenslanders will not forget it.

Mr Crisafulli interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Oh, here we are: the great pretender, the member for Broadwater—

(Time expired)

Electricity Prices

Mr SAUNDERS: My question is to the Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy. Will the minister update the House on the impact of the relief that the government is providing to Queenslanders on their utility costs?

Dr LYNHAM: I thank the member for Maryborough for the question. I know that Queenslanders are doing it tough during this pandemic, just like everyone around the world. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the fine people of Maryborough, and Queenslanders as a whole, for their efforts in doing the right thing. That has allowed us to roll out Queensland's strategy for economic recovery. That recovery includes relief for everyday household costs—for water and electricity bills. Some two million Queenslanders have already received their \$200 utilities rebate. Small businesses are receiving a \$500 utilities rebate. I know from going around the state how important this relief is and how this relief is making a difference for households and small businesses.

A couple of weeks ago I stayed at the Blue Shades Motel in Maryborough—a fine establishment. I had a chat with the owner, Kellie, who is one of the best kind of people in the world because she is originally from Stafford. Kellie did not gild the lily. Times are tough in hospitality, so that \$500 rebate off her power bill came as welcomed relief.

How can we do this? Because we own our assets. That is how we can do it. Kellie owns them. Maryborough pensioners Russell and Mary Healy, whom I mentioned earlier, own them. The \$250 off Queensland power bills this year and the \$50 off next year are only possible because the people of Queensland own their assets—not a company in Switzerland, not a company in China, not a company in Europe. Queenslanders own these assets.

What did those opposite offer in their three years in government? A 43 per cent price increase. Everyone can remember Strong Choices. They wanted to sell our energy assets—hand over those poles and wires, sell Energex and Ergon to the highest bidder, sell Powerlink. How do members reckon Kellie from the Blue Shades Motel would go phoning up Switzerland and asking for a rebate? It would be non-existent. Public ownership, affordable energy and renewable energy are what we need. The only difference between the LNP's policy of 2015 and now is that in 2015 they announced asset sales to the public. This time around they are going to hide it.

CopperString 2.0

Mr KATTER: My question is to the Premier and Minister for Trade. Will the Premier guarantee to the workers on CopperString from Townsville to the north-west that the government will use its power and not fail to ensure the future of their mining and manufacturing jobs?

Ms PALASZCZUK: As the member for Traeger mentioned, CopperString is a very important project for the government. It would generate some 3,500 ongoing jobs and inject millions, if not billions, of dollars into the economy. It is one of the largest projects for the north of Queensland that we have ever seen and it is something that we are absolutely committed to doing.

We know that there is huge potential in North Queensland and that the connectivity between Townsville and Mount Isa would serve the state and the industries associated with that for generations to come. We will continue to back the project. I will have more to say about the project in coming weeks and months. I am quite sure that we will continue to keep the member informed. It is a vital project. It is one that has huge support. Whenever I speak to people in Mount Isa and Townsville, everyone is supportive of it. We will continue to back the north-west.

Works for Queensland

Mr HEALY: My question is to the Minister for Local Government, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs. Will the minister update the House on the success of the recent COVID-19 Works for Queensland round and the support for Works for Queensland across the state?

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I thank the member for Cairns for the question. I was thrilled to be with him when we announced the successful projects for the COVID-19 Works for Queensland round on 9 July. The COVID-19 Works for Queensland round is a \$200 million injection into the Queensland economy as we embark on the journey to recover from the impacts of the global pandemic. It has provided funds to all local governments across the state to deliver shovel-ready projects that not only provide and sustain jobs now but also leave meaningful and lasting community benefit into the future.

As part of the Palaszczuk government's \$6 billion Unite and Recover for Queensland Jobs plan, some 520 projects will be delivered by councils, creating or supporting around 4,600 jobs across the state. This round of Works for Queensland will assist councils across Queensland as they work hard to provide employment in their communities and to provide wonderful community infrastructure. Water and sewerage works, tourism attraction projects, park upgrades, airport upgrades, bikeways and footpaths are some of the works that will be undertaken in the next 12 months under this project.

I was also asked about the response to this funding round from across the state. I am absolutely thrilled to advise the House that there has been widespread appreciation of the work done by the Palaszczuk government to support local governments and their communities across Queensland. Not only have we seen mayors get behind Works for Queensland; it seems that those opposite have finally realised that the program is meaningful to their communities. In the spirit of this new-found bipartisanship, I would like to publicly thank the member for Ninderry for his recent advocacy of Works for Queensland in his electorate. In a series of Facebook posts—and I table them—the member for Ninderry managed to understand the concept perfectly, saying—

This is a win-win outcome. Not only is it great investment in our local community; the project will also support local jobs!

Tabled paper. Extracts, undated, from the Facebook page of the member for Ninderry, Mr Dan Purdie MP, regarding sporting grants in his electorate [[1309](#)].

I could not have said it better myself. The Palaszczuk government welcomes this new-found policy direction of the LNP which is in stark contrast to the past four years where they have been silent in their communities about how terrific Works for Queensland is and what it means for their electorates. While the member for Ninderry is bravely out there congratulating the work of the Palaszczuk government and Works for Queensland, the rest of the opposition remain silent. Will they axe Works

for Queensland? Will they explain it to local governments and mayors across Queensland? Come on, they need to be more like the member for Ninderry and be supportive of Works for Queensland. I hope that they will be. I hope that they will get over their protests and unwillingness to support this great signature program of the Palaszczuk government and the way that it has delivered for Queensland over the past four years. I hope and trust that they will come to their senses and commit to it.

Coronavirus, Queensland Border Checks

Mr PURDIE: My question is to the Premier. Were the two girls arrested at Noosa yesterday even challenged or questioned by officials when they arrived in Brisbane on the train from Sydney or was this another breach of Labor's border honour system?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am happy for the police minister to get back to the member on that. I do not have that information at hand. Let me say very clearly to the member for Ninderry that those opposite called for the borders to be opened 64 times. There would have been no border pass. There would have been no checks. It would have been open season for all. Anybody would have been allowed in here without any checks or balances.

The member for Ninderry is absolutely reckless. The Leader of the Opposition is reckless. The member for Mudgeeraba is reckless. Every single LNP member is reckless and would have put all Queenslanders at risk. We will defend Queenslanders every single day. Every single day we will defend Queenslanders. It was the recklessness of the opposition that called 64 times to have the borders opened. Now they dare not mention that word. Border, what border? Border pass, what border pass?

Where is the member for Currumbin? The member for Currumbin was assisting people across the border. Where were the border pass checks there? I say to the Leader of the Opposition: go out in public and see what the public has to say to you.

Logan and Gold Coast, Road and Transport Infrastructure

Mrs McMAHON: My question is of the Minister for Transport and Main Roads. Will the minister update the House on how the Palaszczuk government's plan for economic recovery, which includes \$23 billion for roads and transport, is benefiting communities between Logan and the Gold Coast and restoring the deep cuts of the previous LNP government?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the honourable member for Macalister for her question and for her commitment to infrastructure and jobs for Logan and the Gold Coast. Our commitment of \$23 billion is seeing 21½ thousand jobs created, four M1 upgrades worth \$2.3 billion, Gold Coast Light Rail stage 3 early works underway and a billion dollars in road stimulus announced over the last three months. We are creating jobs by building infrastructure. That is our economic plan to recover from the COVID pandemic.

We are restoring the economy from the deep cuts of those opposite—a legacy that is so vast and so deep that even the members of the opposition cannot remember what they cut. In June—and I am glad the member is here—the member for Mudgeeraba wrote to my department demanding to know what happened to a \$21 million commitment by the previous Bligh Labor government for the Gold Coast-Springbrook Road. I quote from her letter, which reads—

Where did the allocated \$20.3 million set aside to construct this project go to as it obviously has not gone to any construction at all?

There is a very simple answer. It was the LNP government that cut it. She was a member of the cabinet—albeit briefly—that cut this project and she does not remember what she cut. For the benefit of the member for Mudgeeraba, who gives me such fantastic material—I thank the member for Mudgeeraba for that—I will point out the other cuts they made on the Gold Coast. A \$35 million project for the Southport Nerang Road was cut by the LNP. The \$19.8 million for Tamborine Oxenford Road was cut by the LNP. The \$25 million for the upgrade of the Smith Street connection road was cut by the LNP Newman government. The most amazing thing is that she writes to me forgetting the projects that her own government cut during Campbell Newman's era. There was not a single new dollar for the M1.

Ms Bates: I didn't forget. Craig Wallace cut it.

Mr BAILEY: The member for Mudgeeraba can yell and scream all she likes—

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock! Member for Mudgeeraba, I appreciate there is some provocation, but you will cease your interjections.

Mr BAILEY: We know the LNP cut \$600 million from roads last time they were in government. They did it before and they will do it again. We know it is in their DNA. They called on borders to be open 64 times. The current member for Currumbin was helping people cross the border illegally, on camera.

We know we cannot trust them on cuts. We know that we cannot trust them on the border. On Twitter the member for Burleigh seemed to be standing by his billboard saying 'Open the borders' only in the last few days. They have not learnt their lesson. We cannot trust the LNP when it comes to job cuts. We cannot trust them on the borders. They do not listen to health advice. Their reckless approach to the health of this state is a disgrace. We all know what would have happened if they had been calling the shots in government. Queenslanders would not be safe because we cannot trust the LNP on the health response, on roads, on cuts.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: The period for question time has expired.

MOTION

Business Program



Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (11.17 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 Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, a maximum of three hours to complete all stages
 - (b) the Forest Wind Farm Development Bill, a maximum of 2.5 hours to complete all stages
 - (c) the Queensland Future Fund Bill and the Royalty Legislation Amendment Bill, a maximum of four hours to complete all stages
 - (d) the Health Legislation Amendment Bill, a maximum of 2.5 hours to complete all stages.
2. The following time limits for the bills listed in 1. apply:
 - (a) the minister to be called on in reply:
 - (i) for the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill by 30 minutes before the expiry of the maximum hours
 - (ii) for the Forest Wind Farm Development Bill by 30 minutes before the expiry of the maximum hours
 - (iii) for the Queensland Future Fund Bill and the Royalty Legislation Amendment Bill by 30 minutes before the expiry of the maximum hours
 - (iv) for the Health Legislation Amendment Bill by 30 minutes before the expiry of the maximum hours.
 - (b) consideration in detail to be completed by three minutes before the expiry of the maximum hours
 - (c) question on third reading to be put by two minutes before the expiry of the maximum hours
 - (d) 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, 13 August 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 last night's meeting. As members will appreciate, this is the penultimate sitting week of this term and the Palaszczuk government is getting on with the job of delivering for all Queenslanders. We have a number of bills on the *Notice Paper* which will benefit Queenslanders right across our state as we continue to deliver economic recovery and unite and recover Queensland from COVID-19.

Members will note that there are six bills within this business program motion before the House and I urge everyone to support this sensible motion and these bills. I acknowledge that prior to question time we moved motions in relation to cognating four of those bills. The legislation before the House

ranges from legislation to strengthen the protections the Palaszczuk government has already put in place to protect our pristine environment, legislation to assist the development of the Forest Wind farm and to further enable renewables in Queensland, legislation dealing with our economy and strengthening our economy and health related legislation to be moved by the Deputy Premier and Minister for Health to further strengthen the Palaszczuk government's work in protecting Queenslanders.


On that point about health, we know the great work that Queensland Health is doing under the leadership of our amazing Chief Health Officer, Dr Jeannette Young, the director-general and the Minister for Health and Deputy Premier in keeping our communities safe from COVID-19. Of course, they are led by the Premier in that great work. On behalf of my community of Redcliffe, and indeed all Queenslanders, we thank Dr Young for her outstanding and diligent work in keeping our communities safe during COVID-19. As the Premier said earlier today, we thank all Queenslanders for their efforts in dealing with COVID-19 and working with us collectively to protect this state. We know that we all have to play a role, but the leadership of our health sector is absolutely critical. Dr Jeannette Young's efforts are unquestionable.

Mr Hunt: Ministerial statement.

Mrs D'ATH: I take that interjection. If those opposite think it is an issue or a waste of time complimenting Dr Jeannette Young and Health on these wonderful things, then by all means they can raise that.

To ensure that this House gets on with the job of debating in their house—the people's house—the legislation that matters to the people of Queensland, I will move a motion later this week to suspend the debate of committee reports for this week's sitting to enable further time for this House—in particular, those opposite—to debate the legislation put before this House by the Palaszczuk government, which is getting on with the job of delivering for all Queenslanders.

We have a lot to do in our last two sitting weeks before the election. The people of Queensland expect us to get on with that job. I know that the Manager of Opposition Business will get up and once again criticise the business program. He has two occasions left to continue to criticise it this term. It is important that these bills are debated and that we do it in a way that the people of Queensland can listen and participate in that debate during sensible sitting hours that we introduced in this term of parliament. I continue to thank the committee members for their contribution. I ask for the support of all members in relation to this motion.

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (11.21 am): I would have thought that in the last 2½ years the Leader of the House would have worked out by now that I am never going to support these ridiculous anti-democratic, democracy-is-dead-in-Queensland, stupid motions moved by the government. It is a complete farce—

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

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw. The Business Committee takes up half an hour of my life each parliamentary sitting week that I can never get back. It is all the worse now for having the Minister for Transport and Main Roads serving on that committee. Being in opposition is one thing; being in opposition and serving on a committee with Minister Bailey is another thing completely.

In the last sittings three bills were guillotined. Ministers, members of the government, crossbench members and members of the opposition were all guillotined from speaking on bills. We have seen that continual erosion of democracy in the last 2½ years under the Palaszczuk Labor government because of the arrogance of this government. We can hear it in their answers in question time today—the arrogance. On 31 October the people of Queensland will have their say. They will have their say on the arrogant Palaszczuk Labor government. I can see the smirks over there now. They will not be smirking and laughing on 1 November, I can assure them of that.

The Leader of the House talks about this sensible motion. It is not a sensible motion. It has not been a sensible motion for 2½ years. When you are gagging members of parliament, there is no sense to that. There is no sensibility about that. It is basically killing democracy. Then the Leader of the House talks about the important matters to debate and that the people of Queensland want to see these matters debated. The people of Queensland want to see their members of parliament doing what they get paid for—and that is to sit here until whatever time is necessary to have their say and debate these motions and/or bills.

Six bills are being debated this week. It is like the government woke up on Monday morning and thought, 'My goodness, we only have six sitting days left and we were meant to have passed all this legislation, so now we are going to debate six bills.' They are cognating bills that are not even relevant to each other—for instance, the Queensland Future Fund Bill and the Royalty Legislation Amendment Bill. They have gone through the committee process. They have no relevance to each other. They should have separate debate time. No, the government has to have six bills debated this week. They need to curtail the time of members. Then they will cognate both the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, as well as the Queensland Future Fund Bill and the Royalty Legislation Amendment Bill because they have run out of time.

Why have they run out of time? Because they cut parliamentary sitting weeks. They cut weeks out of this year. They cancelled the budget. They cancelled the estimates process. We have lost weeks of debate. At the start of the coronavirus I said in this chamber there is nothing to stop members of parliament sitting in this chamber with social distancing and all the requirements that every other business was expected to adhere to—but no. The Palaszczuk Labor government took the opportunity to avoid scrutiny and not come here because they hate coming here. Because Queensland does not have an upper house, the Legislative Assembly is the only place where they can be held accountable for their errors, misjudgements and budget blowouts. My goodness, this morning when they were talking about the Cross River Rail budget blowouts, they wear it as a badge of honour: 'It's the Labor way.'

Mr Bailey: It's called jobs.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the Minister for Roads—a billion dollar budget blowout and he says it is about jobs.

Mr Crandon interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member for Coomera. Member for Kawana, come back to the motion please.

Mr BLEIJIE: Then we get told in the Business Committee meeting yesterday, despite the fact we have these new family-friendly hours, which I have never supported, that the debate on committee reports scheduled on Thursday afternoon is not taking place to save the government a couple of hours. The committee members, as members of parliament, get paid to be on those committees to produce reports and to debate reports. This is the arrogance of the government: 'Don't worry about what the committees think.'


Mr Crandon: It's not important to them!

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the member for Coomera. Committee business is not important to them: 'Don't worry about the committees. Don't worry about the parliament. Let's cut the budget. Let's cut the estimates process. Let's curtail the parliament to family-friendly hours.' This is democracy dead in Queensland under the arrogant Palaszczuk Labor government and the Labor ministers. There is so much more to scrutinise. There are so many more dodgy ministers like Minister Mark Bailey whom we should be scrutinising every day of the week in the House.

Mr BAILEY: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence and ask that that be withdrawn.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): The member takes personal offence. I ask you to withdraw.

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw.

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (11.26 am): I know the member for Kawana struggles with the 21st century, but these standing orders are consistent with legislative chambers throughout the western world and our normal procedure. Oppositions and governments need to prioritise their speakers. What we are seeing here is a range of bills. What I contest to the opposition is this: tell us which bills we should not be debating. There is the Queensland Future Fund Bill. We know the opposition want assets sales. They obviously do not want to debate that.

Mr Crandon interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Coomera.

Mr BAILEY: They prefer Strong Choices. There is the Forest Wind Farm Development Bill. We know that they are against renewables. I guess it is predictable that they would oppose that bill going forward.

There are the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. They are anti environment. Every time we can rely on the LNP to be against the environment at every opportunity.

There is the Health Legislation Amendment Bill. There is a thing called a pandemic on. I do not know whether the opposition has noticed this. Necessarily, this chamber—

Mr Crandon interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Pause the clock. Member for Coomera, since you have come into the chamber you have interjected the entire time. Your interjections are not being taken. Next time you will be warned under the standing orders.

Mr BAILEY: In defence of the member for Coomera, he is under tremendous pressure out there, that is for sure.

Mr Crandon interjected.

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


Mr BAILEY: What we are seeing is that necessarily the parliament's business has had to be focused on the health response. That is very clear and well known. It is a global pandemic that has huge impacts on this state like everywhere else in the world. Necessarily the legislative program has been geared towards the emergency powers and what we needed to do to deal with something that protects the lives of Queenslanders. This is the best performing state in the country because we have prioritised people's health. We have listened to health advice all the way through and we have been consistent about it. We have not called for the borders to be opened 64 times. We have not been helping people across the border when it has been closed like the member for Currumbin, who has not just been not listening to the health advice but actively working against the health advice.

What we are seeing here is logical, orderly business. The 'death of democracy'? Spare me! The member for Kawana comes in here with his amateur thespian routines. If he does not like the Business Committee meeting I would suggest that he resign and give the position to someone who is competent. We put up with him. If it is all too much for him, maybe he should give it to somebody who actually knows what they are doing.

You have to prioritise speakers. Time and time again in the first term we heard the exact same lines from the LNP spoken by five, six or eight members. There was no original thought: they just regurgitated LNP briefing papers. That is not debate. That is not adding value to legislation. That is not contributing. It is just repetition. This place is too important for members to come in here and just repeat someone else's lines instead of making a genuine contribution. What these standing orders say is: make a genuine contribution. I know that for the opposition it is confusing to have to make a genuine, authentic, original contribution where you have research and do a lot of work. I know that is a bit difficult for them, but that is what you have to do. In a 21st century chamber in a democratic system cognate debates are normal.

We heard the member for Kawana repeatedly say, 'There's no budget.' Well, no state has a budget. There is a thing called a pandemic on. There is a federal budget coming down in October, so we will see what is in the federal budget. Like other states and jurisdictions, we will responsibly look at what is in the federal budget, and then no doubt there will be a budget that follows at some point in time after the election.

The opposition is wasting this chamber's time. This is another 15 minutes during which we could debate genuine legislation that matters. The member for Kawana loves his time when he can stand up and he can preen, he can strut, he can do his little amateur thespian routine in front of his colleagues and pretend that he knows what he is doing, but we all know that he does not. This opposition is going nowhere fast. This is a logical motion by the Attorney-General and I absolutely support it.

 **Mr MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11.31 am): I once again rise to speak against the business motion. The Minister for Transport and Main Roads may accuse the Manager of Opposition Business of being an amateur thespian, but the Minister for Transport and Main

Roads is a professional actor. No-one does it better on the Labor side of the House than the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, who is consistently acting because he cannot do his job properly. We have again come here to talk about an attack on the democratic processes of this House.

It is very interesting that the way this Labor government addresses the issue of dealing with more bills this week is not to extend the hours so we can talk about those things; it is to actually eliminate debate. We have eliminated the debate on committee reports because this government cannot manage its agenda. We had to eliminate that debate because they eliminated a whole week of parliament. We would welcome extra time so we can talk about issues that are important to Queenslanders. As the Manager of Opposition Business already mentioned, we are cognating bills that simply have nothing to do with each other. The future fund bill and the royalties bill are totally separate issues that deserve separate debate and focus—issues that are all supposedly about the economic future of our state. If I was this government I would not want extra debate time about these things either, because they do not want the flaws of this government to be exposed.

What have they done? They have eliminated debate time for committee reports, they have cognated bills, and they have refused to extend the hours of debate so that not only the 38 LNP members but all 93 members can contribute, and that is what the democratic process is all about. As the Manager of Opposition Business said, this government is good at eliminating things, and the most significant thing it eliminated is the budget. This morning the minister for Cross River Rail was asked about the budget of Cross River Rail and she said, 'It's in the budget papers.' What budget papers is she referring to?

Mr BAILEY: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Clearly, the member is not addressing the motion. He is now debating entirely different content to the motion moved by the Attorney-General.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. In reference to that point of order, under the standing orders my recollection is that the minister just spoke about the borders. If the minister could tell—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order! Member for Kawana, we are not going to debate across the chamber what people spoke about.

Mr BLEIJIE: Correct, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have not made a ruling yet. Member for Everton, I have been listening very intently to what you are saying. I am going to give you a little bit of latitude, but I encourage you to come back to the motion we are debating, please.

Mr MANDER: Thank you for that direction, Mr Deputy Speaker. The point I am making is that it is important that in this House we have time to speak about matters that are relevant to everyday Queenslanders, and of course one of the most important matters is a budget—a budget that we have not seen and will not see in this term of government—because there are questions that need to be asked about those things. Just a few weeks ago the Treasurer spoke about cost-saving measures and he mentioned glossy advertising. What have we seen in the last three or four weeks on our television screens and newspapers? A proliferation of advertising—

An opposition member interjected.

Mr MANDER: An avalanche of advertising. I will take that interjection from the—

Mrs D'Ath interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I think I am going to pre-empt you, member for Redcliffe. Member for Everton, I gave you a little bit of latitude. You now need to come back to the motion we are debating.

Mr MANDER: At every sitting and at the final sitting we will continue to fight for the democratic right of Queenslanders to have their representatives in this House speak on their behalf. By continuing to truncate debates, by continuing to refuse to extend the hours of operation and by cancelling sitting weeks that democratic right is not being exercised, and it is plainly wrong. If we want to see change in this area there is only one way we can see that change, and that is to elect a government that acknowledges and respects the democratic right of every Queenslanders for their representative to enunciate those views. On 31 October Queenslanders will have a chance to bring real change to this House, and that is by electing an LNP government.

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

In division—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): While the bells are ringing, I would like to acknowledge students from Everton Park State High School who are in the chamber joining us today. Welcome.

AYES, 47:

ALP, 47—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

NOES, 41:

LNP, 38—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Gerber, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Ind, 1—Bolton.


Resolved in the affirmative.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

BIODISCOVERY AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill resumed from 18 June (see p. 1390) and Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill resumed from 26 November 2019 (see p. 3768).

Second Reading (Cognate Debate)

 **Hon. LM ENOCH** (Algester—ALP) (Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef, Minister for Science and Minister for the Arts) (11.43 am): I move—

That the bills be now read a second time.

The Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019 and the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020 are both significant pieces of legislation that represent key reforms of the Palaszczuk government. I would like to thank the respective committees for their consideration of these bills—the former Innovation, Tourism Development and Environment Committee for consideration of the Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, and the Natural Resources, Agricultural Industry Development and Environment Committee for consideration of the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I would also like to thank those who participated in the two committee inquiries either by providing submissions or by attending a hearing.

The committee reports for the biodiscovery bill and the environmental protection bill were tabled on 21 February and 3 August 2020 respectively. Both committees recommended that the respective bills be passed. The committee report on the environmental protection bill also included three further recommendations. I am pleased to table the government's response to this report.

Tabled paper: Natural Resources, Agricultural Industry Development and Environment Committee: Report No. 6, 56th Parliament—Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020, government response [[1310](#)].

This response notes recommendation 1 of the committee's report—

... that the explanatory notes provided with a Bill note the existence or absence of a RIS and outline the process undertaken by the relevant department in consideration of the development of a RIS.

This is a general recommendation for all bills, but I would like to note that the Department of Environment and Science has been fully cooperative in providing detail on the regulatory impact assessment process that was undertaken for the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation

Amendment Bill when the committee requested further advice. To address the committee's recommendation, I would now like to table an erratum to the explanatory notes for the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill which provides detail on the regulatory impact assessment process undertaken. The erratum also corrects a numbering error.

Tabled paper: Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020, erratum to explanatory notes [\[1311\]](#).

As outlined in the government's response to the committee report, all elements of the bill were assessed in accordance with the *Queensland government guide to better regulation*. For key proposals, including the Rehabilitation Commissioner and residual risk reforms, a preliminary impact assessment was completed and submitted to the Office of Best Practice Regulation. The OBPR considered the assessment and concluded that the preparation of a RIS was not necessary. The other two recommendations asked that I provide clarity on some matters in my second reading speech, and I will address both of these shortly.

I will firstly address the biodiscovery bill. The Biodiscovery Act 2004 provides the legal framework for accessing Queensland's renowned biodiversity for commercial purposes and ensures that benefits from these activities are shared with Queenslanders. The biodiscovery bill supports Queensland's biodiscovery industry to grow and collaborate with international markets, paving the way for companies to be compliant with the Nagoya protocol. This is essential for effectively supporting Queensland's biodiscovery industry to grow and remain nationally and internationally competitive.

No-one has a better knowledge of Queensland's biodiversity than the First Nation peoples who have understood and utilised it for many thousands of years. That is why I am proud to say that this bill will give the custodians of traditional knowledge the means to benefit from, and participate in, biodiscovery. This bill will bring about consistency with the Nagoya protocol, which includes recognition and protection of traditional knowledge and has been ratified by 124 countries globally. It provides for consent and benefit sharing to be negotiated with traditional knowledge custodians on mutually agreed terms, where traditional knowledge is used in biodiscovery. This will enable First Nation peoples to feel confident about sharing their valuable knowledge of native plant and animal material and to share in any benefits on their own terms. It will also support new and innovative research to develop commercial products.

Approvals under the Biodiscovery Act will be simplified with the removal of biodiscovery plans from the approvals process—a sensible reform which reduces administrative burden for all. The biodiscovery bill clarifies the relationship between the Biodiscovery Act and relevant international protocols, primarily the Nagoya protocol and the International Treaty on Plant and Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, sponsored by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, commonly known as the FAO treaty. This clarity will assist Queensland researchers to share benefits worldwide for crucial food and agricultural crops and reduce confusion between overlapping legislative frameworks. The FAO treaty applies to use of food and agricultural resources to support food security. The Biodiscovery Act would still apply to non-food uses of agricultural crops, such as use in cosmetics.

As a government, we are committed to working in partnership with First Nation peoples. As the committee has acknowledged, engagement with stakeholders has been highly collegiate and I would like to thank both the traditional knowledge stakeholder round table and the biodiscovery entities for the collaborative nature of the discussions, and for the invaluable advice from the round table on proposed amendments relating to traditional knowledge. The Department of Environment and Science and I are committed to continuing detailed discussions with both these groups to develop the traditional knowledge code of practice and supporting guidelines. Developing the code of practice will ensure that people impacted by the new traditional knowledge obligation are fully aware of the steps they need to take in reaching agreements with custodians of traditional knowledge. Guidelines will further support the code by acknowledging culturally appropriate ways of engaging First Nation peoples.

Although not subordinate legislation, the code will be approved by regulation and therefore subject to parliamentary scrutiny. A person cannot be prosecuted for breaching the traditional knowledge obligation until the regulation and therefore the code is approved. Let me be clear though—while following the code is one way of fulfilling the traditional knowledge obligation, it is not the only way. The code will be written in plain English, rather than in the legal format required for a regulation, to provide clarity for biodiscovery entities. Therefore, it would be inappropriate to include the code in the regulation itself. There will nevertheless be protections in place for traditional knowledge while the code is being developed because the state will not enter a benefit-sharing agreement unless satisfied that the traditional knowledge obligation has been fulfilled.

During the committee's consideration of the biodiscovery bill concerns were raised that creating protections for traditional knowledge may cause delays in research and development. As the traditional knowledge obligation effectively provides assurance for both biodiscovery entities and First Nation peoples, its addition may accelerate the rate of new products and therapies being developed. This is because potential commercialisation partners are more likely to invest.

The amendments to the Biodiscovery Act will maintain Queensland's leadership in access and benefit-sharing regulation and reinforce our reputation as the preferred state for conducting biodiscovery. What is more, Queensland's First Nation peoples will be better able to participate in biodiscovery by negotiating the fair and equitable share of any benefits that arise.

In his contribution to the public hearing on this bill, David Claudie, CEO of the Chuulangun Aboriginal Corporation, thanked the government for proposing amendments to the act that 'take into account and respect the traditional knowledge of Indigenous peoples and for putting in place a framework that meets the obligations of the Nagoya protocol and the access to genetic resources for the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising'.

In his address to the committee, Mr Colin Saltmere of the Myuma Group, which includes the highly successful Dugalunji Aboriginal Corporation, spoke of the proven benefits of using traditional knowledge and engaging First Nation peoples in biodiscovery. Mr Saltmere explained that over the last 12 years their organisation's facilities, where development of a range of products using spinifex nanofibres is undertaken, have created training and employment opportunities for 1,200 young First Nation peoples. This includes work on research and development as well as harvesting and processing of spinifex. I am advised that, prior to the onset of COVID-19, 700 of these young people were still engaged.

As the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on the global economy become increasingly understood, industries like biodiscovery will play an important role in driving future employment and economic recovery in Queensland. Biodiscovery could lead to the development of novel drugs that might be used to treat or possibly even prevent another major health crisis in the future.

I am also taking this opportunity to address the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. This bill heralds the next step in improving our already world-leading rehabilitation regulations and will continue to contribute to creating more regional Queensland jobs through land rehabilitation. The Palaszczuk government is serious about Queensland being a world leader in rehabilitation standards for the resources sector to benefit the environment, the community and, importantly, our government's plan for jobs and economic recovery. The environmental protection bill enables the appointment of a Rehabilitation Commissioner with specific statutory functions. The Rehabilitation Commissioner's role is designed to further enhance Queensland's rehabilitation framework by providing clear, independent advice on best practice rehabilitation for the resources sector, the community and the regulatory functions of government.

I also note the almost 200 submissions the committee received that support the creation of a Rehabilitation Commissioner role in the interests of Queensland's environment, community, industry and economy. Creating this position will not add a regulatory burden. Rather, the role will add value to Queensland's environmental protection framework with new functions and expertise to support the government, industry and the community. The Rehabilitation Commissioner will provide rigorous scientific and independent advice that will be made available to both industry and government when making decisions on rehabilitation aspects of resource projects. This will improve rehabilitation outcomes and the efficiency of the regulatory system for the benefit of both the community and planning for rehabilitation across the resource industry.

We know the resource industry takes achieving world-class rehabilitation for Queensland seriously and we are responding to its request to provide greater clarity on achieving that. The Rehabilitation Commissioner means the government has a dedicated senior officer that can engage with stakeholders on best practice rehabilitation and associated matters. This will provide an additional opportunity for interested stakeholders including landholders, industry specialists, scientists and First Nation peoples to contribute to our world-leading rehabilitation outcomes.

The Rehabilitation Commissioner will have a unique role to play in promoting better understanding and awareness of rehabilitation matters and activities. For example, the Rehabilitation Commissioner will develop technical and evidence based reports on complex aspects of rehabilitation and best practice management of mine land. All the advice, reports and guidance prepared in the exercise of the Rehabilitation Commissioner's functions must be published online. This will ensure transparency and will also provide a valuable tool for stakeholders on best practice rehabilitation

standards. The appointment of a Rehabilitation Commissioner will also play a key role in providing strategic reporting on rehabilitation performance and trends. This will enable Queensland's resource sector rehabilitation framework to be properly evaluated and ensure greater public confidence by being more transparent in monitoring, measuring and reporting on rehabilitation outcomes.

The bill also supports our rehabilitation reforms through amendments to the residual risk provisions in the Environmental Protection Act. These amendments include a requirement for a post-surrender management report to be submitted with a surrender application where a resource activity has been carried out. The amendments do not introduce further information requirements for surrender. Their purpose is to ensure that the requirements are crystal clear and will be more efficient by consolidating existing requirements into the one report.

The Department of Environment and Science is working closely with industry to ensure there is sufficient guidance available so that resource operators can understand in advance what will be expected of them when it comes to surrender. This will assist with project planning and support the surrender of land so it can be made available for other productive uses as soon as practicable.

The residual risk assessment guideline will include and define all the technical terms relevant to undertaking a residual risk assessment. In its report, the committee recommended I clarify that the term 'credible residual risks' will be included and described in the residual risk assessment guideline. This was recommendation 4 of the report. The term 'credible residual risks' is not used within the residual risk assessment method nor in the legislation. The term used in the framework is 'credible risk events'.

The Department of Environment and Science has worked with subject matter experts and the resources industry to identify credible risk events that may occur after the surrender of a resource site. These credible risk events were then incorporated into a working model of the residual risk calculator by technical experts and validated by industry representatives. To ensure that the residual risk assessment is undertaken with reference to an individual resource site, the Department of Environment and Science will work with the industry implementation working group to ensure that the residual risk assessment guideline includes detail on how credible risk events will be identified and calculated. The guidelines will also determine how monitoring and maintenance are calculated for individual sites. In this way the residual risk assessment guideline will set out the quantitative risk assessment method to be used by environmental authority holders to assess the relevance and materiality of these credible risk events regarding their sites.

Immaterial or incredible risks are not included in the credible risk event component of the residual risk calculation. Where a credible risk event is identified, the residual risk calculation tool will assess the materiality of the risk measured against a threshold value. The credible risk event will only be included in the residual risk calculation when it is above the threshold.

Should this bill be passed, I will be writing to stakeholders as soon as possible inviting them to participate in the industry implementation working group. This working group will provide a user view of the documents and processes for the residual risk reforms to deliver practical, transparent and appropriate outcomes.

A key part of these reforms is the development of a consistent environmental risk assessment method for all resource activities to ensure the proper identification of ongoing management requirements. This will increase clarity and certainty for industry and landholders about how any remaining risks on resource sites being surrendered will be assessed, documented, funded and managed into the future.

This bill also includes the requirement for all post-surrender management reports to be included on a public register. This will enable information on the residual risk assessments to be accessible by current and future landholders. Further, the proposed new residual risk fund will ensure that residual risk payments are managed by an entity with the required expertise.

There is a range of other provisions in the environmental protection bill that address minor drafting and operational issues in the Environmental Protection Act. These amendments are directed at increasing efficiency and, while technical in nature, contribute to this government's ongoing work in ensuring high-quality legislation that addresses the needs of industry, regulators and the community.

I would now like to speak to recommendation 3 of the committee report for the environmental protection bill—that I clarify that the notation of residual risks on the land title will occur at a lot-on-plan scale, not on a resource tenure or environmental authority scale. This is certainly the intent of the bill's provisions. To ensure that this intent is unambiguous, I will move amendments during consideration in

detail. These amendments are to one provision of the bill, proposed new section 275B of the Environmental Protection Act, which provides for the recording of residual risks on land title to reflect the intent that notation on the title would only occur on those lots assessed as having ongoing management requirements.

During the committee inquiry, questions were raised about this section. The drafting in the bill meant the section could be interpreted as though notation on title was required for all lots covered by a surrendered environmental authority, even if only some of those lots had management requirements. As it is important that there is no ambiguity on this matter, amendments are proposed to ensure the intent is clearly and correctly reflected in the drafting. These amendments put beyond doubt that notation on title will only occur at a lot-on-plan scale, not at an environmental authority scale.


This bill also includes other minor and technical amendments to the Environmental Protection Act that will improve and clarify the requirements of existing regulatory processes. In particular, there are amendments to streamline and reduce regulatory burden for farmers in meeting the new Great Barrier Reef protection measures. These amendments will put beyond doubt that the application requirements for new commercial cropping and horticultural activities in reef catchments are limited to reef water quality matters such as the release of fine sediment. Further, there is no requirement for these environmental authorities to include details on how the land will be rehabilitated after the activity ceases. These amendments were supported by the Queensland Farmers' Federation and mean farmers are not required to do more than is necessary in meeting the new Great Barrier Reef protection measures.

I will also move amendments during consideration in detail of the environmental protection bill to amend the Acquisition of Land Act 1967 to support important koala conservation initiatives. Recently, the Gold Coast City council was hampered in its efforts to obtain several parcels of land in the regional landscape and rural production area for the purpose of koala conservation. This occurred because of a drafting error in the Acquisition of Land Act 1967 resulting in an inconsistency between this act and the South East Queensland Regional Plan 2017. The term 'regional landscape and rural protection area' should be replaced with 'regional landscape and rural production area' where it relates to the taking of land for koala conservation. These amendments will ensure that land may be taken for the purpose of koala conservation where that land is designated 'regional landscape and rural production area' in the South East Queensland Regional Plan 2017.

Both bills before us today address key commitments of the Palaszczuk government. The Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill fulfils the government's commitment to support the commercialisation of bioproducts and improve the business environment for biodiscovery.

Through Tracks to Treaty, the Palaszczuk government has committed to meaningful, impactful partnerships with First Nation communities that strengthen the way to self-determination and a more inclusive and respectful shared future. The recognition of the traditional knowledge possessed by this country's first scientists and the opening up of pathways for First Nation Queenslanders to share in the benefits from its use in biodiscovery are commitments the government is proud of.

The Palaszczuk government has also committed to ensure that land disturbed by resource activities is rehabilitated to the highest standards. The Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill represents another significant milestone in our delivery of this commitment. I commend the bills to the House.

 **Mr CRISAFULLI** (Broadwater—LNP) (12.05 pm): From the outset, I advise the House that the opposition will not oppose the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. During the course of my contribution, I will highlight some of the areas that we would dearly have loved more time to debate. It is fit and proper that I follow those speakers, particularly the Manager of Opposition Business, who highlighted how, in this mad scramble that we in this parliament find ourselves—with sittings being cancelled and no budget being handed down—we are now cobbling together things in some kind of eleventh-hour mad rush. In a democracy, it is a great shame when we should have every opportunity to debate it. If that means having to sit later, so be it. That option should have been on the table.

I start by thanking the minister for the briefing of her departmental staff and indeed herself in making contact, as is her style. Thank you, Minister. I also acknowledge the clarification in her second reading speech. Shortly I will discuss one of the amendments.

I will start with the mine rehabilitation element and the Rehabilitation Commissioner in the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I want to talk about, first and foremost, the importance of making sure there is a framework for the rehabilitation of mines in this state—not

demonised or victimised but rehabilitated. It is wrong of us in this place today to not acknowledge that there are many companies—in fact, the vast majority of companies—that are rehabilitating former mine sites to an excellent standard. Some do such a good job that people would not even know that a mine had been on the site. In the past, there were others that have not been so good. At estimates hearings over the course of two years I highlighted one: Baal Gammon. There was a lot of lip-service but not a lot of activity from the government until it was highlighted.

I refer to the Rehabilitation Commissioner. I acknowledge the quality of questions and the quality of the statement of reservation by LNP members of the committee, the members for Condamine, Buderim and Bundaberg. The commissioner has been given no compliance power but has been given a bureaucracy surrounding that role. I will put forward a cost that we could have avoided in still having this function. The Rehabilitation Commissioner will cost this state \$8 million over the next six years and will employ another six full-time staff. We still do not know what that function will look like. The committee process highlighted just how shambolic that is. We do not know what that function will look like or what powers it will have. We know that it does not have a compliance power, yet somehow we know that it needs another six full-time staff.

I would have thought, using the expertise within the department, that we could have used that opportunity to empower those existing staff towards going into this unit and being able to deliver value for money but also a sense of purpose for those staff with that skill set in the department of environment. We do not know what that skill set is yet, but I am certain that within that department there would be people with that skill set who could have filled that role and saved taxpayers this whopping big sum of money and still delivered an excellent outcome for the environment.

I want to highlight an element, whilst minor in nature, which will show why cobbling together things in a mad rush is never a good way to do business. The amendment to the reef environment legislation is one that is welcomed by the opposition, and I will tell members why it is welcomed by the opposition. Under the original changes to the reef quality legislation, individual landholders were asked to conduct paperwork to the same level as a mining entity. The irony that this has been put in a bill in which we are discussing mine rehabilitation is not lost on me, but that clarification shows that the government got it horribly wrong early on. I acknowledge the change. I wish it had never got to this stage, but I acknowledge it is a positive change. I would gladly talk about the need for good reef laws every day of the week, but do members know what I would like to talk about? I would like to talk about why it is so important that we should be able to come in this place and debate legislation when it comes to improving water quality and farm viability. That is the sort of debate I would have loved to have in this chamber, not handing over a blank cheque to the bureaucracy an authority to set those standards and change them at a whim, and members will see that tone and that flavour run through other parts of this bill.

I will turn to the biodiscovery element of the bill. I acknowledge, as the minister said, in a growing industry and one that is well and truly being supported by those research institutes the need to empower our First Nation peoples, but my comments are not going to reflect the intent of this bill. Rather, they are going to reflect the implementation of it and why we saw in that committee process some flaws. I start with the code of practice—a code that today, in the same way we did with the reef legislation, we will hand over authority not from this place, not for us to be able to debate what that code should look like, but we just hand over a blank cheque for it to be changed at any time in regulation. That is no way for a parliament to conduct itself.

A parliament should be willing to debate and stand by the laws it debates, not to hand over unfettered, unchecked and unregulated authority to those who are not accountable to people. How long will this code of practice take to develop when we do not know what the code of practice will say? The minister initially said 12 months and then the bureaucracy said that it was not possible to be doing it in 12 months and now we are being told we just do not know how long it will be.

Mr Krause: You couldn't possibly put a deadline on it.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I will absolutely take the interjection from the member for Scenic Rim. We have been told that we could not put a deadline on it, so we do not know what the code is and we do not know its implications but we do know that it cannot be done in a period of time that we had initially said that it would be done. What are the implications? There are penalties of up to \$600,000—penalties of up to \$600,000 in a code when we do not know what it looks like and we have handed that over without this place knowing its intent.

I want to talk about the Queensland protected areas and the loss of biodiversity. Mr Deputy Speaker, for your intent, it relates to clause 6 in article 15. When the government quite rightly debates issues like this, I want to highlight why we should be doing so much better in this state. We have spoken in this place about the Auditor-General's report, but I want to squirrel down and talk about the fall in funding when it comes to acquisitions for national parks and protected areas in this state. It is a shameless legacy of this government how—

Ms ENOCH: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. We are not talking about funding related to those matters. We are talking about the bills before us.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stevens): Thank you. Member for Broadwater, I ask you to come back to the long title of the bill, please.

Mr CRISAFULLI: Mr Deputy Speaker, at the start of my contribution I highlighted exactly what I am referring to. If you look at clause 6, you will see that the minister is in fact incorrect in saying it does not reference it. Today the Queensland Conservation Council has painted just how poorly a job this government has done in protecting those protected areas and therefore the loss of biodiversity, which is what this bill is about. It is one thing to talk about the environment, but environmental achievements are marked via actions, not words; via practical results, not virtue signalling. The government will stand up and it will empathise with people who will glue themselves to roads and sit on bridges to make a political point, but it will not get dirt under its fingernails and protect areas that need protecting.

There are many reasons why this state needs a change of government—many reasons—but one of them is to re-establish a legacy in this place of locking away areas for communities and people in a way that only practical conservationists can—areas like in the Far North of this state where the former environment minister empowered Indigenous communities to be able to protect things that were important to them. We are in the only time of this parliament when a government has protected over a million hectares of land in a single term, and for a conservation group to acknowledge that today is a great thing.

Ms ENOCH: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The clause that the member is alleging to refer to—clause 6—is about the Great Barrier Reef catchment areas. It is not relevant to the areas that he is discussing. He is out of scope of this bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, I have been listening intently, but I will take advice from the clerks at the table on the matter. However, the matters that the member was talking about were very much in terms of environmental areas and issues that are dealt with under the bill. I will take advice from the clerks at the table. Member for Broadwater, it is limited in terms of how far you can wander off the long title of the bill, so I would ask that you bring your comments back to the long title of the bill.

Mr CRISAFULLI: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I will now move on to an area that the minister raised, and that is amending drafting errors when it comes to koala protection, and I acknowledge the minister's intent in this. It was obviously sloppy drafting, but what the minister is doing is seeking to clarify what is an important area, but again I will take the opportunity to talk about practical conservation. For this government to have spent barely a third of what was already a miserly amount in protecting koala populations in the 2018-19 year is another shameful legacy.

The population of koalas in the northern Gold Coast will be at unsustainable levels in less than two decades and they may not exist in less than half a century and yet money that was set aside has not been spent to acquire this corridor. Shameful! We should be arguing in this place whether or not that quantum of money is sufficient, not whether or not, having set a budget, the government cannot even get out of its own way to purchase those corridors back.

Environmental legacy is about practical outcomes. It is about fulfilling what you say you are going to do. The delays in achieving good outcomes for the koala population of this state continue to compound. We heard about the council and its meeting dates, the timelines and the draft policy and we kept on seeing delays. In the meantime what has happened is that areas that needed to be protected were not. I will stand up in this place every day of the week that we get a chance to speak, and we do not have many cognated debates then guillotined after only a few hours, and speak about the need to protect the environment. I will also speak about the need to protect individual land rights.

If there is an area that is viewed to be environmentally sensitive and needs to be protected and it is assigned for development, the owner has to be compensated at a fair and reasonable value. That is why we have set aside money to purchase corridors. A good government will have the vision to say: how can we purchase future developmental land to prevent it from falling into hands that will mean it

will cost us more in the future? This government has done neither. It has not locked away parcels in a long-term strategic way. It has not sought to buy those corridors that have been put away because of past mistakes. In the meantime the issue we are discussing here is sloppy legislation rather than futureproofing and vision.

I conclude by saying the opposition will not be opposing these bills. I use my final comments to return to where I started: it is not an issue in my mind of the intent with these changes; it is the implementation that continues to trip up this government. I do not believe this government does not wish to protect koalas—we all do—but it is incapable of making tough decisions. I do not believe the government seeks to undermine protected areas, but it has a lack of vision and foresight to work with agricultural groups to ensure areas like nature reserves are put away, to ensure that those national parks we have already are actually maintained and improved.

Ms ENOCH: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. We are moving away from the actual core of these bills.


Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stevens): Member for Broadwater, in your final comments if we could turn back to the long title of the bill.

Mr CRISAFULLI: And they are my final comments. I note the minister getting a little agitated. I look forward to the minister, in her final contribution, indicating where I was in fact wrong in advising the House that the government has barely spent a third of the funds put away for koala rehabilitation. I look forward to the government correcting the Queensland Conservation Council which today painted an abysmal record of this government.

Ms ENOCH: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order again. The member is straying from the bill once again. It is out of the scope of the bills and I ask you to rule on the point of relevance.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Minister. Member, in your final comments, for the final time, could you return back to the long title of the bill.

Mr CRISAFULLI: In conclusion, the opposition will not be opposing this lengthy cognate bill, but we will continue to highlight where practical environmentalism will trump virtue signalling every day of the week.

 **Mr PEGG** (Stretton—ALP) (12.24 pm): It is great to be back in the House. I want to put on the record my thanks for the support of members from both sides of the House, including the member for Broadwater. I have been away for a little while but after listening to the member for Broadwater some things never change. The more things change the more they remain the same.

I recognise this is a cognate debate, but I did want to recognise that I was part of the Innovation, Tourism Development and Environment Committee that conducted the inquiry and reported on the Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill so I will be primarily focusing on that in my contribution today. Given that the committee no longer exists and this was one of our final reports, I place on the record my thanks to the members for Jordan, Cook, Theodore, Scenic Rim and Noosa and the committee secretariat for their hard work. We have morphed into another committee that no longer has environment responsibilities so I did want to place that on the record and also recognise the efforts of the minister in her contribution.

I want to address some of the remarks made by the member for Broadwater. He tried to make out that this bill and this debate was somehow rushed. The reality is that when one looks at the biodiscovery bill one finds that it was actually introduced last year. In fact, our committee report was completed in February of this year. Six months on, we are now debating this particular bill. I would not call that rushed in any form—quite the contrary. I reject those remarks made by the member for Broadwater.

The primary objective of the bill is to amend the Biodiscovery Act to ensure that it is contemporary, effective and equitable by reflecting international standards which include providing an obligation for the use of traditional knowledge. I think that is very important. It will also help Queensland's biodiscovery industry to remain globally competitive and ensure that the benefits of biodiscovery are shared equitably throughout Queensland, including, of course, with First Nation peoples. The committee did recommend that the bill be passed.

It is also important to note that Queensland was the first state or territory in the country to implement an access and benefit-sharing framework for biodiscovery with the introduction of the act which provided Queensland's emerging biotech industry with greater certainty and also gave effect to article 15 about access to genetic resources of the CBD. Since 2004 other jurisdictions, both nationally

and internationally, have adopted access and benefit-sharing legislation and policies. Queensland can be rightly proud of leading the way in this particular area. This bill builds on the work that was done earlier.

In relation to the amendments, clause 10 provides for a new part 2A in the act and additional legislative provisions to recognise and protect traditional knowledge used for biodiscovery and it also aligns the act more closely to international standards for ABS by establishing an obligation on persons using traditional knowledge for biodiscovery.

In relation to penalties, failing to comply with the obligation will trigger a penalty provision of 5,000 penalty units and be considered an executive liability provision similar to existing offences under the act. A penalty of this size is consistent with other serious offences in the act such as using native biological material sourced from state lands or Queensland waters for biodiscovery without a benefit sharing agreement. I think they are all very important provisions.

I note that in his contribution the member for Broadwater endorsed the statement of reservation by non-government members in relation to the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill but that he did not do the same for the Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. Having read the statement of reservation by the member for Scenic Rim and member for Theodore, I can understand why. In their statement of reservation, the member for Scenic Rim rails against parliament—

Mr Krause: I was going to say something nice about you.

Mr PEGG:—and rails against the code and subordinate legislation.

Mr Krause: It is bad law.


Mr PEGG: I take all of the interjections from the member for Scenic Rim. Member for Scenic Rim, I do not recall you raising those sorts of issues and objections when you were in government. Member for Scenic Rim and member for Theodore, you have taken a strong ideological—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stevens): Member for Stretton, please direct your comments through the chair and not to members across the chamber.

Mr Boothman: Duncan, you weren't here when we were in government.

Mr PEGG: I take that interjection from the member for Theodore. If the member for Theodore wants to provide some evidence that when he was in government he adopted this same ideological approach then I would be more than willing to have a look at it. My extensive research has not uncovered such evidence thus far. I will await the member for Theodore passing me a piece of paper or maybe in these times of COVID-19 restrictions he might have to email or SMS me. I look forward to that. I commend these bills to the House. Environmental protection and biodiscovery will be increasingly important in Queensland's future.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Stretton. It is good to have you back in the House.

 **Mr KRAUSE** (Scenic Rim—LNP) (12.31 pm): I too was a member of the Innovation, Tourism Development and Environment Committee that reviewed the biodiscovery bill that is the subject of this cognate debate. The committee was chaired by the member for Stretton. Throughout the time that the member for Stretton has been ill and receiving treatment, I can attest to the House that he has been no less tough in the committee. Certainly, he remains very unreasonable when it comes to dealing with sensible and reasonable suggestions from members of the opposition in committee, in particular in relation to this bill.

The process by which we reviewed the bill revealed a lot of holes in the legislation. While the intent of the Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill can be supported, there is much missing from it that should be in it, as was highlighted in the very good statements of reservation in the report by not only myself and the member for Theodore but also the member for Noosa, who is one of the crossbench members of the House. Members of the government should look at those statements of reservation, including the one from the member for Noosa, as they outline the many flaws in the bill.

The Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill has the potential to be a huge handbrake on the development of particular products that have a traditional knowledge element, especially where that knowledge may already be in the public domain or has become knowledge generally shared in the community. In the very first paragraph of her statement of reservation, the member for Noosa highlights this issue when she states that the bill raises more questions than it answers.

In the public briefing and during the hearings that we held, questions were asked about the code of practice—or the lack of the code of practice—to be put in place under the bill and the mechanisms that might exist for dealing with agreements between custodians of traditional knowledge and other parties that might be developing products. It was highlighted that there is no mechanism outlined in the bill and we have no code, not even a draft one, to review that will allow possible issues of conflict to be resolved, which could be legal issues in relation to benefit-sharing agreements.

If there is no mechanism for issues to be resolved and we do not have any idea what the code will say or how the process of this bill will work, then effectively if the parliament passes this bill today we will be handing a blank cheque of power to the minister and the government to sort out, behind closed doors, how the framework is supposed to work. As was pointed out by the member for Noosa, it could impact 'the pharmaceuticals, agriculture, nutraceutical and cosmeceutical industries, directly impacting every Queenslanders'. In particular, she highlighted the issue of traditional knowledge already in the public domain.

The member for Theodore and I also wrote a statement of reservation. I will reiterate our concerns. This bill is half-baked, it is undercooked and it is bad law for all of the reasons that have been set out in this address and in our statement of reservation, because we are handing unchecked power to the government to sort out how it is going to work. In the public hearing, it was embarrassing for the government when it became abundantly clear that the officers giving evidence for the government had no idea what they were talking about. In fact, the submitters had more idea about how this bill was supposed to work than the actual government officials who were introducing it. It was a very sad and sorry state of affairs for that department.

In relation to the fundamental legislative principles, the department advised one thing in relation to clause 27 and the reversal of the onus of proof and then three weeks later said something different, obviously having had a chance to actually look at what they were briefing the committee about during the process. In relation to the traditional knowledge code of practice, in the first instance they said, yes, it will be subordinate legislation and the parliament would have a chance to review it. About five minutes later they changed tune and said, no, it will not be; it will only be a code and will not be subject to any sort of review by parliament at all. When we look at the transcript, we can see those issues.

In relation to the penalty provision to be introduced, there is a very large penalty for breaching the code. Even though we do not know what will be in the code, there is a very large penalty attached to breaching the code. That penalty provision that is attached to a code that we cannot review is highly inflexible. How can a government say, 'We are going to fine you potentially \$600,000', without putting the provisions that enact those offences before the parliament? It is outrageous that this is being allowed to go through, especially given that this government always claims that it wants to do things in the interests of accountability, transparency, fairness and equity for all Queenslanders. It is giving unchecked power to the department to create a code that will criminalise certain behaviour or, if not criminalise, certainly attach very hefty penalties to such conduct.

There are plenty of problems with the bill and I want to point out another, which I noted in the public hearing, in relation to patent protection. The bill has the potential to overlap with other laws in the nation in relation to patents and issues could arise as a result of that. The bill introduces a whole lot of uncertainty around the costs of doing business and developing products because, as was put on the record by the department, the costs associated with the bill in relation to an agreement for traditional knowledge use will be a negotiated cost and not an actual payment such as under a patent system where royalties are paid for the use of different technologies.

Another issue that came up related to the fact that civil liability does not attach to a minister. Very heavy penalties for breaching the law can attach personally to directors of a company if they are found to be in breach, but those same penalty provisions do not attach personally to a minister. If the state breaches the code that is yet to be developed, the minister is not held personally responsible as are executives of a company. It is set out that that liability goes to the state. Why is there a double standard here where executives are held personally liable for breaching this very uncertain law but ministers are not? The biodiscovery bill raises a whole raft of issues.

In my remaining time I want to touch briefly on the other bill that is before the House in this cognate debate. I would have liked a lot more time to deal with the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, especially as we need time to talk about all of the concerns raised about the appointment of a rehabilitation commissioner in relation to mines.

In my electorate of Scenic Rim, there are quite a number of unrehabilitated mines around the Willowbank area. Instead of them being rehabilitated at this point in time, this government is sitting by and allowing a process to develop that could see three, four or more dumps put into those areas to fill


up those unrehabilitated mines with rubbish—after the community has put up with mining for 30 or 40 years. There have been concerns raised about the duplication of functions between the Rehabilitation Commissioner and the mining regulator.

My concern is that the Rehabilitation Commissioner, in relation to those local issues in Willowbank, will not have any power at all to deal with rehabilitation of mines because there is a process underway, which the government is allowing to proceed, that is seeing them turned into dumps. Ipswich, it has been reported, is already taking 73 per cent of the waste of South-East Queensland. Clearly, there is an agenda by this government to allow the Willowbank area in particular to become the dumping ground of South-East Queensland. It should stop. They should call in those developments and put the minds of the people I represent in that part of Willowbank and around that area to rest so that—

Ms Enoch: It's a good thing you supported the waste levy, then.

Mr KRAUSE: I am glad that someone mentioned the waste levy. If the waste levy is so effective, why are there four new dumps proposed for Willowbank? Why are they being allowed to proceed? You should call them in and give the residents of Scenic Rim—

(Time expired)

 **Mrs MULLEN** (Jordan—ALP) (12.41 pm): I am pleased to speak in support of the bills. Like the previous two speakers, I will focus my comments on the Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019, which I was involved with through the previous parliamentary committee.

As has been stated, this bill will amend the Biodiscovery Act 2004 and the Right to Information Act 2009 to improve the business environment for biodiscovery and support economic opportunities for First Nation communities in Queensland. This bill reflects three core objectives. Importantly, the first of these is to recognise and protect the use of traditional knowledge in biodiscovery. The bill will also simplify approvals under the Biodiscovery Act and clarify the relationship between the Biodiscovery Act and relevant international protocols including the Nagoya protocol.

We know that the biodiscovery industry has evolved since the introduction of the act and the international regulatory context for access and benefit sharing has changed, particularly with the introduction of the Nagoya protocol in 2014. The Nagoya protocol provides a framework for the equitable sharing of benefits derived from the utilisation of genetic resources. This includes the use of traditional knowledge associated with these genetic resources. Currently, biodiscovery entities in Queensland are unable to demonstrate compliance with the Nagoya protocol and are at risk of failing international checkpoints and not having access to global markets. Without being aligned to the Nagoya protocol, the growth of Queensland's biodiscovery industry will be limited just as it begins to gain momentum. By providing for access and benefit sharing for the use of traditional knowledge, the Biodiscovery Act will align with the protocol and enable greater international research and commercialisation opportunities for Queensland's biodiscovery industry.

First Nation representatives have described being discouraged from sharing their knowledge without adequate legal protection in place. With these amendments in place, it is hoped that First Nation peoples will feel more confident to share their knowledge about native plants and animals, some of which could lead to new drugs, therapies and bioproducts that attract international investment and benefit all Queenslanders. That is a very exciting thing.

Mr Colin Saltmere from the Myuma Group explained to our parliamentary committee the importance of the proposed reforms to the act for Indigenous people and industry alike. He said—

It should be our decision-making process, in accordance with custom law, that determines who we divulge this to so we can trust the people we sell it to or those who invest in this to make sure it is not exploited.


Queensland's biodiscovery industry is expanding, with 90 per cent of current benefit-sharing agreements entered into since 2017. By way of example of the huge potential for biodiscovery, the partnership formed in 1993 between the British based company AstraZeneca and Griffith University illustrates just one instance where overseas investment has helped to commercialise innovative new products. This partnership represented a multiyear, \$100 million investment that built the capacity of Griffith University to screen flora and fauna extracts to identify bioactive molecules that could have potential pharmaceutical applications. Over 14 years the partnership led to benefits, including collection and preservation of information about Queensland's biodiversity including endangered species and discovery of new species including 37 new plant species; the creation of 43 full-time jobs; the publication of 140 scientific articles on natural product drug discovery; and training in natural products research for 113 staff. The benefits of this partnership continue to accrue through Compounds Australia and the Griffith Institute for Drug Discovery.

Griffith University told our committee during the public hearing on the bill of the high potential and benefits of the biodiscovery industry to Queensland. As Dr Jens Tampe, Deputy Director of Griffith Enterprise, said—

There is immense potential, but it is hard to get there. In each field only one out of several thousand makes it. It is a high-risk activity, but the key is that the more it is used, the more success we have and the more success is coming back to Queensland, to universities, to our Indigenous partners, to traditional knowledge holders. It is really about enabling easy, clear deal flow in a certain sense. The more that is happening and the more results that are used, the more benefits there are.

Other biodiscovery activities that are operating in Queensland also involve international collaborations across regions including North America and Asia.

This bill's reflection of Nagoya principles will help to attract further overseas investment and raise Queensland's profile as a biodiscovery partner of choice, creating opportunities and Queensland jobs and opening up economic opportunities for our First Nation communities. I commend the bills to the House.

 **Mr LAST** (Burdekin—LNP) (12.46 pm): I rise to contribute to the cognate debate on the biodiscovery and environmental protection bills. As the member for the Burdekin region, which is home to so many of Queensland's major resource projects and the home to crucial agricultural activities, I take a particular interest in aspects particularly of the environmental protection bill that we are debating here today.

Effective rehabilitation of resource industry extraction activities is a major issue for both agricultural landholders and long-term environmental health. As the shadow minister for mines, I pay particular attention to the rehabilitation of our mine sites and I want to add my voice to those speaking about the state of those abandoned mine sites across Queensland which are a blight on our state and a symptom of years of neglect and mismanagement.

Our resource sector is keeping this state afloat. When we you talk mining, people have images of huge holes in the ground and mountains of overburden. I want to also acknowledge today that most of our mining companies are doing the right thing. When you travel across the state you see some excellent examples of rehabilitation taking place. When I go to mine sites, I always make sure that I inspect their rehabilitation sites and ascertain what their plans are in terms of how they are going to rehabilitate those mining operations. I have stood in paddocks of grass over my head that have been grazed by livestock. That clearly demonstrates that land can be rehabilitated back to its natural state. I think we need to pay due credit to those companies that have taken the initiative and are doing the right thing across Queensland.

Regrettably, the Palaszczuk Labor government has consistently failed Queenslanders to address key mining rehabilitation failures and the significant environmental risks posed by abandoned mines. AgForce rightly recommended that the proposed Rehabilitation Commissioner needs to have the regulatory power to instruct the government to enforce rehabilitation compliance requirements. However, it is an extremely poor reflection upon this Labor government's environmental record if landholders are calling for an independent regulator to enforce standards because of Labor's failure to do so.

I have concerns that by creating this position of Rehabilitation Commissioner we are creating yet another layer of bureaucracy in this state. My colleague the member for Broadwater talked about the costs involved in setting up that position and the operation of that particular office. One would question why this role would not fall under the ambit of current departmental staff, as it has done, and why they could not be encouraged, permitted and authorised to do this same role.

The biggest issue arising from this bill is yet another illustration of the shambles that the Palaszczuk government is in. Let me be more specific. The amendment to clause 12 of the reef environmental authority is without doubt an absolute admission that this government has sold out Queensland's primary producers. Despite now trying to appear to be the farmers' friend, this amendment fails to find the balance between one of Queensland's key industries and the natural jewel that is the Great Barrier Reef. Unlike Labor, the LNP knows that we do not have to choose one or the other. We can support local jobs and protect the reef, as was proven in the recent Senate inquiry. It is not just Queensland's hardworking primary producers who know this government has them in their sights and know that this government's legislation is an absolute failure. It is right there in the committee's recommendations that further information is needed—a committee, I might add, that is headed by one of their own.

The other thing that is illustrated by this legislation and the committee process is the fact that, despite the repeated claims of those opposite, Queensland's farmers are responsible guardians of our land. I note the Queensland Farmers' Federation and AgForce support this bill and I note that the Queensland Resources Council also supports the intent of the bill.


Whilst the LNP and Queensland's main industries support the effective rehabilitation of former resource sites and support both the agricultural industry and the reef, the Palaszczuk government has simply failed. Labor—and it is proven by this legislation—has failed to publish the guidelines when it comes to residual risks. Labor fails to provide the regulatory framework that will support job creation. They have failed to provide a definition that will allow industry to estimate the costs of this bill. They have failed to undertake a regulatory impact assessment in this case.

That is four notable failures by this government, but there are more to come. Every Queenslanders deserves to know that the Palaszczuk government has not only failed to consult properly on this legislation but also failed the moral test when they attempted to cover up their failure. Perhaps the most stunning failure of this government is yet another delegation of legislative functions to unelected bureaucrats. Again, Labor has failed to honour the basic tenets of democracy to this state. To allow them to absolve themselves of blame, Labor has failed to empower members of this House, elected by Queenslanders, to do their job—the job that we are paid to do and which we are elected to do. At a time when Queenslanders need leadership, they have failed to lead yet again.

I move on to the Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. As someone who has spent considerable time working with Indigenous communities, I welcome the acknowledgement of traditional knowledge held by Queensland's Indigenous people. Despite welcoming the intent, I must say that this legislation showcases even more Labor failures. Whilst Queensland's world-class researchers continue to impress, this government continues to fail. It is a sad day for our researchers, a sad day for Indigenous people and a sad day for Queensland as a whole when this government continues to fail on these important matters.

Whilst I will not be opposing these pieces of legislation before the chamber today, I do want to put on the record the need for this government to do better. Here we have an opportunity to recognise traditional knowledge, an opportunity to improve on Queensland's already world-class research and an opportunity to solve issues faced throughout the state, throughout Australia and throughout the world.

Queensland's resource workers, Queensland's primary producers and Queensland's Indigenous people deserve better. At a time when our state faces a monumental challenge, this government has been caught wanting—wanting to again defer the powers that are bestowed upon them by Queenslanders to unelected bureaucrats. I look forward to the minister clarifying the issues raised by the LNP today, but most of all I look forward to the day that Queensland's resource workers, Queensland's primary producers, Queensland's Indigenous people and Queenslanders as a whole elect a government that not only values the contribution of them all but also gets it right. That day is 31 October this year.

 **Ms LUI** (Cook—ALP) (12.54 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019 and the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020. I will speak firstly on the Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. Before I do, I want to acknowledge the committee chair, the member for Stretton. It is good to see you back in your element today. I also want to acknowledge the member for Jordan, the member for Scenic Rim, the member for Noosa, the member for Theodore, the committee secretary and the minister for all of their hard work on this bill.

The primary objective of the bill is to amend the Biodiscovery Act 2004 to ensure that it is contemporary, effective and equitable, by reflecting international standards which include providing an obligation for the use of traditional knowledge. This will help Queensland's biodiscovery industry to remain globally competitive and ensure that the benefits of biodiscovery are shared equitably throughout Queensland, including with First Nation peoples.

The Biodiscovery Act currently does not recognise the traditional knowledge held by Queensland's First Nation peoples. Without the regulatory protection that these amendments will provide, the risk of the unauthorised use of traditional knowledge remains and barriers to First Nation peoples and communities realising economic opportunities in the biodiscovery industry continue. Without these amendments, biodiscovery entities might continue to use traditional knowledge without the express consent of the custodians of that knowledge.

This bill introduces a traditional knowledge obligation—a requirement that users of traditional knowledge in biodiscovery take all reasonable steps to only use traditional knowledge with the agreement of the custodians of that knowledge. This amendment will in turn provide a new avenue for First Nation peoples to manage and benefit from the use of their knowledge. The traditional knowledge obligation provides First Nation peoples with more opportunity to reconnect to country and culture and to realise economic benefits through the creation of new jobs and the development of new skills.


The government will continue this engagement to develop the code of practice and guidelines. This is necessary to ensure that community protocols are respected.

While I am on my feet, I would also like to pledge my support for the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020. The Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020 will improve rehabilitation and financial assurance outcomes in the resources sector by amending the Environmental Protection Act 1994 and the Mineral Resources (Financial Provisioning) Act 2018 to establish the statutory position of Rehabilitation Commissioner and support the delivery of residual risk reforms. The commissioner's role will enhance the quality, consistency and confidence in rehabilitation outcomes through advice on best practice rehabilitation in Queensland.

The Rehabilitation Commissioner will be established under the Environmental Protection Act. The commissioner will be supported by an office and have new functions separate from the regulatory functions of the Department of Environment and Science. The commissioner will work collaboratively with the Department of Environment and Science, the community and industry. The commissioner will provide advice on best practice rehabilitation and management practices and outcomes.

The Queensland government has been implementing a suite of reforms to achieve better results for the rehabilitation of land disturbed by mining activities. Central to determining that land has been adequately managed or rehabilitated is understanding what constitutes best practice. I acknowledge that the proposal for the establishment of the Rehabilitation Commissioner was discussed with key stakeholders, including Lock the Gate Alliance, the Environmental Defenders Office, WWF Australia, the Queensland Resources Council, BHP and Glencore. Broad public consultation on a draft bill has not been undertaken because of difficulties in the COVID environment. As members know, we are going through some very challenging times. It is essential that we all abide by COVID regulations.

These legislative reforms are critical for the future of environmental protection and addressing equity issues to create economic opportunities for First Nation peoples. In closing, I support both bills before the House.

 **Mr BOOTHMAN** (Theodore—LNP) (12.59 pm): I rise to make a contribution in this cognate debate, but I will specifically deal with the Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. From the outset, I thank my fellow committee members and the secretariat staff for all their work on this bill.


As many other speakers in this House have spoken about, the biodiscovery industry is certainly expanding and evolving throughout Australia and the world. Different countries are getting on board and participating in this industry. As other members have said, the Nagoya protocol was updated in 2014. The idea of the Nagoya protocol is to create a fair and just system that allows traditional owners and community groups that potentially used genetic research and genetic resources to benefit from that.

Debate, on motion of Mr Boothman, adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 pm to 2.00 pm.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.00 pm): COVID-19 has been suppressed in Queensland, but the economic crisis is worsening by the day. Last week Virgin airlines announced it was laying off 3,000 employees. Today we hear that 400 of those jobs may be from Queensland. As a part owner of Virgin, the Palaszczuk Labor government must guarantee that not one of those 400 jobs will be lost from Queensland.

Labor used Queensland taxpayers' money to buy a stake in Virgin, so it is down to Labor to now guarantee that not one of those Queensland Virgin jobs will be lost. Labor and the Treasurer made a lot of noise about the fact that Queensland taxpayers' money was going in to buy Virgin, but now their silence is deafening. It is not just airline workers who face an uncertain future; the pandemic is hurting every single Queensland industry throughout our economy.

Our economy was in trouble long before coronavirus. Thanks to the Palaszczuk Labor government's economic mismanagement and their higher taxes, Queensland started this crisis with the worst average unemployment in the nation, the highest number of bankruptcies and the lowest economic confidence. That is how Queensland started the worst economic crisis in 90 years.

Today more than 200,000 Queenslanders are out of work. I wish I could say that the worst is over but unfortunately I cannot. We know that closing the border will inflict further economic damage. There will be more business failures and more job losses, but the LNP has always said that our border controls are not set and forget. As the facts change, our response must change as well. It is a fact that the Victorian Labor government has totally failed to control coronavirus.

Government members interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Do you want me to say it again? I am happy to. It is a fact that the Victorian Labor government has totally failed to control coronavirus. That failure has raised the risk faced by the rest of the Commonwealth. That risk was compounded by the Palaszczuk Labor government's flawed honour system checks at the border. Now that our borders have closed again, the economic response simply must be ramped up. If the tourism industry does not receive extra financial support, even more jobs will be lost.

Queensland urgently needs a plan for recovery. It is pretty clear that the Palaszczuk Labor government has no plan. It had no plan for the economy before coronavirus and it has no plan now. This is a government that does not even have a plan for a budget. If you do not have a budget, it means that you have no plan and certainly no plan for recovery.

Unlike Labor, the LNP does have a plan. We will deliver a budget within the first 100 days of the next election. Our plan will stimulate the economy, secure jobs and drag Queensland out of this recession. Our plan is based on four foundations: investing for growth, unleashing Queensland industry, supercharging the regions and securing our children's future.

Our economy needs immediate action. That is why the next LNP government will deliver a \$1 billion program of new rail and road projects across the south-east. These projects will bust congestion and create thousands of construction jobs. The SEQ Congestion Program will be fully funded by the state because I want to see workers with their hi-vis on get working. It was the Morrison federal government that has provided a safety net with JobKeeper and JobSeeker. My plan for infrastructure will be our 'JobMaker' scheme. The procurement process will be streamlined and fast-tracked to get shovels in the ground. The procurement process will give preference to Queensland construction firms. Now is the time to look after our own first.

In Brisbane's western suburbs, the LNP will invest \$245 million in duplicating the Centenary Motorway bridge. The Centenary Motorway is Queensland's slowest motorway, with a peak-hour speed of just 28 kilometres an hour through Jindalee. Labor ignored this bottleneck for years. We will also fix the worst bottleneck on Brisbane's north side. Our stimulus program will fund a \$90 million overpass at the intersection of Gympie and Beams Road at Carseldine.

On the bayside an LNP government will also invest \$100 million to fix the worst road in the Redlands. We will make Cleveland Redland Bay Road safer and faster by constructing four lanes through Thornlands, Victoria Point and into Redland Bay. The LNP will invest \$5 million in a business case for the Eastern Busway extension from Coorparoo to Capalaba. We know that that is welcomed by those opposite because the Palaszczuk government has done absolutely nothing in the last five years. That is the project that even the Palaszczuk government say—not that they will fund it—will bust congestion by delivering more high-frequency buses through the eastern suburbs.

The Mount Lindesay Highway out towards Jimboomba and Beaudesert will benefit from a \$40 million upgrade. It is one of the most unroadworthy routes in Queensland, according to the RACQ. Investment is needed urgently and the LNP will provide it. The LNP will also invest \$35 million to fast-track the Bells Creek Arterial Road at Caloundra. The landowner will match our commitment, meaning there will be \$70 million of investment to get the Sunshine Coast working again.

These projects will not just bust congestion but help to bust this recession too. Labor have no plan for our economy and we know they have no budget. They are flying blind through the worst economic crisis we have ever known. It is only the LNP that has a plan for Queensland, a plan that will stimulate our economy, create a decade of secure jobs and drag Queensland out of this recession.


Unlike Labor, the LNP will never neglect the Gold Coast. The SEQ Congestion Program will fund new on and off ramps at exit 45 on the M1. There will be 125 more car parks at Nerang Railway Station. On top of that, our commitment is to build the second M1. An LNP government will also develop a

master plan for the northern Gold Coast Hospital and health precinct. The booming northern Gold Coast needs new infrastructure and better health services, and it is only the LNP who has a plan to deliver them.

The LNP will also take pressure off the Nerang and Pacific Pines high schools by planning for a new school west of the M1. It is only the LNP that has a plan to create jobs and invest for growth north of the Gold Coast. It is only the LNP that will open up and unlock the potential of our regions. That is why it is only the LNP that knows water means jobs. That is why the LNP backs the New Bradfield Scheme as well as the Nullinga Dam, Urannah Dam, Rookwood Weir, Emu Swamp Dam, raising the Burdekin Falls Dam and fixing Paradise Dam. The LNP will build dams and we will make water cheaper too.

If the LNP is elected on 31 October we will slash the price of water to farmers by almost 20 per cent on 1 July 2021. We will implement the recommendations of the QCA to reduce water costs by transitioning SunWater to a regulated asset based approach for financing asset renewals. I can see the water minister shaking his head. I would be shaking my head as well, because it is only the LNP that will make water cheaper for Queensland. It is only the LNP that knows water means jobs. They have been caught out on the hop because it is only the LNP that will get Queensland working again.

Liberal National Party, Performance

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Treasurer, Minister for Infrastructure and Planning) (2.10 pm): One of the defining features of the member for Nanango's leadership has been her extraordinary gift for getting the big calls spectacularly and stupendously wrong. It is appropriate that we feel the Ekka winds this week even without the Ekka, because they are as predictable as the lack of the Leader of the Opposition's judgement. We know that the Leader of the Opposition and her hapless deputy wanted to consign Virgin to the scrap heap. They did not care about 9,000 jobs. They did not care about them at all. As Robyn Ironside reported in the *Australian*, a spokesman for Bain said that without the Queensland government's investment the airline would likely have relocated to New South Wales or Victoria. If the LNP had been in charge, either there would not have been any Virgin or 9,000 jobs or thereabouts—let's say 6,000—would have gone to Victoria or New South Wales. Of course they said nothing about the federal government, did they? They said nothing about the federal coalition putting \$67 million into Rex airline, which is based in Sydney, owned by Singapore and chaired by a former National Party minister. They said nothing about that public investment into an airline.

The Leader of the Opposition has doubled down on her betrayal of Queensland's tourism industry. She talks about the Gold Coast, but last Friday she publically refused to back our lifeline to theme parks after the Prime Minister reneged on the federal government's promise of support. There she was on the Gold Coast, raining on the Movie World character parade hoping to turn Sea World into 'See Ya Later World', affecting thousands of direct employees, thousands more in supply chains and dependent industries and tens of thousands of visitors. That was what she wanted to do. They got most of the seats on the Gold Coast but they do not care about some of the biggest employers in the state—out they go as part of the Leader of the Opposition's great policy clearance.

Then we had the border closure farce—and that is exactly what it was—where the Leader of the Opposition performed a bigger backdown than Scott Morrison on Clive Palmer's border closure High Court case. Prior to that probably not many Queenslanders on Twitter knew who the member for Nanango was, but they do now. There was one of the biggest Twitter pile ons in recent history when she posted her hypocritical stance on the closure of the borders. One thing about Queenslanders is they can spot a phoney a mile off, and that is exactly what the Leader of the Opposition is: a phoney. Do you know what, Mr Deputy Speaker? Most of their backbench now know they are going in the wrong direction with the Leader of the Opposition and her hapless deputy. Then, of course, we have the magic pudding of 'Deb-onomics'. We have \$23 billion in commitments: \$15 billion in the new old Bradfield scheme, or whatever you want to call it, and another \$8 billion in commitments on top of that. How are they going to fund it? No Queenslander knows because they are going to hide their budget plan until 100 days after—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Order, members!

Mr DICK: For 974 days the member for Everton has been the shadow Treasurer and what have we heard from him? Absolutely nothing. I have done more in two months than he has done in 974 days. I have done more in three months than he has done in three years because he does not know what he is doing. Now we have heard more promises today. Remember when they talked about the new bridge

they wanted to build? First of all, they said it was a billion dollars in new money—not, of course, in the forward estimates. The next day they turned up at the press conference open-mouthed like the groper in Cairns and did not know what they were talking about. They said they were going to find savings. When they were asked where the savings were, they said they were going to privatise prisons. That is what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and shadow Treasurer said. There are known corruption risks in the corrective services space when you privatise women—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DICK: Can I say that the member for Everton knows women as well because he claimed there were too many women on the Parole Board. That is what he thinks. They have no idea. They said it was going to be new money, and then they said they were going to find savings, but when they were asked in a press conference they had absolutely no idea. This is not an opposition fit to be in opposition. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has had a bad day. He had to apologise once. He has been found in contempt of the parliament. He will have to apologise again. He is none from two. Is he going to face up to the pitcher again? What we know about the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is that he makes things up and then he is caught out and has to apologise. If he cannot tell the truth in here, why would Queenslanders ever believe anything he says?

(Time expired)

Queensland Economy; Ethics Committee Report, Apology



Mr MANDER (Everton—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (2.15 pm): I can say that my worst day will always be better than his best day. We are talking about a Treasurer who did not know the debt level when asked on national television. Not long ago he did know not know the fiscal principle about the growth of the Public Service and—

Mr DICK: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The matter that the member refers to is personally offensive. It is not what I was asked on radio. I was not asked about the principle. I was asked about—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Are you taking personal offence?

Mr DICK: I ask the honourable member to withdraw. It is personally offensive to me.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member has found that comment personally offensive and asks that you withdraw.

Mr MANDER: I withdraw. It was only a few weeks ago that the Treasurer came out after the federal government's economic and fiscal update and snuck through an announcement that the debt level by the end of next financial year will be \$17 billion worse than what was announced at the December MYFER. They have the hide to hide behind COVID to explain their debt levels, but let's remember that out of this \$101 billion—

Mr DICK: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I find it personally offensive that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said I was intending to hide anything. That is entirely untrue. It is personally offensive and I ask him to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Treasurer, it is not an opportunity to debate. Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the Treasurer finds your comments personally offensive and asks that they be withdrawn.


Mr MANDER: I withdraw. We now have a debt that is hurtling towards \$101 billion of which 93 per cent was already racked up before coronavirus hit. This government has fiscal principles that mean absolutely nothing. They are there to put on paper and mean nothing. Basically, every one of them has been smashed and they have zero credibility. That is why when this Treasurer comes in here and talks about this side of the parliament having no plan, when there has been no budget, no transparency, no idea with regard to how they are going to make savings, did not know the size of the Public Service, still unsure about details with regard to how they are going to reach that \$3 billion worth of savings, it is laughable. It is absolutely laughable.

In contrast, the LNP's fiscal principles will ensure that Queensland builds a stronger economy to secure more jobs and improve services like health, education and policing. The LNP will stabilise Labor's debt and deliver our economic plan to get Queensland working again. We have already released the LNP's fiscal principles. First, we will strive to be the lowest taxing government in the nation by guaranteeing no new taxes and a 10-year royalty freeze to give certainty to business. Second, we will target fiscal balances across the economic cycle by limiting general government expenditure to be less than revenue. We will not spend more than we earn, which got us into that trouble in the first place.

Third, we will stabilise and begin repaying Labor's debt with the target of regaining the state's AAA credit rating. We are on the verge at the moment of having our credit rating downgraded again under this Labor administration. Fourth, we will set improved standards in Public Service delivery and accountability across the whole of Queensland. Finally, as we have heard the opposition leader say today and we will say it time and time again, we will build the job-creating infrastructure Queensland needs. We will establish the Queensland infrastructure fund, which will be royalties from the Galilee Basin; we will build new roads and dams; and we will deliver the New Bradfield Scheme to harness the floodwaters, the monsoonal rains of the north, to irrigate a land mass the size of Tasmania, to have hydro-electricity to generate power for 800,000 homes and to stop all of that sediment that runs into the Great Barrier Reef because of the floodwaters. There is only one party that has a vision for Queensland, and that is the LNP.

I do want to mention in this speech today that I have read report No. 200 of the Ethics Committee, and I apologise unreservedly to the House for my actions.

Electricity Prices

 **Hon. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy) (2.21 pm): What a rambling contribution from the member for Everton. We cannot forget that he was part of a government that broke commitment after commitment to the people of Queensland. The Palaszczuk Labor government is delivering on energy prices. For three years in a row, power prices have dropped for Queensland families. These were power prices that were supposed to come down under an LNP government. They were supposed to fall under an LNP government, but what happened? They went up 43 per cent. Energy assets were supposed to stay in public hands under the LNP. What happened? They spent more than \$70 million trying to sell them to corporates in the United States, Hong Kong and Switzerland. They even went as far as to close generation units. They put people out of work in Kingaroy.

By contrast, under the Palaszczuk Labor government, Queensland has the energy trifecta—the lowest average prices on Australia's eastern seaboard, a reliable supply and a planned transition to a renewable future. We have the reliability that is the envy of every southern state. Just as they envy Queensland's response to the pandemic, they envy our electricity system. Twenty per cent of Queensland's electricity supply is projected to come from renewable energy by the end of the year. We have the lowest average power prices on the eastern seaboard and, as I said before, prices have fallen three years in a row and are forecast to fall even further.


We have achieved this by keeping our energy assets in our hands—in the hands of Queensland families. These dividends go back into the pockets of mums and dads and businesses across Queensland. Those dividends from our businesses pay the half a billion dollar subsidy to keep prices down for regional households and small businesses. They fund the \$50 asset dividend payments that were wiped off 1.9 million household power bills, and there are another two of those coming. That is another \$100 million flowing back into the pockets of Queensland mums and dads. We would have to agree that that is a much better investment than an asset sales kick for \$70 million. Those dividends have also helped freeze obsolete tariffs for farmers for three years during this drought—tariffs that only rose under their tenure. Those dividends also fund measures to assist farmers to reduce their energy use. Our energy assets are investing in infrastructure, supporting jobs. They are forecast to spend another \$1.8 billion this financial year supporting nearly 4,000 jobs.

Let us be clear. If members opposite had their way in 2015, that investment would not be occurring here in this state. What are those opposite offering? The LNP are going to take a half a billion dollar subsidy from regional families and hand it over to private companies instead of investing in lower prices. 'Hey, let us forgo profits and reduce prices for customers instead.' Has any private company CEO said that ever? That is what they are doing. They are taking money from regional Queensland families and putting it into private companies and hoping and praying that those private companies will pass those dividends on to Queensland families. It just will not happen. The LNP are leaving a trail of broken promises in their wake, and now they are asking Queensland families to trust them. They can slick back their hair, they can put on a suit and tie, they can shine their shoes, but they cannot hide the fact that the LNP in 2015 is no different to the LNP in 2020.

Unlike those opposite, the Palaszczuk government's track record speaks for itself. We have a plan to steer us through the global headwinds ahead. This plan is underpinned by our energy trifecta. For three years in a row, power prices have come down and they are going to fall even further. Our economic recovery is not the recovery that those over there envisage—the recovery of sacking and selling. Our recovery is taking Queensland families with us and holding on to those precious assets that

we own, that Queensland families own, that pay dividends back to Queensland families and not to overseas corporate offices in Switzerland and China. That money goes into the pockets of Queensland families, not overseas, as those opposite would have it.

Coronavirus, Queensland Border Checks; Aged Care

 **Ms BATES** (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (2.26 pm): In the last two weeks, Queenslanders have seen how the Palaszczuk Labor government cannot manage the borders and keep Queenslanders safe. Labor's border honour system clearly is not working and we have seen border breach after border breach, with a few reckless individuals exposing massive gaps in the Palaszczuk government's border defences risking a second wave like we have seen in Victoria. No-one wants to see that here in Queensland. It will put lives and livelihoods at risk.

The latest border breach involves two teenage girls who caught a train into Queensland, and it exposes another major flaw in Labor's border honour system. Once again, the Palaszczuk Labor government's border honour system has failed, and yet more and more people will try and breach Labor's weak border defences when they see how easy it is. The Premier liked to talk tough last week about closing border exemptions and loopholes, only for it to be revealed that the fake diplomat from Afghanistan who came into Queensland with COVID last week was able to dodge quarantine following an exemption that was approved by the Palaszczuk government. This of course was on top of the exemption that was previously provided to TV celebrity Dannii Minogue. On top of that, media reports today show that the Premier did not even raise the issue at national cabinet last week—probably out of embarrassment that it would expose another hole in Labor's border defences.

Whilst celebrities and fake diplomats get exemptions and get to jump the queue—dodging mandatory quarantine requirements for incoming travellers coming from COVID hotspots—everyone else is supposed to do the right thing. At the same time, a GP from the Tweed was reportedly refused entry into Queensland. This is someone who staffs the Palm Beach COVID fever clinic. As the media reported today, the doctor has been told to apply because no system to handle their entry has been established beforehand. It could take a week to get an answer to a written inquiry for exemption. This is yet another health bungle on the border that could put the lives of Gold Coast locals at risk. There needs to be some common sense applied, especially for essential workers such as doctors, nurses and paramedics. Surely a GP who runs a fever clinic is an essential worker in the middle of a global health pandemic.

All of this makes a mockery of the whole process and shows the inconsistencies in the approach of the Palaszczuk Labor government. GPs who run fever clinics in the southern Gold Coast have trouble getting into Queensland, yet teenage girls in Noosa and Logan can expose major flaws in the border bubble while exemptions are granted to fake diplomats and celebrities.

My office has also been contacted by another person who tried to do the right thing but exposed another flaw in Labor's border defences. A Queenslander staying in Victoria wanted to come home and decided to apply for the appropriate passes to drive from Victoria through New South Wales and into Queensland.

He made the decision to leave Victoria on 5 August and got the relevant New South Wales and Queensland border passes that day. He left Victoria on 6 August and stayed overnight in New South Wales. He crossed the Queensland border last Friday, on 7 August, after driving from New South Wales with no issue. In fact, he was waved through despite having a Q for quarantine requirement on his border pass. When he proactively contacted the COVID-19 hotline he was told to isolate at home for two weeks. His wife informed my office—


I also rang COVID-19 on 13 42 68 around the same time and was told that he was fortunate to be waived through and it is up to border control if he would need to quarantine and that he should go straight home to self-isolate. I also informed the lady that I live in the house with my daughter and asked if we would need to self-isolate.

Last Friday night he received a knock on the door from police and he was then required to go into government arranged hotel accommodation and pay \$2,800. It is clear that the Palaszczuk government cannot manage the border with ongoing border breaches highlighting major flaws in the honour system.

While I am on my feet I want to raise another issue about aged care on the Gold Coast. There are issues with a HHS tender for the transfer of patients to residential aged-care services. Leading Age Services have written to the HHS and raised concerns about excessive fees levied by placement services that are charged to aged-care providers. Excessive fees charged by placement agencies reduce the resources that are available to deliver aged care. There is significant concern among aged-care providers on the Gold Coast about these excessive fees. Many providers may simply refuse to accept new residents under these arrangements, reducing the choice of services available to

patients. After the trauma of the Earle Haven debacle last year, the last thing Gold Coast residents want to see is another aged-care debacle. I urge the HHS to work with local aged-care providers through this tender process.

Coronavirus, Queensland Border Checks

 **Hon. MT RYAN** (Morayfield—ALP) (Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services) (2.31 pm): In relation to a question asked of the Premier this morning, the Queensland Police Service has provided the following advice. Every train from New South Wales is met by police in Queensland. All passengers—I repeat: all passengers—are questioned by police. I am advised that the two individuals who were arrested in Noosa were subject to this check. However, they were not truthful with officers when questioned. This is reckless behaviour.

Anyone who attempts to enter Queensland under false pretences should be warned that the police will take action. In this case, police took swift action to locate the two individuals in question. Unlike those opposite, I will always commend the police for their excellent work—in this case as well. Like every other Queenslanders, I owe a debt of gratitude to the Queensland Police Service for their work on our borders. In short, they are saving lives and preventing the spread of COVID-19. It is not easy work, but it is vital work and it is relentless.

Since March this year, police have intercepted more than half a million vehicles at our borders. More than 7,000 vehicles have been turned around and more than 11,000 people have been directed to quarantine. At domestic airports police have checked the entry details of more than 230,000 passengers. Thousands of airline passengers have been sent into quarantine and 394 of those arrivals have been refused entry.

We have received many letters in my office thanking the police for their efforts. Rob, a proud dad of his daughter, Maddie, who returned from overseas, wrote to congratulate police. Rob's daughter told him—

Dad, when I walked in and saw all of the police at the airport and saw how organised they were and just how nice and helpful they were, I just relaxed and I knew it would be okay.

Then there was Rory, who said—

I have just completed my 14-day quarantine. All the police officers who accompanied me for exercise breaks and other admin duties were extremely polite, courteous and good natured. They are to be commended. They are an asset to Queensland.

Then there was a message from Chris, who wanted me to congratulate the government on its handling of the pandemic. Chris said—


I would also like to note that I have never voted Labor before at a state election, but I will most certainly be doing it this time. The superb job done by the Premier, the health minister and the police deserves to be recognised by another term in government.

Police are not just keeping the community safe; they are also protecting our economy. Queensland is in a much better place than other jurisdictions.

Where would we be under the LNP? In relation to borders, the LNP's approach borders on madness. If they had control of the borders, the LNP would represent a clear and present danger to all Queenslanders. The LNP just do not get it. They think the pandemic is an opportunity for cheap political pointscoring, and we just heard the contribution of the member for Mudgeeraba which just proves their tactic. It has been demonstrated by their words and their actions that they have no interest in the welfare of Queenslanders. The opposition leader tweets calling for the borders to be opened. The LNP move motions in this parliament about the opening up of the borders. The LNP even put up billboards on the Gold Coast calling for the borders to be opened. The LNP take no notice of the expert advice from the Chief Health Officer and, in fact, attack her. The LNP have demonstrated that nothing is beneath them. The LNP have demonstrated that they will betray the people of Queensland if they think it is in their political interest to do so.

The LNP are not an alternative government. Given the week, I think it is good to draw an analogy with the Ekka. The LNP are like that dodgy dodgem car at the Ekka: a dodgy dodgem car with a dodgy driver spinning out of control, banging and crashing around and going nowhere. The pandemic has exposed, once and for all, the emptiness in the hearts of the LNP for all to see. Their cynicism has no borders, particularly when it comes to the border. They are unfit to govern. Our Premier has done an outstanding job keeping us all safe, backed in by the police keeping the borders secure.

Bruce Highway

 **Mr MINNIKIN** (Chatsworth—LNP) (2.36 pm): I rise today to inform honourable members about my recent 2,830-kilometre road experience driving from Cooktown right down to Coolangatta. The primary purpose of this trip was to inspect the condition of the roads, predominantly the Bruce Highway,

to see firsthand the actual road conditions which those using the highway must navigate. It was also to meet with heavy vehicle transport operators, road builders, traffic control contractors, local councils, port authorities along with tour and charter bus operators to receive their valuable input.

Roads act as enabling infrastructure that support economic growth and social connectivity. They are critical economic arteries for building and maintaining a community. It was evident that many sections of the Bruce are undivided, so overtaking can be dangerous, as many members would know, and outdated bridges prevail. Annual flooding events have caused the destruction of road pavement and structures, resulting in poor and unsafe driving conditions on damaged surfaces. While there were roadworks occurring along the Bruce, understandably this brings long delays to traffic. Also the placement of speed restriction signs of 40 and 60 kilometres per hour where absolutely no work was occurring was hard to justify and it was frustrating motorists.

The 1,652-kilometre stretch of road is the single most important piece of infrastructure in Queensland, which is why it is so disappointing that it took the Palaszczuk Labor government almost three years to hold its first Bruce Highway Trust meeting. Despite promising to establish the trust prior to the 2017 state election and being part of the transport and main roads ministerial charter letter, the incompetent TMR minister delayed holding a meeting until 103 days out from the forthcoming October election. This hardly demonstrates that the Bruce Highway is a priority for this lazy and incompetent Labor government. To add further insult to injury, the membership of the trust did not include one person who resides north of Gympie. Local knowledge of road conditions is a huge benefit and so regional representation should be a key ingredient of the Bruce Highway Trust. An LNP government would ensure full regional representation on the Bruce Highway Trust, unlike the transport and main roads minister, referred to as 'foolish' by the CCC.


Of further concern is that in 2018 Queensland's Auditor-General identified that as a result of chronic underfunding there was a backlog of \$4 billion to maintain the state controlled network. This backlog has grown to over \$5½ billion, which means severe consequences for road safety as well as productivity. Despite the many challenges, I would like to acknowledge the positive attitude of regional Queenslanders. There were plenty of examples of innovation and determination to get on with shovel-ready projects. However, many of them are frustrated that red and green tape are clogging the system and stalling projects.

In terms of integrity measures the general view is that, while the CCC recommendations are supported, the ideological, Labor inspired reforms are grinding council operations to a halt. These shackles need to be removed and local government empowered to once more become a highly functioning, responsive and agile system of government for local communities. An LNP government will partner with local governments as part of our economic strategy to stimulate the overall economy. We will provide practical solutions and the best opportunities for local communities to survive and prosper. The LNP will explore every possible avenue to assist these councils to maintain their full-time workforces with a regular pipeline of supply works and also secure work for local contractors.

Queenslanders know that the state was in an economic crisis well before COVID-19—not because of it. The Palaszczuk government had the last Premier to announce an economic stimulus package that would actually do something for the state, to rectify the economic malaise we find ourselves in. However, no budget means that Labor is flying blind through the biggest economic crisis in almost a century. Particularly in these troubling times, we simply cannot afford another wasted term of Labor government. In contrast, an LNP government will deliver its budget within the first 100 days in office.

The Bruce Highway requires all levels of government to work together towards planning, funding and building a better Bruce. An LNP government would work closely with the federal coalition government and immediately stump up our funding share under an 80-20 arrangement. We need to get works underway as soon as possible. This will form part of our new 10-year plan for the Bruce Highway, Queensland's economic artery from Brisbane to Cairns. The people of Queensland deserve better than what this lazy, incompetent Labor government is currently delivering—very little. I challenge the TMR minister to drive the 2,830 kilometres from Cooktown to Coolangatta, as I did recently, to see the road conditions for himself.

Aspley Electorate, Infrastructure

 **Mr MELLISH** (Aspley—ALP) (2.41 pm): In June we announced that the Palaszczuk government has committed \$128 million to build a new rail overpass at Beams Road, boost the Carseldine park-and-ride and improve local road connections. In 2017 we said that we had a plan to fix Beams Road,

and we are making it happen. Construction will start next year on this fantastic local project. This means hundreds of jobs created and hundreds of hours saved at the boom gates. I launched a community petition, secured funding for a feasibility study, launched the business case and locked in funding from all levels of government. I took up the fight to get this dangerous level crossing removed. I thank the many local residents who joined my community campaign to demand that the level crossing at Carseldine be removed and replaced with a new overpass. This new funding from the Palaszczuk government will mean that we can get this project underway now, with construction starting in 2021.

In addition to the rail overpass, we are delivering a commuter car park plan, including 170 extra car parks, and upgrades to the surrounding road network. In fact, construction is starting this month on the additional car parks. The member for Sandgate and I are very excited about that. We also have the diverging diamond interchange in Bald Hills, a \$30 million project jointly funded by the state and federal governments. This project went out to tender last month, and we are ready to go. We are getting on with it.


However, at a state and federal level all we see from the LNP is promise after promise with no plan to deliver. Like with their money for Linkfield Road, they make an announcement but do not actually put the funding in their budget. Today's *Courier-Mail* reports that, of 15 projects to be fast-tracked under an economic rescue packaged announced by the Prime Minister, none are wholly within Queensland whilst eight are in New South Wales. Only one project, inland rail, is partly in Queensland. I recall then prime minister Tony Abbott saying in 2013 that inland rail was being fast-tracked. Apparently it is not. We are getting on with delivering real projects right now, not in some fictional future.

The Beams Road project is part of Queensland's plan to unite and recover for Queensland jobs. It will deliver much needed construction jobs for locals as we begin to emerge from the COVID-19 pandemic. Plenty of other great projects are happening across the north side as well. Today it was great to hear that three local schools—Geebung Special School, Aspley State School and Craigslea State School—will benefit from the Premier's announcement of school infrastructure enhancement projects. Aspley State School will get \$200,000 to refurbish block B and \$200,000 to create a safe and modern outdoor learning area. I know that the P&C, students and parents have been waiting some time for that. Craigslea State School will get a \$200,000 refurbishment to block D, and that includes new lights, fans, carpet and a repaint. Geebung Special School will get \$200,000 to refurbish its early childhood development precinct to create better learning spaces, storage and facilities. I am really pleased that these three great schools are able to get ahead. These projects are happening now, in this financial year—not at some made-up date in the future.

Of course, this is on top of our fantastic announcements at Aspley State High School. There will be a new multipurpose sports hall, a covered outdoor learning area and a new music centre—investments totalling over \$14 million. I was very pleased to turn the first sod on this work last month with Minister Grace. For years, Aspley State High School students have had no indoor space for sports or PE—if it rained it was all off—and they could not even fit all students in the same hall for assembly. We are fixing that.

Just down the road in Zillmere, the new north side indoor sports centre will be the new home of Northside Wizards Basketball. It also will be a hub for many other sports, with five courts and seating for over 300 spectators. It is under construction right now and will soon open. We also helped fund the relocation of Jabiru Community College right next door. It opened earlier this year and provides a flexible learning environment for students in years 10 to 12. Both of these facilities were in disused sheds that the former LNP government shut down. We are repurposing and re-using them and we are revitalising the entire suburb of Zillmere. This is in addition to our \$6.5 million sporting facilities in Carseldine, which are going gangbusters, just across the creek. We are delivering jobs and certainty in the midst of a shuddering global economy and a health pandemic. Whilst the Leader of the Opposition has been busy calling 64 times a day for our borders to reopen, we are delivering jobs for Queenslanders right now. You cannot trust the LNP to keep Queenslanders safe, and you cannot trust it with the economy.

Rural Finance; Charters Towers, Dialysis; Water Infrastructure

 **Mr KATTER** (Traeger—KAP) (2.45 pm): I would like to talk about the virtues of a rural development bank in response to an article today declaring that there has been an 11.3 per cent rise in rural agricultural debt. In the context of the coronavirus, we should be very tuned in to opportunities that exist to stimulate and grow the economy. The article and the agriculture minister talk about reconstruction loans. They are rubbish. I said the same things when I introduced a reconstruction bill

previously. These loans are targeted at people who do not really need them. They apply to some people but miss all those who can use them. We look for rural development authorities to capture those people who cannot access the standard levels of available finance. Most of the rural loans offered by federal and state governments have to be a second mortgage, but most banks say, 'We don't want a second mortgage; we will just refinance you.' So many people are just refinancing. Some might say that that is a win. No, it is not. The APRA guidelines have definitions on the loan that just miss people. We should approach agriculture from the point of view of, 'This bloke from Ingham is a good farmer. We want to keep him in the industry, but he is just short of capital.' By virtue of the fact that he is low on capital, the system discriminates against him. If we are thinking about trying to stimulate agriculture, we want the good people in there. We do not want foreign investment, institutional capital or just a bigger expansion. They are not necessarily a better farmer or better custodian of the land. By virtue of having more available capital, they look better under the APRA guidelines. There is discrimination against people who do not have access to that.

You can apply exactly the same principle in terms of housing in rural areas. At a Western Alliance meeting the other day, a mayor of one of the small towns reported, 'Someone went to a buy a house in one of these remote towns in my area and were looking for a loan of \$200,000.' One of the financial institutions said, 'Look, we will not give it to you for this town, but go to Townsville and we will loan you \$600,000.' How are we supposed to compete and stop our population declining—that is happening all through Western Queensland—if we do not have an opportunity to access finance? There is postcode discrimination. The banks are up-front about that. I spoke to Wayne Reeves in Normanton. He has a great little business, one of the only service stations in town. He is trying to expand his business. Maybe some people saw the fantastic ad on Youtube with Dean Reeves trying to get more workers in Normanton. It was very entertaining. Wayne Reeves is there with his son trying to build up the service station. The banks have said to me, 'Rob, the problem is that he's out at Normanton.' It is a good business. Normanton has always been a good, stable economy—no boom or bust—but the banks will discriminate against it. Someone in a credit facility in Sydney will not sign off on a loan for a business in Normanton.


If we looked at this business we would say, 'Do we want anyone to exist in those areas? Do we want any businesses to access capital to grow?' When I refer to businesses, I include agriculture. If we answer 'yes' to that question, we have to do it. Here is the good news: it does not cost taxpayers. It may up-front but in the long term it does not. We have had these most of our lives in Queensland and Australia. QIDC sold for \$1.5 billion. Do not say that it costs us money or it is too much of a burden.

The QIDC was sold for \$1.5 billion, so the government cannot say that it costs it money or it is too much of a burden. It was sold for \$1.5 billion. It made us money. Banks make money. It is not a bank for everyone or is not there for everyone. It is there for good loans that do not meet the existing criteria. There is room for a development bank and for it to be done properly, not these stupid second mortgages that are just a waste of time. I will admit that they work for a small number of people, but they miss the point. That is a big issue we need to focus on.

Another issue I want to touch on quickly is dialysis. Charters Towers still has no dialysis. It is hard to find another town in Queensland of that size that does not have dialysis in those western areas. At the moment 11 to 12 people need to travel every day to Townsville, and that is a disgrace. That needs to be fixed. Mount Isa is still 17 short, so those people effectively go to Townsville to die. Many of those people's families do not have the means to visit them and they are stuck in Townsville for the rest of their lives if they and their families do not move. It is a terrible scourge and reflection on government. If there is any money in health, surely that should be a priority. In this day and age the fact that there is still such a big shortage out there is a curse, and that issue is only getting worse and it is something we need to look out for.

We keep hearing about the Bradfield Scheme. If members care about the Bradfield Scheme, they should get up to Townsville, get in the ring and start fighting for a proper sized dam wall. At the moment the plan is for a small dam wall that will kill the Bradfield Scheme forever. There is a fight that needs to be had there and I encourage people to get in that fight.

Gold Coast, Transport Upgrades

 **Ms SCANLON** (Gaven—ALP) (2.50 pm): I nearly fell off my chair earlier listening to the member for Nanango's rewriting of history on the Gold Coast. She clearly thinks that we have short memories. I remind the Leader of the Opposition of an article published in the *Gold Coast Bulletin* in fact at the last

election with the title 'John-Paul Langbroek on why the LNP in government could have done more for the Gold Coast', and by 'more' he clearly meant something because, despite holding every seat on the Gold Coast, those opposite took our community for granted and did not just fail to deliver for the community; they cut funding for roads and transport and sacked staff at our Gold Coast hospitals. I assure those opposite that the people in my community still very much remember.

In stark contrast, I am very proud to be a part of a Labor government that is delivering critical transport and road upgrades for the Gold Coast as part of our economic plan to build infrastructure that creates jobs during this global pandemic. It was a Labor government that kick-started stage 1 of the light rail. Under this Palaszczuk government, we built stage 2 in eight months flat for the Commonwealth Games and we are building stage 3 right now which will provide over 760 jobs and expand the network to Burleigh, but we are going even further.

Last week I joined the Premier and minister to announce funding to start a business case for stage 4 of the light rail that will go all the way down to Coolangatta via the Gold Coast Airport, a key economic driver within our community. This is a project for which I have advocated for a long time because it will revolutionise travel along that linear coastal strip while preserving the heavy rail corridor for a potential future expansion. Having grown up in Nerang though, I am particularly excited about the east-west bus and light rail connection which will be explored through a multimodal study that will prioritise rapid transit along the Broadbeach to Robina and Broadbeach to Nerang corridors. I have lived on the Gold Coast my entire life and connections with the airport and better services for families in the western part of our city have been a discussion for a long time, so I am really pleased to see the Palaszczuk government has supported the next critical steps needed to push these major transport projects forward, making it easier for members of my community to get to the beach or enjoy our famous night-life without having to get in their cars.

This builds on a number of other projects that we are delivering. When I was first elected I made it crystal clear that one of my major priorities would be to get the M1 upgrades happening 'as soon as they possibly can' after the LNP did not spend a single new dollar when last in government, setting us back years. I table that article from the *Gold Coast Bulletin* published in December 2017.

Tabled paper. Article from the *Gold Coast Bulletin*, dated 7 December 2017, titled 'Scanlon: Labor are "crystal clear" on M1' [\[1312\]](#).

Since then we have started and finished the Mudgeeraba to Varsity Lakes section and we have commenced work on the larger section from Varsity Lakes all the way to Tugun. We have gazetted the Coomera Connector corridor—again stopped by the LNP from progressing—and started the business case with the federal government to get this project moving. We have also spent over \$160 million upgrading Southport-Burleigh Road, Ross Street, Olsen Avenue, Nerang-Broadbeach Road and the new Gooding Drive roundabout and creating a shared pathway connecting Nerang station to Metricon Stadium.

Right now exit 57 is getting an upgrade. Exit 41 in Yatala will start later this year and a business case is underway on exit 49 in Pimpama. Our Cross River Rail project will unlock the bottleneck of our rail network, allowing more trains to run more often from the Gold Coast, as well as the construction of three new train stations at Pimpama, Helensvale North and Merrimac which will provide greater options in those growth corridors while taking pressure off our existing park-and-ride facilities and creating jobs through the construction phase. Our government has a plan and a pipeline of projects that continue to support and create jobs. According to data from the Queensland Government Statistician's Office, in the last 10 years to June 2019 the Gold Coast grew the most of any other region in Queensland by an average of 12,700 persons per year. When we consider these numbers, it is disappointing to think of the time that we lost under the Newman LNP government, which did not spend a single new dollar on the M1 and stopped the Coomera Connector from progressing.

Even now we have the member for Mermaid Beach describing the light rail as an infliction and the member for Burleigh advocating for a bizarre new route which would do a dogleg away from the coast line and conveniently right past a brewery which he co-owns. When further asked on radio about the broader ramifications this would have on the train line, he said, 'Forget about the heavy rail to the airport,' making it very clear that the LNP opposes a future heavy rail extension.

The LNP cannot be trusted to deal with the health response of this pandemic and it cannot be trusted to deliver infrastructure in the interests of working Gold Coasters. This Palaszczuk government has the runs on the board when it comes to delivering road, rail and public transport upgrades for the Gold Coast and we have a plan to keep moving forward.


ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

BIODISCOVERY AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading (Cognate Debate)

Resumed from p. 1866, on motion of Ms Enoch—

That the bills be now read a second time.


 **Mr BOOTHMAN** (Theodore—LNP) (2.56 pm), continuing: Before the lunch break I was talking about the importance of adhering to the Nagoya protocol to give First Nation peoples the benefit of their traditional knowledge when it comes to medicines and other fibres et cetera. The bill does have an honourable intent but, as we found during the committee process, it lacked detail on how it was going to follow-through with that intent. Unfortunately, it created more questions than it answered. It also highlighted the lack of knowledge from the environment department about the legislation's framework and it seemed that the submitters had a lot more knowledge about the legislation itself than the department. As the member for Scenic Rim highlighted, that is very concerning.

Fundamentally, when it comes to this legislation my personal fear is how the code of practice would follow through and how that would deal with disputes. For instance, there could be two groups of individuals that would lay claim to a certain traditional medicine or a traditional fibre which could then be potentially caught up in the legal system for decades. If there is a potential medicine which could alleviate a modern illness or an illness which has been around for many years, if it gets tied up in the legal framework the only people who will make money out of it are the lawyers unfortunately. This is something which I found deeply concerning simply because there was no mention in the committee hearings how this could be addressed. It was simply stated that there would be discussions between the parties. As we know, sometimes these discussions can boil over and progress can be very slow. That is my major concern with this bill. As stated in our statement of reservation—

The department advised that clause 27 may reverse the onus of proof, but somehow this breach of fundamental legislative principle was justified. Then less than three weeks later, the department provided new advice that it now suddenly did not consider that clause 27 involved any reversal of proof in criminal proceedings ...

It seemed to the committee that the department did not do its homework. We felt that there were a lot of questions left unanswered. The member for Noosa, in her statement of reservation—which was a very good statement of reservation—certainly hit the nail on the head. It was similar to what we put together. As I said, we had serious concerns around this.

One of my residents, an individual who has a fair bit to do with my local Aboriginal community, said, 'Don't we elect MPs to make decisions on legislation? Why are we leaving it to bureaucrats all the time to come up with these codes of practice?' It is a concern for many in our communities who say, 'They are not accountable; you guys are. Therefore, you should be putting up legislation which we deem appropriate and we can actually have our say through the ballot box.' As he rightly says, a bureaucrat does not stand for election; we as members of parliament do. We need to make sure that when we put legislation through it is going to work in the best interests of all Queenslanders. While the bill does contain an honourable intent, unfortunately it falls far short of what it should actually do. I have deep concerns as to how this will progress in the future. It worries me that we may get medical treatments that will potentially be held up in years of litigation.

 **Mr BOYCE** (Callide—LNP) (3.01 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I oppose this bill in its entirety. I do this on behalf of the mining and resource industries, the grazing and farming industries and everybody associated with them. The Callide electorate in this COVID-19 era is the economic engine room of Queensland. We produce the food you eat. We grow the fibre to put clothes on your back. We supply the materials you build your homes with. We generate the power that your affluent city lifestyles use. We provide jobs for countless thousands. We provide the revenue that pays Public Service wages. I will not see this capability compromised.

The proposal to install a Rehabilitation Commissioner seems logical and reasonable at face value. The virtue-signalling, urban environmentalist would agree with it. However, when you dig down into the substance of this proposal its intent is entirely different. The mining and resource sector already

implements and practices world's best rehabilitation and environmental standards that are second to none. To overlay another level of bureaucracy is totally unwarranted, as Mr Ian Macfarlane from the Queensland Resources Council has pointed out.

The committee report says that the Rehabilitation Commissioner will be appointed upon recommendation by the minister, the commissioner will take direction from the minister and there are no specific qualifications necessary. This will be at a cost of millions to the taxpayer. This clause is absolutely toxic, in my opinion. It affords the minister, especially someone who may well be given to extremes of ideology, an opportunity to effectively weaponise any and all directions that are given to the Rehabilitation Commissioner. Effectively, the Rehabilitation Commissioner may become a political hitman for a government of the day. This is especially relevant where the current government is captive of a cabinet with ideological and political leanings overwhelming favouring extreme green eco Marxist ideology and, by default, a stand of anti agriculture, anti resources, anti development and, therefore, anti employment and, so, anti prosperity.

Queensland suffers from a bloated and somewhat inefficient Public Service. The Labor government wants to create another department. The Rehabilitation Commissioner will not be a standalone independent position; rather it will become driven by ideological politics and bigoted environmental opinion that will be championed by the uncompromising member for Algeester, Leeanne Enoch. We have seen actions in this 56th Parliament such as the appalling way the minister handled the Carmichael mine project. Make no mistake: the minister is intent on making the mining and resource sector that much harder and restrict and stifle its growth and prosperity. Who can forget the day that Jackie Trad, the member for South Brisbane, stood in this House and said coalminers must reskill?

Ms TRAD: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member is actually taking it out of context. It is personally offensive. I ask him to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): The member for South Brisbane finds it offensive. I ask you to withdraw.


Mr BOYCE: I withdraw. To attach agriculture to this bill, in particular requirements for an environmental authority for cropping and horticultural activities, is nothing short of appalling. The report notes the bill will align application requirements for an environmental authority for cropping and horticulture activities with matters to be considered when making a decision to grant an environmental authority. Put simply, farmers will now face the prospect of having to lodge applications to a government department to plant their crops. This is disgraceful. Farmers will be reduced to a tick-the-box state government department system of yes or no.

The bill clarifies existing provisions for the improved implementation of the Great Barrier Reef protection regulations. Recently I attended the federal Senate inquiry into reef science. I was the only member of this House to do so. The revelations from that inquiry are astounding. Senator Rennick asked Dr Hardisty from the Australian Institute of Marine Science, 'Is there an overall database of coral growth rates or declines for the entire Great Barrier Reef?' Dr Hardisty's answer was, 'An entire database of growth rates for the Great Barrier Reef as a whole, no such thing exists.' Dr Hardisty said, 'We have never connected them to anything to do with farm run-off or farm activity.'

The 2017 Scientific Consensus Statement for the reef, which underpins the reef legislation, states—

Sugarcane areas are the largest contributors of dissolved inorganic nitrogen and pesticides, while grazing contributes to the largest proportion of sediment and particulate nutrients to the Great Barrier Reef.

This is in total conflict to what Dr Hardisty has said and, in my opinion, is misleading and deceitful. The whole reef legislation and the bill implementing government controlled agriculture must, even to the casual observer, offer spine-chilling similarities to Stalinist Russia's disastrous state controlled collective farm system that notably created mass starvation and resulted in the death of millions. For AgForce and the Queensland Farmers' Federation to support this bill defies logic. In my opinion, they are either complicit or showed wilful negligence when examining this bill. It is little wonder their membership has failed. On behalf of the Callide farmers, graziers and miners, I do not support this bill.

 **Mrs GILBERT** (Mackay—ALP) (3.08 pm): The contribution from the member for Callide was entertaining. Whatever he had for lunch, we all should have some. I rise to speak on the cognate bills, the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. The rehabilitation of mining land in my region is vitally important to land

health, the environment and the ability to re-use land once mining operations are extinguished from a mine site. In recent years there have been some exciting and extensive rehabilitation works carried out on mine sites and I have been privileged to be invited onto these sites to inspect the works. There are mining companies in the Bowen Basin that are taking rehabilitation of their disused pits seriously. They want to leave the land in a state that is usable for agriculture, grazing or back to its natural state reflecting the wishes of traditional owners.


The most recent mine that I have had the privilege to visit this year was the Coppabella mine. The land will never look the same as it did before mining, but Coppabella's rehabilitation program is focused on establishing a post-mining land use that has been determined in consultation with traditional owners. The objective of this is to establish a conservation area useful for traditional owners. This has been achieved and is built into Coppabella's rehabilitation process through the selection of native grasses and tree species. Coppabella has already rehabilitated 657 hectares of land as part of its progressive rehabilitation plans.

In 1998 Coppabella signed Queensland's first native title agreement and Peabody maintains a positive working relationship with the native title holders of the Barada Barna people. Peabody has a trainee program supporting local Indigenous youth trainees working on country. Eight Barada Barna trainees are currently employed at Coppabella and neighbouring Peabody mine Moorvale. This is just one good news story of rehabilitation from the Bowen Basin.

Through its legislative amendments, the Palaszczuk government continues to deliver our plan to unite and recover by improving rehabilitation outcomes and financial assurance provisions in the resource sector to create jobs that will support regional communities and protect the environment.

This bill allows for the appointment of the independent Rehabilitation Commissioner by the Governor in Council and provides for the functions of that position. Those functions are separate from but complementary to the existing regulatory role of the Department of Environment and Science. The Rehabilitation Commissioner will be tasked with working collaboratively with the community, industry, environmental groups, researchers and the Department of Environment and Science on rehabilitation and management practices and their outcomes. Specifically, the Rehabilitation Commissioner will be asked to provide advice, reports and guidance to the government and industry on best practice rehabilitation and management of non-use management areas. When I have attended functions that include mining companies, some of them have said to me that they would welcome more guidance and oversight in their rehabilitation. They want to get it right.

I will refer briefly to the Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. This bill clarifies the relationship between the act and international protocols, namely the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Nagoya protocol and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations International Treaty on Plant and Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, known as the FAO Treaty. Clarifying these relationships was a key recommendation of the statutory review and was reinforced through subsequent stakeholder consultation. I commend the bills to the House.

 **Ms BOLTON** (Noosa—Ind) (3.12 pm): I rise to speak on the cognate debate of two bills that cover biodiscovery—a big issue—and the appointment of a rehabilitation commissioner. There are many important elements of the Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019, which includes its incorporation, the recognition and legal protection of our First Nation peoples and its reflection of the international standards of the Nagoya protocol. The amendment of the Biodiscovery Act 2004 provides obligation for the use of traditional knowledge that will help Queensland's biodiscovery industry remain globally competitive. It will also ensure that the benefits of biodiscovery are shared equitably throughout Queensland, including with First Nation peoples. This is a welcome and essential part of our forward journey together and the future this creates.

However, as outlined in my statement of reservation of February this year, there are concerns to be noted. Firstly, through submissions at the public hearing and briefing, as well as via the traditional knowledge stakeholder round table, questions were raised around the lack of a code of practice. That code has been referred to as an essential document in identifying the appropriate and authorised custodian of traditional knowledge, the circumstances in which the traditional knowledge obligation applies and the minimum requirements to fulfil that obligation. Without the code to consider in parallel with this bill, it has been difficult to obtain a more robust understanding of processes and support for the resolutions of these issues. It has also been difficult to identify other appropriate mechanisms that will address potential delays for important and maybe lifesaving and vital access to medical advancement for Queenslanders. That is not something to be taken lightly.


Secondly, given the complexity of the bill the time to draft the code of practice could restrict the ability of participants to consult fully on complex issues. Multiple industries may be impacted during this time, including pharmaceuticals, agriculture, nutraceutical and cosmeceutical industries. That can in turn directly impact all Queenslanders.

Thirdly, while submitters support this bill and its intent, there is a question around how the bill will be applied in practice. Griffith University researchers and legal counsel raised issues pertaining to the management of traditional knowledge when held by multiple groups. The deferral to a code of practice and guidelines further complicated those issues. It may not be considered standard, appropriate or possible to have documents such as those available when considering all bills. However, in such an important and complex arena—which may be instrumental in, for example, curing cancer, dementia or even COVID-19—it would have given reassurance to all stakeholders as well as those examining this bill to have those documents available.

I turn to the second part of the cognate debate. The Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020 provides for the appointment of the Rehabilitation Commissioner. The bill also clarifies and enhances the residual risk framework to better manage risks on sites after an environmental authority for a resource activity has been surrendered. We all need to be confident about the outcomes for rehabilitated mine land. The role of the commissioner is vital in this, as is the funding and the ability to move forward in the rehabilitation of those sites, leading to benefits that can be delivered across Queensland, including through jobs.

We need to be confident that the strong legislative framework we put in place is informed by stakeholder consultation. A lack of or limited consultation with key industry stakeholders has raised some concerns and we heard about some of those earlier. While COVID-19 may account for the limited opportunity for submitters to provide comment on the draft bill, stakeholder input is critically important. Indeed, best practice policy and legislative development happens when stakeholder consultation is undertaken on all aspects of a bill. Stakeholders further highlighted that industry is more than willing to resolve outstanding issues in line with expectations through consultation.

Both bills in this cognate debate are admirable and essential, although they do raise some concerns. However, ultimately we need to assess the overall benefit and that the amendments put, and future management processes proposed, will sufficiently address those. In closing, I thank the departments, agencies and committees that have worked on both bills. I acknowledge my fellow committee members for their work in the complex arena of biodiscovery, undertaken in a short time frame. I thank the submitters to that bill and reassure them that their voices have been heard. To our traditional owners and custodians of the land, thank you for your reassurance at the hearing that concerns surrounding obtaining agreements between groups can be resolved through discussion. This is vital as it is imperative that lifesaving knowledge is not delayed or withheld from our communities because of the inability to obtain agreement between each other or red, green or any other coloured tape.

 **Ms TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (3.18 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the cognate debate on the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020 and the Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. I am not sure that I am going to trump the member for Callide. I will not even try. He never disappoints. I cannot wait for his contribution on 5G—

Mr Power: And vaccinations.

Ms TRAD: I take that interjection from the member for Logan—and his contribution on vaccinations.

Ms Simpson: Contribution on corruption in—what seat is it? South Brisbane! That's right.

Ms TRAD: As soon as the member for Maroochydore can stop heckling, I am very proud to stand in this chamber—

Ms Simpson interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order! Pause the clock. Member for Maroochydore, your interjections are not being taken. I have already given you a fair go. Next time you will be warned under the standing orders.

Ms TRAD: I am very proud to be making a contribution on both of the bills before the House. When I was a young person I was compelled and motivated to join the Labor Party for a whole range of reasons: fairness at work, fairness in our society, justice for First Nation Australians and better

outcomes and better protections for our environment. The bills we are debating cognately address these values. I am proud of the role that I have played in terms of some of the elements of the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020.

As members in this parliament will know, at the time when I was leading negotiations around the mine closure and progressive rehabilitation regulations that we now have in this state—brought in by a Labor government, committed to at the last election—I committed this government to progress a rehabilitation commissioner for our state. This was not, as the member for Callide would say, as a result of the desire to grow a bureaucracy but because it was very clear that, whether you are a landholder or whether you are someone who is incredibly interested in the environment, our track record when it comes to mine rehabilitation in this state needs to improve. That is just a fact. The best way to improve it is to have an independent gaze over how we ensure rehabilitation and progressive closures so that we are not left with abandoned mines that the Queensland taxpayer must fix in the future. We already have such a significant liability in this respect. It is something that we, as a Labor government, have committed to addressing. This bill goes some way to addressing it.

I thank the Minister for Environment for bringing forward this legislation and for her leadership on this issue. It was an important commitment that we made in 2018 and it is great to see it followed through. I know that there will be a lot of people right throughout our state who are very happy about this new role, its new functions and the increase in standards around mine rehabilitation and progressive closures.

I would now like to make a contribution to the Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. For far too long we have decided to use First Nation people's lands, seas, knowledge and culture, appropriated in a way without their authority and without their prior informed consent and agreement. This bill seeks to provide a place at the table for First Nation Queenslanders, for traditional owners, when it comes to their own traditional knowledge of biodiversity. Of course we know how important biodiversity is in terms of looking at some of the complex and challenging health issues that we have and also in terms of managing the land. The minister has provided examples in relation to things that Colin Saltmere has been doing. I have been very honoured to witness some of the work he is doing in the area of spinifex and its bioproducts. More power to him in the great work that he does.

In relation to the role that First Nation peoples and traditional owners should play in all of the legal power and all of the legal standing that they have in terms of biodiscovery, let's be clear: it is a Labor government that is bringing this into this House and there will be considerable change for traditional owners in Queensland because of this. I note the fact that it is a woman of Indigenous descent who is doing this in this House. I think that is just tremendous.


I want to address some of the issues that have been raised by people in this chamber about the concerns they have around the lack of information or the fact that the code of conduct or guidelines have not been presented with this legislation. I have been in this parliament for a while now and I know that we present a bit of legislation with a flag that we will go off and do further work around further regulations, further codes of conduct or further guidelines that will be ratified by the executive and for stakeholders to use. Let me say in the first instance that this is nothing new. What is new is that it primarily gives people a bit of a question mark over whether or not traditional owners can manage and resolve their business in order to see biodiscovery unfold and research continue around their understanding of biodiscovery, nature, plants, flora and fauna.

It is quite incredible to hear someone like the member for Theodore say, 'Look, it is noble and honourable in intent but, quite frankly, it is too difficult because we do not think traditional owners can come to an agreement over who owns the rights here.' If we pulled up stumps every time something was difficult, I do not think we would make half the discoveries, or even 90 per cent of the discoveries, that we do. Everything comes from effort and everything that is difficult is worthwhile.

Ms Grace: All whites don't agree, either.

Ms TRAD: I will take that interjection from the member for McConnel. Non-Indigenous people do not agree, either. In fact, we are fine examples of that in this chamber. To say that we should not pursue this and that the LNP will be voting against this because they do not think traditional owners can have a conversation, have a discussion, engage in negotiation and come to an outcome is quite disgraceful. I would suggest that it is indicative of casual racism, quite frankly.

This is a terrific opportunity for a new economy or access to an economy that traditional owners have traditionally been locked out of. I think this is a fantastic leap forward. I commend both bills to the House. I personally want to thank the Minister for Environment for bringing forward this great legislation.

 **Mr WEIR** (Condamine—LNP) (3.26 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020 as a member of the Natural Resources, Agricultural Industry Development and Environment Committee. The Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill was introduced into the chamber and referred to the committee on 18 June and the committee was required to report by 3 August, so it has been a very speedy process. According to the explanatory notes, the principal policy objectives of the bill are to provide for the statutory appointment of a rehabilitation commissioner with specific functions including providing advice on rehabilitation or best practice management of land and facilitating better public reporting on rehabilitation; and to clarify and enhance the residual risk framework to better manage risks on sites after an environmental authority for a resource activity has been surrendered.

No-one can argue the need for strong guidelines and regulation concerning the rehabilitation of mine and petroleum sites when they reach the end of their extraction lives, but the development of this bill raises a number of issues that are yet to be resolved. Indeed, industry questions the need for the establishment of a rehabilitation commissioner in the first place. The Queensland Resources Council stated in its submission—

QRC is of the view that a Rehabilitation Commissioner is unwarranted. Given the Commissioner is to draw upon already existing Government staff for support and to provide technical advice, much of which is anticipated to be sourced from within ... (DES), QRC questions the add value of the role beyond the existing function and capabilities of the Department ...

...

The additional resourcing and expenditure required to implement the role of the Rehabilitation Commissioner and the associated office is to cost the State an initial \$8 million over six years (through to 2024-25). This is a significant financial commitment in the current environment, particularly when Government already has the capability to largely deliver the intent of the Commissioner.

The Queensland Law Society raised concerns that the role of the Rehabilitation Commissioner may ultimately duplicate the functions of the regulator.

The qualifications of the commissioner are unclear, as was also noted by QRC, which stated that they are incomplete and vague. The QRC submission stated the importance of having a suitably qualified and skilled representative in the role, saying—

The Rehabilitation Commissioner must have a comprehensive understanding of how mines of different commodities operate and rehabilitate, and the technical matters to be considered in these processes. For this reason, and the highly technical nature of the role, it is necessary for the person appointed to have relevant qualifications and experience outlined in legislation ...

AgForce expressed concerns that the Rehabilitation Commissioner will not have the regulatory powers to instruct the department to enforce rehabilitation compliance and if not, why not?

In regard to residual risk amendments, the Queensland government's consultation report titled *Managing residual risks in Queensland: discussion paper* noted that the residual risks are those risks remaining at a rehabilitated and surrendered resource site when the resource company is generally no longer responsible for the monitoring, maintenance or rectification of the site. Residual risk covers the risks of rehabilitation failing, ongoing management and the risk of contaminants being released from the area and potentially causing environmental harm after the environmental authority has been surrendered.

The concerning part of this section of the legislation is the fact that the key underlying instruments of the legislation such as the guidelines regarding the administration of the residual risk fund and the calculator for undertaking calculations on residual risk are still unfinished and unpublished. In its submission, the Queensland Law Society stated that the increasing trend of this government to delegate legislative functions outside the parliament's scrutiny is a concern.

There are yet more areas of this bill that were unclear in the wording, including the recording of residual risk on title. The Australian Petroleum Production & Exploration Association Ltd expressed concern that the risk not be across an entire tenement but be on a lot on plan only, as it can be many years before work is finalised across the tenure but may be finalised much earlier on individual lots. Whilst the department stated that the intent is for lot on plan only, I note that the minister has tabled an amendment to enshrine this in the legislation. This is in response to one of the committee's recommendations.

Whilst this is welcomed, it only serves to highlight the lack of consultation with affected stakeholders in the rush to introduce this bill. Industry was only too willing to address these concerns, but was not given the opportunity in the time frame allowed. As Ian Macfarlane from QRC stated—

For something that is going to have such a significant impact and has so many loose ends, for want of a better word, if not grey areas, then we would have thought that a longer consultation along the lines of what the government promised us, two months consultation on all legislation, would have at least been the minimum. Obviously, we were not afforded that and hence the grey areas around a significant part of this legislation.

Another indication of the rushed process to introduce this bill was the misinformation provided to the committee regarding the absence of a regulatory impact analysis. In response to concerns on this issue raised by the QRC in their submission, the department stated in a written response to the committee—

The department followed the Regulatory Impact Assessment requirements specified under the *Queensland Government Guide to Better Regulation*. Under the principles in this guideline, none of the amendments in the Bill required a Regulatory Impact Statement. Where required under the guideline, the department sought advice from the Office of Best Practice Regulation by submitting exclusions and preliminary impact assessments. This is outlined in the Explanatory Notes for the Bill.


There was no such statement in the explanatory notes.

Whilst we will not be opposing the bill, it is very hard to have a lot of confidence in this government to deliver any meaningful result out of such a poorly drafted piece of legislation. We all support the rehabilitation of end-of-use mines. No-one wants to see the errors of the past repeated—and there are a number of them.

We want to see best practice. There is no better example of this than New Hope Acland mine in the electorate of Condamine. This rehabilitation has won national awards, but this government, instead of rewarding this best practice, is intent on closing this mine down and throwing all the workers at this site on the ever-growing unemployment list. This does not instil a lot of confidence in the Palaszczuk government's commitment to world's best practice rehabilitation.

I am extremely disappointed that this bill has not been debated in this House as a standalone bill. To cognate this bill with the biodiscovery bill, which has nothing remotely in common with this bill, is nothing less than an abuse of this parliament. I have been critical of some of the findings of the committee and some of the processes of the committee, but the committee worked very constructively on this report, as is noted in the recommendations made. I acknowledge all members of the committee on both sides of the House and our secretary, Jacqui Dewar.

I will speak briefly on the biodiscovery bill. I recently visited John Koehler, who lives at the foothills of the Bunya Mountains. He has been into traditional herbal remedies for many years—remedies made from things such as gumby gumby, wilga, emu bush and nettle. It is a long list and he has a large clientele of very dedicated followers. I think he is processing something in the vicinity of 60,000 capsules a month and is expanding the business. He has worked closely with the traditional custodians and has some of them lined up to be part of the business. There is obviously a benefit in those products. We need to investigate those. Any possible cures that may come forth we need to encourage and use.

 **Mr MADDEN** (Ipswich West—ALP) (3.35 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill which are being debated this afternoon as cognate bills. My short but enthusiastic contribution to the debate will focus on the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill because after the first reading speech this bill was referred to the Natural Resources, Agricultural Industry Development and Environment Committee which is the committee I serve on as a committee member in the 56th Parliament.

Ms Pugh: Hear, hear.

Mr MADDEN: Thank you. I take that interjection. I would like to begin by thanking the Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef, Minister for Science and Minister for the Arts for introducing this important bill to the parliament. As well, I would like to thank my fellow committee members, led by the member for Bancroft as chair, and the committee secretariat, led by Jacqui Dewar. I would like to thank the parliamentary officers who prepared the statement of compatibility, the departmental officers, the submitters and Hansard.


The principle policy objectives of the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020 are: firstly, to clarify and enhance the residual risk framework to better manage risks on site after an environmental authority for a resource activity has been surrendered; and, secondly, to provide for the statutory appointment of a Rehabilitation Commissioner with specific functions including providing advice on rehabilitation or best practice management of land and facilitating better public reporting on rehabilitation.

As the minister said in her first reading speech, this bill will amend the Environmental Protection Act 1994 and the Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Act 2018 to fulfil this government's commitment to establish a Rehabilitation Commissioner and enable the residual risk reforms for the resources sector. Through these legislative amendments the government continues to

deliver on our plan to unite and recover by improving rehabilitation outcomes and financial assurance provisioning in the resources sector to create jobs that will support regional communities and protect the environment.

The explanatory notes state that consultation on the bill was restricted due to the difficulties arising during the novel coronavirus COVID-19 emergency. However, consultation with key stakeholders on the establishment of a Rehabilitation Commissioner occurred during September and October 2019. Consultation in relation to the residual risk aspects of the bill initially occurred between 19 November 2018 and 1 February 2019, with the Queensland government releasing the *Managing residual risks in Queensland: discussion paper* for public comment. During 2019 workshops were held with key stakeholders. In late May 2020 a draft bill was provided to the Lock the Gate Alliance, the Environmental Defenders Office and the Queensland Resources Council. I would like to thank these groups for their input to the final bill.

On 19 June 2020 the Natural Resources, Agricultural Industry Development and Environment Committee invited stakeholders and subscribers to make written submissions on the bill. The committee received 14 submissions. The committee received a public briefing about the bill from the Department of Environment and Science on 1 July 2020. The committee also received written advice from the department in response to matters raised in the submissions. The committee held a further public hearing on 13 July 2020. In its report tabled in August 2020, the Natural Resources, Agricultural Industry Development and Environment Committee made various recommendations including that the bill be passed. I commend both bills to the House.

 **Mr KNUTH** (Hill—KAP) (3.39 pm): I rise to contribute to today's cognate debate. However, I would like to point out that we should be debating and voting on each bill on its merits individually instead of bundling them together. KAP supports the Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill primarily for its protection of Indigenous traditional knowledge rights in line with the Nagoya protocol. I have no doubt there are many applications, cures, treatments and products which can be developed using traditional knowledge. However, many remain hidden due to the lack of protection for First Australians.

I have been informed of one such product which is now protected under the legislation which uses spinifex to produce rubber products. This process was developed through the application of traditional knowledge methods. Now there is a full facility in place including onsite training for Indigenous workers located near Camooweal in the mid-west of the state. This type of product cannot be developed using traditional knowledge without the express permission of the custodians of this knowledge. This opens up substantial business development opportunities and jobs for our First Australians which I am sure everyone agrees is a good outcome.

The KAP cannot support the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill as it sets a perception of cleaning up the reef regulation legislation implemented by this government. We should not even be debating this legislation as the original bill should never have been forced on farmers in the first place. The reef regulation legislation brought in draconian requirements wrongly portraying and demonising farmers as public enemy No. 1.

I have read the proof *Hansard* from the July hearing of the federal Senate inquiry, which is looking at whether farm practices impact water quality outcomes in the Great Barrier Reef. The inquiry certainly paints a different picture and should be an eye-opener for those willing to read the transcripts. Let me read some of the statements from Dr Schaffelke, Research Program Director for A Healthy and Resilient Great Barrier Reef at the Australian Institute of Marine Science. Dr Schaffelke was answering questions in relation to the impact of land run-off and water quality on ecosystems of the Great Barrier Reef and said—

... there are periods of time when calcification has reduced, and we have been able to link that with marine heatwaves and coral bleaching. So this is not something that has anything, as far as we know at the moment, to do with water quality ...

In regard to the aspect of pesticides, often cited as severely damaging to the reef, Dr Schaffelke stated—

Corals, in general, are not that much exposed to pesticides, because they are just further away from where the influence usually lies.

...

They are out there actually in measurable concentrations for the whole year. But the concentrations at the actual reef sites are relatively low.

When asked about whether there was a database of coral growth rates or declines for the entire Great Barrier Reef, Dr Paul Hardisty, CEO of the Australian Institute of Marine Science, responded by saying—

We have never connected them—


meaning coral growth decline rates—

to anything to do with farm run off or farm activity—

However, in the 2017 Scientific Consensus Statement on land use impacts on the Great Barrier Reef water quality and ecosystem condition, produced by the Queensland government, Dr Schaffelke is listed as one of those lead authors. On page 11 regarding source of land based pollutants, it states—

Sugarcane areas are the largest contributors of dissolved inorganic nitrogen and pesticides, while grazing contributes the largest proportion of sediment nutrients to the Great Barrier Reef.

It appears that when grilled under a Senate inquiry the truth comes out, yet when it comes to a Queensland government produced publication somehow the science is the exact opposite. The question is: what is the truth? It appears that the government are basing legislation on what can only be described as highly questionable science. I completely reject this bill. The KAP already have a bill ready to go after the upcoming election that will repeal the state government's reef regulation. I want to bring that to the attention of the House.


 **Ms PUGH** (Mount Ommaney—ALP) (3.44 pm): As a member of the committee which recently took over responsibility for the environment portfolio, I rise briefly today to support the introduction of the cognate bills. It has been fantastic having the opportunity to get our heads around a whole new portfolio. I am sure I speak for you as well, Mr Deputy Speaker Weir, as a fellow member of the committee. It has been great to have the opportunity to have some hearings on the introduction of the Rehabilitation Commissioner.

The Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill honours the government's commitment to explore options related to the establishment of a Rehabilitation Commissioner. The bill delivers on this commitment by creating a statutory position of a Rehabilitation Commissioner to be appointed by the Governor in Council. This position will carry distinct functions under the act which are additional and complementary to the existing functions of the Department of Environment and Science.

The Rehabilitation Commissioner will be independent from the regulatory functions of DES and supported by a dedicated team. The commissioner will work collaboratively with the community and stakeholders, the resources sector, environmental and scientific groups, and DES to provide advice on best practice rehabilitation management practices and outcomes. This will include the development of reports on best practice rehabilitation and management of non-use management areas. The commissioner will raise awareness of rehabilitation matters; will be responsible for chairing relevant workshops and forums; and will monitor and report on rehabilitation performance and trends to the minister responsible for the EP Act.

An annual report from the Rehabilitation Commissioner will be tabled in parliament. This report will include details on the performance of the Rehabilitation Commissioner's functions. It is important to note that the creation of this position will not create additional regulatory burden for operators. Rather, it is about giving the community confidence that the conditions applied to mining operations reflect best practice and also that that information is equally available, easily available and freely available to all within the community.

As I mentioned, the commissioner will also have the ability to meet with stakeholders and educate them about best practice rehabilitation. This will create openness and transparency within the broader community about the expectations the commissioner has in current and future rehabilitation, and provide that information broadly. This is about ensuring that there are clear expectations for the community. I commend the bills to the House.

 **Mr BATT** (Bundaberg—LNP) (3.48 pm): As a member of the Natural Resources, Agricultural Industry Development and Environment Committee, I rise to make my contribution to the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, which is being debated in cognate with the Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. Before I begin, I would like to thank our committee's secretariat staff for their continuing invaluable assistance—including Jacqui, Rhyll and Caitlin and to welcome back Ciara from her secondment—and to thank my fellow committee members for the collegiate way both sides have worked on this bill so far.

On 18 June, the minister introduced the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill to the House and it was referred to our committee for consideration. On 1 July there was a public briefing and on 13 July we held a public hearing. The stated principal policy objectives of the bill are to, firstly, provide for the statutory appointment of a Rehabilitation Commissioner with specific functions including providing advice on rehabilitation or best practice management of land, and facilitating better public reporting on rehabilitation; and, secondly, to clarify and enhance the residual risk framework to better manage risks on sites after an environmental authority for a resource activity has been surrendered.

The bill also includes amendments to clarify the information requirements around the existing Great Barrier Reef protection measures that were introduced by the Environmental Protection Regulation 2019. These amendments reduce the required information for agricultural ERA applicants to only data relating to water quality instead of having to go through the full list of requirements needed to get an environmental authority.

Our consideration of the bill revealed numerous failings with the legislation as drafted and substantial concerns that due process was not followed by the Palaszczuk Labor government. The LNP is concerned that the key underlying instruments of the legislation, such as the guidelines regarding the administration of the residual risk fund and the calculator for undertaking calculations on residual risk, are still unfinished and unpublished.

The committee's consideration of the bill has been hampered by the Labor government's inability to publish these key instruments for parliamentary, community and stakeholder scrutiny. Even though industry requested more time to consult on the bill the request was refused by Labor, with only six days provided for detailed consideration. Whether this decision was made to avoid parliamentary scrutiny or as a stopgap measure to hastily introduce this bill, the delegation of significant legislative functions to non-legislative instruments goes against the parliament's fundamental legislative principles. As the Queensland Law Society's submission to this bill states, the increasing trend of delegating legislative functions outside of the parliament's scrutiny is a concern. It appears that Labor has little regard for due process or parliamentary scrutiny. The *Office of the Queensland Parliamentary Counsel Notebook* clearly states—

For Parliament to confer on someone other than Parliament the power to legislate as the delegate of Parliament, without a mechanism being in place to monitor the use of the power, raises obvious issues about the safe and satisfactory nature of the delegation.

At a time when a record number of Queenslanders are unemployed, with over 200,000 residents looking for work, the Labor government continues to create more regulatory uncertainty, risking investment and jobs. While industry is willing to engage with government to resolve the issues at hand, the Department of Environment and Science is blocked from doing so by a government that is happy to risk Queensland jobs and investment just to rush legislation through before the next election.

The Queensland Resources Council, QRC, questioned the need for a rehabilitation commissioner and expressed concern that the role would cause duplication and require additional resources and expenditure. The Queensland Law Society, QLS, raised concerns that the role of the rehabilitation commissioner may ultimately duplicate the functions of the regulator, leading to poor regulatory outcomes. Given AgForce's considerable interaction with the GasFields Commission Queensland, AgForce raised concerns about the capacities of a rehabilitation commissioner to fulfil the desired functions outlined in the bill and how they would work collaboratively with the community, including traditional owners, industry, environment and scientific groups, and the government.

The QRC also informed the committee that the changes in the bill were significant. The government had not undertaken a regulatory impact analysis and did not consider that a regulatory impact statement, RIS, was necessary. That is why the committee has recommended that the explanatory notes provided with the bill note the existence or absence of a RIS and outline the process undertaken by the relevant department in consideration of the development of a RIS.

The bill refers to the residual risk assessment guideline with respect to the risk assessment for a post-surrender management plan and deciding the amount of payment for residual risks; however, several submitters have raised concerns that the contents to be included in the residual risk assessment guidelines are unclear. That is why the committee recommended that in the second reading speech the minister clarifies whether the term 'credible residual risks' will be included and described in the residual risk assessment guideline.

The committee also recommended that in the second reading the minister clarifies that the notation of residual risks on the land title will occur at a lot on plan scale, not on a resource tenure or environmental authority scale. This had to be included by the committee in response to requests by


submitters that residual risks be recorded on the specific lot plan at the location of the specific risk, to which the department responded, stating—

The department would like to clarify that it is intended that notation of residual risks on the land title will occur at a Lot on Plan scale, not on a resource tenure or environmental authority scale. This would mean that landholders located within the resource tenure that do not have residual risk management requirements on their land would not have a residual risk noted on their land title. The department is seeking further advice to ensure that the drafting in the Bill achieves this intent.

I am glad we did make this recommendation, because here today we see amendments being brought into the House by the minister for this to occur. It obviously was not in the original bill and would not have been part of this new legislation other than by submitters and the committee ensuring this commonsense request was forced on government to be actioned. Like many Queenslanders, the LNP is concerned about Labor's ability to address key mining rehabilitation failures and the environmental risk posed by abandoned mines. The Labor government's track record in mine rehabilitation is substandard and unacceptable. There are serious questions as to whether this bill will have regulatory power to implement real change for landholders who are directly impacted by poorly rehabilitated resource projects.

I conclude by putting on the record that the non-government members of this committee hold concerns regarding the reliability of evidence given by DES staff because of the inaccurate response to submitters' concerns about the absence of a RIS for this bill. The committee could not find information on the RIS process in the explanatory notes, which is where the department advised it could be found. In this instance the department's evidence to the committee was not misspoken advice at a public hearing: this was a considered written response to concerns raised in submissions. This is a very concerning error by the department and one which I hope the minister can appropriately deal with.

The upcoming election in October will be a referendum on who has an economic plan to move Queensland out of recession. The bill is symptomatic of the Labor government's failure to manage the economy or protect the environment over the past five years. An LNP government will implement our economic plan for a decade of secure jobs to get Queensland working again and pull Queensland out of recession by stimulating the economy.

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (3.55 pm): The protection of our environment is a core value of mine and a core value of this government. Best practice mine site rehabilitation is an important environmental reform in Queensland given our history, and I support both the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020 and the Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019.

The Palaszczuk government is committed to upholding the highest environmental standards while also providing for jobs and growth. The Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020 will allow for an effective system to rehabilitate resource sites, in turn creating more economic certainty and fertile land for our recovering Queensland economy. The Palaszczuk government has always been committed to achieving the best environmental standards while creating more economic certainty. We did that in 2018 with the passing of significant reforms to mine rehabilitation laws. These reforms included the requirement to prepare a progressive rehabilitation and closure plan that incorporated time based rehabilitation milestones. This plan ensures that rehabilitation occurs progressively over the life of the mine.

The establishment of the rehabilitation commissioner has been a thoroughly considered policy decision of the Palaszczuk government. The commissioner is the best way to support the implementation of these world-leading laws and to provide more certainty on best practice rehabilitation. The Palaszczuk government has done this in a collaborative way, working with the environmental and resources industry to ensure the new rehabilitation regulations continue to encourage investment in the industry and the creation of local jobs. To inform investment decisions for rehabilitation activities, industry requires certainty about the rehabilitation outcomes that will be required at surrender and any residual risks costs. This bill is a further step in ensuring that our regulations support growth and jobs for Queenslanders across our state while also delivering the highest of environmental standards.


There are specific economic benefits in the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020 which will provide for more certainty as we move through these tumultuous economic times. The rehabilitation commissioner will be tasked with publicly publishing reports on best practice management and rehabilitation of land online. This will create much needed clarity and more transparent expectations of the resources industry regarding obligations around rehabilitation and land management. This increased clarity in best practice management and land rehabilitation will boost community confidence in our resources industry.

Appropriate rehabilitation will result in more land in our regional areas being returned for productive use after mining is completed. This will mean more land for agriculture and even recreation. A high standard of rehabilitation not only protects our environment but also indirectly creates jobs in regional Queensland. The residual risk reforms will provide more clarity to the existing residual risks framework.

The bill will prescribe clearer requirements in the framework when it comes to the process of surrender to environmental authorities. This will be done through the introduction of the post-surrender management report, which ensures that the necessary information required at the time of surrender is consistent and is compiled in one report, simplifying the current process. The reforms to the residual risk framework directly address industry claims and concerns that the current requirements of the framework are confusing and prevent resource companies from applying for surrender.


The bill will also support the resources industry by providing for increased flexibility around the timing of submitting a progressive rehabilitation and closure plan. The bill directly responds to industry requests allowing progressive rehabilitation and closure plans to be submitted after an environmental impact statement has been completed. This will allow the progressive rehabilitation and closure plan to be responsive to the information collected in the EIS process. The creation of a new decision-making point will allow stakeholders to determine whether an EIS will be required for their project before undertaking an environmental authority application.

This bill reflects the Palaszczuk government's continued collaboration with industry to ensure a smooth transition to this new framework. We have been committed to ensuring Queensland has the most advanced rehabilitation laws in the world. The resources industry has also expressed support for the amendments that will result in projects benefitting from greater certainty before starting the application process to environmental authorities. The bill will deliver a range of benefits to industry without imposing any additional regulatory burden. Across the board, Queenslanders and our environment will benefit from the increased clarity and certainty regarding rehabilitation requirements for industry and the Queensland community. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr WHITING** (Bancroft—ALP) (4.00 pm): I rise to speak in support of the bills before us today. I am the chair of the Natural Resources, Agricultural Industry Development and Environment Committee. It has been very interesting to listen to the LNP speakers here today, but none were more interesting than the member for Callide. I do not agree with what the member for Callide said, but at least he had the wherewithal to actually say it. I know his opinion is shared by many people on the other side. He does have my respect for getting up to say what he thinks.

There are only a couple of things I want to say. The LNP have claimed that there will be a lack of enforcement involved in all these things. We can see that in their statement of reservation on this bill. The trouble is that no-one actually believes they are truly concerned about a lack of enforcement. Let me remind them that the LNP cut environment staff by 33 per cent last time they were in government. That is a full-time equivalent of 495 staff. No-one actually believes what the LNP say about improving enforcement, because we know that if they ever get in they cut, sack and sell every time.

The LNP have said that we do not need the Rehabilitation Commissioner and they do not believe it is warranted. That just shows that they do not really believe in any more protections. It is very clear that they have always wanted less protections every single time. I remind the House that it was the LNP that wanted to remove protections, ram through approvals and give retrospective approvals to illegal mining activities last time they were in government. Let me remind everyone that the LNP will cut our protections every time. I wholeheartedly support these bills.

 **Mr LISTER** (Southern Downs—LNP) (4.02 pm): I rise to speak on the cognate debate before us on the biodiscovery bill and the environmental protection bill. I am on the record in this House on many occasions complaining about the legislative process of the government. Whilst this is not an omnibus bill with dozens of acts implicated, it does bring together two entirely distinct bills and is another indication of how disorganised the government is and how it does not have any respect for the processes and liberties of this chamber.

I am also on record as saying on many occasions in this House that this government has a poor record for consultation. It has a proclivity to decide behind closed doors with its favourites what it wants to do and then ride roughshod over the committee process and the parliament by guillotining all the bills—as this one I am sure was subject to as well. We have seen in this particular instance severe implications potentially for the mining industry which have not been adequately ventilated.

We saw in the committee process the traditionally frank contribution by the Queensland Resources Council. They gave a pretty poor scorecard to the government for the way they have handled consultation on this bill, among many others. We heard Ian Macfarlane say that they were initially given

four days in which to make a contribution to the committee on this bill and they were able to bargain that up to six days. Considering the wide implications of this bill—according to the Queensland Resources Council, which ought to know—that was not adequate consultation. In fact, they were quite scathing in their appearance before the committee and also in their written contribution.

We are talking about a process which has given us the bill, but we do not have all of the accompanying instruments and details so our consideration in this House is incomplete at best. If we do not have the residual risk assessment guidelines, how can we make a true assessment of what this bill truly means? That is another thing which was said by the Queensland Resources Council, which represents a great number of employers and communities in this state.

It reminds me of other bills where we have seen the bill come forward and the regulations are going to follow later, such as the vegetation management bill. I see my friend the honourable member for Gympie nodding knowingly. We were told that we would see the vegetation codes in due course. We are obviously seeing the same sort of thing with this particular bill. It begs the question: why would that be? Is the department wholly incapable of managing two activities at once? I tend to think it is an opportunity to escape scrutiny, knowing there is an election coming up, and to conceal from us in this House and therefore the general public in Queensland the true implications of this bill.

We also heard the government defence that there was no need for a regulatory impact statement associated with this bill. When a peak body like the Queensland Resources Council are saying that there are a great number of resource implications for them in how they are going to respond to this, that is really a damning situation. A number of speakers before me have referred to the fact that the department, in providing a briefing to the committee contended that details associated with questions on the regulatory impacts were contained in the explanatory notes. Given that the explanatory notes would have been compiled by the department, they ought to have known that that was not the case. That is yet another failure in process which leads us to quite conclusively suspect that this is being steamrolled through for the benefit of the government and its favourites.

In terms of consultation, we heard an extraordinary revelation by Mr Macfarlane from the Queensland Resources Council. He said inter alia that his industry has a lot at stake here. Those who are responsible for the land in question have millions and millions of dollars at stake in terms of how these things are applied. Not having adequate consultation with a group like the Queensland Resources Council—which is highly professional in its willingness to engage with governments of all persuasions—reflects no credit on the government at all.


Ms Enoch interjected.

Mr LISTER: I can hear the minister interjecting. I have to say that one of the most concerning things about this bill is the fact that we are talking about establishing the commissioner from within the environment department's staff. I am on record as saying in this House that in my opinion the environment department has become dysfunctional. It is a department that can take 114 days to approve a beekeeping permit in a national park.

Government members interjected.

Mr LISTER: I am speaking about the experiences of my constituents—people who work hard to employ people and pay taxes to pay for all of us politicians, to pay for welfare, to pay for all of the services that we scrutinise in this House. I think the government ought to show a bit more respect towards the people I am referring to.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Weir): Members, under the provisions of the business program agreed to by the House, the time limit for this stage of the bill has expired. I call the minister to reply to the second reading debate.

 **Hon. LM ENOCH** (Algeria—ALP) (Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef, Minister for Science and Minister for the Arts) (4.08 pm), in reply: First of all, I would like to thank all members for their participation in the debate of these two bills. I am pleased to see the level of support for these bills expressed by so many members of the House. The primary objective of the Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019 is to amend the Biodiscovery Act 2004 to reflect international standards, helping Queensland's biodiscovery industry remain globally competitive and ensuring that the benefits of biodiscovery are shared particularly with First Nation peoples.

The biodiscovery industry is expanding globally and in Queensland. This bill clarifies the relationship between the Biodiscovery Act and relevant international protocols, namely the Nagoya protocol and the International Treaty on Plant and Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, the FAO treaty, that came into force in 2014.

This bill recognises and protects traditional knowledge accessed for biodiscovery by providing for an obligation to take reasonable and practical measures to use traditional knowledge for biodiscovery only under agreement with the traditional knowledge custodians. The new obligation is established in part 2A of the bill. Without these amendments, First Nation peoples can do little to prevent unauthorised use of their traditional knowledge. The biodiscovery bill reduces the administrative burden by removing the requirement for a biodiscovery plan detailed in part 2 of the bill. Additionally, an exemption to comply with the Biodiscovery Act is provided for entities working with plants listed under the FAO treaty, also detailed in part 2 of the bill. I would now like to turn to the matters raised during the debate.

Regarding the development of the code of practice, the agreement with traditional knowledge custodians, parliamentary scrutiny and penalties I say: recognising traditional knowledge custodians and their rights to determine how that knowledge can be used and developed is non-negotiable. Regarding transparency, before it can commence, the code must be approved by regulation meaning parliamentary scrutiny and disallowance procedures will apply. Should the code be updated, a new amendment regulation will be required and tabled in parliament, ensuring there is ongoing parliamentary scrutiny.

On the topic of penalties, having significant penalties for noncompliance with the traditional knowledge obligation is consistent with the existing penalty for use of native biological material for biodiscovery without a benefit-sharing agreement. It is reflective of the harm and lost benefits that can result. The committee also acknowledged that the penalty associated with the traditional knowledge obligation is proportionate. Given the penalty, people will be supported to meet their obligation through the traditional knowledge code of practice, which will be developed in consultation with First Nation peoples and biodiscovery entities.

In relation to concerns about the use of traditional knowledge which is already in the public realm—and I have to say I was completely shocked by the tone of the opposition on this matter—there is already a significant incentive for biodiscovery entities to identify the custodians of such traditional knowledge. This is because doing so will help them identify compliance with the Nagoya protocol, thereby more easily enabling collaboration and international research commercialisation. The code will outline the necessary requirements for fulfilling the traditional knowledge obligation under different circumstances including where knowledge is considered to be in the public domain. The code will be developed through deep collaboration with First Nation peoples and biodiscovery entities, meaning that it will reflect a solution that suits all stakeholders.

Further, existing biodiscovery projects not covered by the act but utilising traditional knowledge are not required to retrospectively seek the consent of traditional knowledge custodians. This does not prevent biodiscovery entities from voluntarily satisfying the traditional knowledge obligation. By doing so, they may actually improve their ability to collaborate and commercialise with global partners because they can demonstrate Nagoya compliance.

The member for Noosa and others have raised perceived concerns about the potential for research and development associated with vital pharmaceutical products being delayed, given the obligation to meet the traditional knowledge obligation. To this I say it is completely indefensible to continue to allow knowledge possessed by the First Nation peoples of Queensland to continue to be taken and used without their consent and denying their right to share in the benefit of that knowledge. It is absolutely indefensible.

During this debate the member for Broadwater has incorrectly asserted that failure to comply with the code prior to its approval by regulation could result in penalties to a biodiscovery entity. This is not the case. To be clear, there can be no penalties for failing to comply with the traditional knowledge obligation until after the code has been approved. Therefore, the code is only one way to comply with the traditional knowledge obligation and, as such, there is no penalty for failing to comply with the code itself.

Amendments have been included to reflect changes to civil liability under the Public Service Act 2008. These amendments continue the protection currently afforded under Public Service legislation. In regards to concerns from the member for Scenic Rim, civil liability protection only applies if an omission or act was done honestly and without negligence. Therefore, a minister or chief executive would be liable for malpractice in the same way an executive of a corporation would be liable if reasonable steps were not taken to prevent the offence. This protection for the minister is not new. The bill simply continues existing protections for the minister that are already in the act. This change is needed because of amendments to the Public Service Act 2008.

Protections will still exist for traditional knowledge holders as the minister will not be able to sign off on any new agreements until satisfied that the traditional knowledge obligation has been fulfilled. Prior to the code's implementation the obligation can still be fulfilled through good faith negotiation. Preliminary discussions have commenced with biodiscovery entities and traditional knowledge holders regarding matters to be considered in developing a code of practice and it remains a priority for the government to develop the code within 12 months of the passage of the bill.

The Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill reflects the Palaszczuk government's commitment to support the commercialisation of bioproducts and improve the business environment for biodiscovery. Biodiscovery has already generated a range of benefits for the state including royalties from commercialisation and job creation in both cities and more remote regions. Without aligning the Biodiscovery Act more closely with international requirements, Queensland companies and universities are limited in international markets that do not accept products that are not Nagoya compliant.

The biodiscovery bill enables First Nation peoples to participate in biodiscovery, requiring that access and benefit sharing is negotiated fairly. As partners in biodiscovery, First Nation peoples would have more opportunities to reconnect to country and culture but also realise benefits through the creation of new jobs and new skills, particularly in regional communities. The sharing of traditional knowledge is likely to contribute further economic opportunities for the state and particularly for regional First Nation communities.

The Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020 contains a range of amendments that continues the Palaszczuk government's suite of reforms to rehabilitation outcomes and financial assurance provisioning in the resources sector. Establishing an independent position of the Rehabilitation Commissioner responds to calls for rehabilitation expertise to be maintained to a high level by the government and for this expertise to inform rehabilitation outcomes across the state. There is also a need for a strategic reporting mechanism to achieve transparency and better rehabilitation outcomes. This is why we have seen such strong support for the Rehabilitation Commissioner, particularly from the community.

The environmental protection bill also enhances our existing residual risk framework to ensure our approach to identifying and managing residual risks is clear, transparent and efficient. This means the taxpayers of Queensland will not be left to foot the bill for costs that are the result of resource activity. Where a risk management plan is required, the existence of residual risks will need to be recorded on the relevant land title. This will assist landholders to be able to make informed management decisions for their land. There is no additional burden on landholders—noting on title is for transparency—and no obligations are imposed on landholders under any of these changes.

The proposed amendments that I will move during the consideration in detail stage of the bill will clarify concerns that the notation would apply broadly across all lots subject to a resource activity. These proposed amendments address a recommendation in the committee report to make it abundantly clear that the notation of residual risks will apply to the individual lot.

The other ancillary amendments included in this bill that amend the Environmental Protection Act will benefit industry and government through clarifying terminology and reducing regulatory burden. These amendments are welcomed by stakeholders like the Queensland Farmers' Federation for clarifying intent, addressing industry concerns and supporting administrative efficiency.

This includes clarifying the information requirements for environmental authority applications for new cropping and horticulture activities in Great Barrier Reef catchments to ensure farmers only have to provide what is necessary. Further, to attack the peer reviewed scientific evidence that underpins not only Queensland's response to protecting the Great Barrier Reef but also the Australian government's response is extraordinary and, quite frankly, unbelievable.

The member for Callide continues to attack science in this House. It is absolutely astounding. Another example is the amendments which continue to support the new framework for progressive rehabilitation and closure plans, for providing the ability for this plan to be submitted later in the environmental authority application process if an environmental impact statement is to be completed. Industry has welcomed these amendments. Coupled with the rehabilitation and residual risk reforms, these amendments contribute to clarifying the requirements of resource operators which will lead to greatly improved environmental outcomes for Queensland.

I now turn to the matters raised with regard to residual risk guidelines and the role of the Rehabilitation Commissioner. When I introduced the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill to parliament in June this year, I also announced that an industry implementation

working group would be created to support the residual risk reforms. The purpose of this working group will be to finalise the residual risk assessment guideline and other implementation material that reflects user needs. Given the importance of the guideline and associated materials, it is appropriate that this is done in consultation with subject matter experts and industry.

Creating the role of an independent Rehabilitation Commissioner will not increase regulation or add more bureaucracy, as has been suggested by some members opposite. The commissioner's role is to provide additional expertise for the department, community and industry and does not include a regulatory role that would add any sort of requirements on industry. Further, it does not add an additional layer of bureaucracy as the role sits separate to the department and provides independent expert advice. In this way, the role of the mining regulator and expert adviser are appropriately kept separate and will not duplicate roles or responsibilities. Industry has called on the government to ensure it has sufficient expertise available, and that is what the government is delivering in the Rehabilitation Commissioner. We have heard the words 'increased regulation' but there have not been any arguments that provide substance to these claims.

The Rehabilitation Commissioner will not have a role in determining requirements for individual mines or other resource sites; in other words, there are no additional requirements for any resource company as a result of creating the role of the independent Rehabilitation Commissioner. The role will also be a conduit and mechanism that will support improved communication between the community, industry and government regarding expectations of best practice rehabilitation.

Regarding the commentary that there should be sufficient expertise within the department to provide advice on best practice rehabilitation, I remind those opposite of their track record in government when 85 full-time roles from the environmental regulator were cut, including engineers, scientists, planning experts, environmental officers and 38 dedicated frontline compliance and assessment officers. When members of the LNP talk about how they think the Public Service already has the relevant expertise, we know that they are not being honest. Their opinion of departmental staff was obvious in the way they cut and sacked staff from the former department of environment and heritage protection.

The Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill will deliver a range of benefits to industry and the Queensland community without imposing any additional regulatory burden, particularly increasing clarity and certainty regarding rehabilitation requirements. The Rehabilitation Commissioner will ensure greater environmental outcomes can be achieved in Queensland through the evaluation of resources sector data and reporting on performance and trends. This will support the ongoing responsible management of our land for the benefit of current and future generations. Through publishing best practice standards online for the public to access, the Rehabilitation Commissioner will generate clear and transparent expectations of the resources industry for their rehabilitation requirements and how they manage land.

Growth of the resources industry will be supported through the increased clarity of these rehabilitation requirements and other obligations. The residual risk reforms directly address claims of concerns from industry that the current requirements of the framework are confusing and prevent resource companies from applying for surrender. The establishment of the Rehabilitation Commissioner and amendments to the residual risk framework will benefit the resources industry by supporting business planning and by creating cost and time efficiencies for business to solidify Queensland as a smart place for further investment. The renewed transparency for the residual risk framework will ensure the community is fully informed about any risks remaining on parcels of land which have been the subject of a resource activity.


A bill does not reach this point without considerable work from many people both within and outside of government. I extend my thanks to all those who met with and made submissions to the Department of Environment and Science to discuss the development of the two bills, including members of the traditional knowledge stakeholder round table, representatives from Queensland universities, individual biodiscovery entities in the public and private sectors, resource peak body representatives, and conservation and community groups.

Lastly, I acknowledge the teams in the Department of Environment and Science for their hard work and persistence in bringing these bills together, in particular Geoff Robson and Julia Playford. I also thank the staff in my office for their hard work in the team effort that has brought this cognate debate together. I commend the bills to the House.

Division: Question put—That the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill be now read a second time.

Mr SPEAKER: Members are reminded that the total number of votes cast for each party includes those present under sessional orders and proxy votes but must not include paired members or members asked to withdraw from the chamber and excluded from voting under the standing orders.

Speaker's Ruling, Personal Votes

 **Mr SPEAKER:** A member of a political party has indicated to the Clerk that they wish to vote differently to their party in relation to this bill. The current sessional orders designed for the COVID-19 special circumstances do not contemplate a personal vote unless a matter is notified as a conscience vote. I have decided that we will deal with this matter by continuing with the normal party vote procedure but allowing the member to vote in the chamber from a vacant seat as though they were a crossbench member. The party vote will, of course, have to take into account the absence of the vote to be cast by the member voting differently from the party.

AYES, 86:

ALP, 47—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

LNP, 37—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Gerber, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 6:

LNP, 1—Boyce.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

NQF, 1—Costigan.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

Question put—That the Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill

Clauses 1 to 60, as read, agreed to.

Clause 61—

 **Ms ENOCH** (4.34 pm): I move the following amendments—

1 Clause 61 (Insertion of new s 275B)

Page 41, lines 14 to 17—

omit, insert—

- (a) each lot (each an **affected lot**), comprising or included in the land, in relation to which remedial action or ongoing management activities may need to be carried out;
- (b) the existence of the relevant post-surrender management report for each affected lot.

2 Clause 61 (Insertion of new s 275B)

Page 41, line 18, 'the land'—

omit, insert—

each affected lot

3 Clause 61 (Insertion of new s 275B)

Page 41, lines 20 to 24—

omit, insert—

- (a) show each affected lot is subject to residual risks; and
- (b) state the places where the relevant post-surrender management report for each affected lot may be inspected.

4 Clause 61 (Insertion of new s 275B)

Page 41, line 27, 'the land'—

omit, insert—

an affected lot

5 Clause 61 (Insertion of new s 275B)

Page 41, lines 28 to 30—

omit, insert—

- (a) the affected lot is subject to residual risks; and
- (b) the existence of the relevant post-surrender management report for the affected lot.

6 Clause 61 (Insertion of new s 275B)

Page 41, line 32, 'the land'—

omit, insert—

an affected lot

7 Clause 61 (Insertion of new s 275B)

Page 42, lines 6 to 8—

omit, insert—

- (a), remove the details mentioned in subsection (5)(a) and (b) for the affected lot from the registrar's records.

8 Clause 61 (Insertion of new s 275B)

Page 42, after line 8—

insert—

- (7) In this section—

lot means—

- (a) a lot under the *Land Title Act 1994*; or
- (b) a separate, distinct parcel of land for which an interest is recorded in a register under the *Land Act 1994*.

relevant post-surrender management report, for an affected lot, means the post-surrender management report for the land, the subject of a surrender application, comprising or including the affected lot.

I table the explanatory notes to my amendments and statement of compatibility with human rights.

Tabled paper: Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020, explanatory notes to Hon. Leeanne Enoch's amendments [1313].

Tabled paper: Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020, statement of compatibility with human rights contained in Hon. Leeanne Enoch's amendments [1314].

These amendments with regard to clause 61 clarify that the noting on title for residual risk occurs at a lot on plan scale. The purpose of these amendments is to ensure that it is clear that the noting of an administrative advice on title is not made on each lot associated with an environmental authority; rather, it is only made on affected lots or parcels of land. During the committee process for the bill it was identified that there was some ambiguity in the drafting, so the intent was always that the noting on the title for residual risks would only occur on those lands titles where there is ongoing management activities or remedial action that may need to be carried out on the land. If a lot which is the subject of the surrender application does not have residual risk activities identified in the risk management plan, an administrative noting should not be made on the land title for that lot. To record residual risks on a land title that has been assessed as having no ongoing management activities and no likely remedial actions could misinform a person seeking information on the site. To ensure that the intent is clearly reflected in the drafting, clause 61 is amended to refer to each affected lot in relation to which remedial action or ongoing management activities may need to be carried out. This amendment will ensure that only those lots where residual risk activities have been identified are required to be noted on the title.

Amendments agreed to.

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, under the provisions of the business program agreed to by the House and the time allocated for this stage of the bills having expired, I will now put all remaining questions. The House will consider the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill first. In accordance with sessional order 2B, the House must now consider all remaining clauses, schedules and any amendments circulated by the minister in charge of the bill. I note that the minister's amendment No. 9 is outside the long title of the bill and therefore will require leave of the House. Is leave granted?

Leave granted.

Insertion of new clauses—

Question put—That amendment No. 9, as circulated, be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment as circulated—

9 After part 4, heading

Page 94, after line 19—

insert—

Division 1 Amendment of Acquisition of Land Act 1967

117A Act amended

This division amends the *Acquisition of Land Act 1967*.

117B Insertion of new pt 6, div 5

Part 6—

insert—

Division 5 Validation provisions for Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2020

52 Validation provision relating to purposes for which land may be taken

Schedule 1, part 2, as amended by the *Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2020*, applies, and is taken to have applied, from the commencement of the *Building and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2009*, part 12.

Note—

The *Building and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2009*, part 12 commenced on 19 November 2009.

53 Validation of taking of particular land

- (1) This section applies if, before the commencement, land was taken under this Act for a purpose that included the conservation of koalas on land in a 'Regional Landscape and Rural Protection Area'.
- (2) The taking of the land is, and is taken to have always been, as valid as it would have been if the land had been taken under this Act for a purpose that included the conservation of koalas on land in a 'Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area'.
- (3) Anything done, or omitted to be done, in relation to the taking of the land is, and is taken to have always been, as valid as it would have been if the land had been taken under this Act for a purpose that included the conservation of koalas on land in a 'Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area'.

54 Validation of particular notices of intention to resume and resumption agreements

- (1) This section applies if, before the commencement—
 - (a) a constructing authority—
 - (i) served on a person a notice of intention to resume for land that stated a purpose for which the land was to be taken included the conservation of koalas on land in a 'Regional Landscape and Rural Protection Area'; or
 - (ii) entered into a resumption agreement for land that stated a purpose for which the land was to be taken included the conservation of koalas on land in a 'Regional Landscape and Rural Protection Area'; and
 - (b) a gazette resumption notice for the land was not published.
- (2) After the commencement, the constructing authority may continue to take the land as if the notice of intention to resume or resumption agreement stated, and had always stated, a purpose for which the land was to be taken included the conservation of koalas on land in a 'Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area'.
- (3) Anything done, or omitted to be done, in relation to the notice of intention to resume or resumption agreement is, and is taken to have always been, as valid as it would have been if the notice of intention to resume or resumption agreement had stated a purpose for which the land was to be taken included the conservation of koalas on land in a 'Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area'.

117C Amendment of sch 1 (Purposes for taking land)

Schedule 1, part 2, fourth dot point, 'Regional Landscape and Rural Protection Area'—
omit, insert—

Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area

Division 2 Minor and consequential amendments

Question put—That clauses 61 to 118 and schedule, as amended, stand part of the bill.

Motion agreed to.

Clauses 61 to 118 and schedule, as amended, agreed to.

Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill

Question put—That clauses 1 to 39 and schedule, as read, stand part of the bill.

Motion agreed to.

Clauses 1 to 39 and schedule, as read, agreed to.

Third Reading (Cognate Debate)

Division: Question put—That the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

AYES, 86:

ALP, 47—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

LNP, 37—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Gerber, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 6:

LNP, 1—Boyce.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

NQF, 1—Costigan.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a third time.

Question put—That the Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title (Cognate Debate)

Question put—That amendment No. 10 be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment as circulated—

10 Long title

Long title, after 'amend'—

insert—

the *Acquisition of Land Act 1967*,

Question put—That the long title of the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, as amended, be agreed to.


Motion agreed to.

Question put—That the long title of the Biodiscovery and Other Legislation Amendment Bill be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

MOTION

Member for Everton, Finding of Contempt

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (4.44 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That this House—

1. notes the Ethics Committee report No. 200, tabled in the House today;
2. finds the member for Everton in contempt for his actions on 16 October 2018 in breaching standing order 271 by debating in the House a matter referred to the Ethics Committee that had not been reported on at that time;
3. notes the member for Everton's apology given in matters of public interest today;
4. determines under section 38 (Decisions on contempt) of the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001 that the member for Everton's conduct be now dealt with by this House as a contempt; and
5. accepts the recommendation of Ethics Committee report No. 200 that the member for Everton's apology for his conduct is adequate and the appropriate and final penalty in accordance with section 39—Assembly's power to deal with contempt—of the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001.

In briefly speaking to the motion, can I state that the member for Everton has been a member of this House for approximately 3,062 days and has served in a number of capacities. He is certainly no newbie to this chamber. He is one of the senior members of his party and he should understand by now the rules and orders of this place. It is therefore unfortunate and disappointing that the member for Everton does not understand the standing rules and orders of the Legislative Assembly, even the basic ones about not talking about a matter that has been referred to the Ethics Committee. The Ethics Committee stated—

It appears the Member for Everton was under a mistaken belief that SO 271 distinguishes between matters that are substantive, and those that are merely procedural.

It goes on to further state—


Despite the Member for Everton's apparent mistaken belief, the committee is satisfied that by asking a question related to the ongoing Ethics Committee investigation, the Member for Everton was seeking to debate the matter in the House.

The Ethics Committee further went on to state—

The committee therefore considers that raising the matter that was before the committee, and referencing the CCC media release and press conference in such a way as the Member did, was likely to amount to an improper interference with the free exercise of the authority and functions of the Ethics Committee.

The Ethics Committee has recommended a finding of contempt be made against the member for Everton as despite his mistaken belief he has breached standing order 271. We all know that the member for Everton is no stranger to making statements in this House that offend the standing rules and orders. We only have to remember 15 September 2015 when he made an unparliamentary comment, proceeded to say, 'I will stand here and state on the Bible I did not say that word.', and then later in the evening crept into the chamber under the cover of darkness to withdraw his statements. It is unfortunate that the member for Everton has not learnt from his mistakes.

I commend the Ethics Committee report No. 200 where the member for Everton has been found in contempt of breaching the standing orders of the House and I note his apology.

 **Mr POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (4.48 pm): I rise to make a short contribution to the motion moved by the Attorney-General and Leader of the House. I too note the Ethics Committee report No. 200 that was tabled in the House this morning and the unequivocal apology provided by the member for Everton and Deputy Leader of the Opposition earlier this morning. I note the contents of this motion. The LNP will be supporting the motion, but I would point out that if the Leader of the House wants to start talking about length of service in this chamber and who should know better then we need

look no further than the Premier who indeed is one of the longest serving members of the parliament of Queensland and yet was found in contempt of this parliament earlier this year. Indeed, she is the only Premier in history to be found in contempt of parliament.

Mrs D'ATH: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms McMillan): Leader of the House, I can pre-empt your point of order.

Mrs D'ATH: I rise to a point of order on relevance. The chamber had the opportunity to debate the committee report and the Premier's response at that time. Many of those opposite did speak in that debate. We are dealing with a different committee recommendation this time and he should speak to the motion.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you for your point of order, Leader of the House. I ask that the member come back to the motion and respond accordingly.

Mr POWELL: Thank you for your direction, Madam Deputy Speaker. I summarise by saying that if the Leader of the House wants to start throwing stones of that nature she should be willing to accept some of the criticisms of her own side in terms of their behaviour in this chamber.

A government member: At least we are a side; one big team.

Mr POWELL: When it suits those opposite, clearly. As I have said, we note the Ethics Committee report from this morning. We note the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's unequivocal apology this morning. We note the content of this motion—

Mrs D'Ath interjected.

Mr POWELL: The Leader of the House can mumble under her breath all she likes, but it cannot detract from the fact that there has been only one premier in the history of this state found in contempt—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Glass House, you will come back to the motion, please.

Government members interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms McMillan): Order! Member for Glass House, do you have anything further to contribute?

Mr POWELL: As I said, the LNP will be supporting the motion.

Mr BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (4.51 pm): The Leader of the House just noted that the member for Everton made an apology to the House this afternoon in which he responded to the Ethics Committee report. That was the most appropriate time for him to do that. The Leader of the House also just took a pot shot at the member for Everton and then raised various other issues. They should not throw stones if they live in glass houses. If we were to look at the statistics on the number of apologies that members have had to deliver in this House, I bet that there would be a lot more Labor members than LNP members. The other point that the Leader of the House raised was that when the member for Glass House rightfully—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Kawana, the question is whether or not Ethics Committee report No. 200 should be accepted.

Mr BLEIJIE: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. It should be accepted pursuant to the motion because the member for Everton has done what the honourable committee members said he should do. I understand why the Labor Party would not want to delve into any other issues. When the member for Glass House mentioned other issues, including one involving the Premier, the Leader of the House noted that we have debated those issues in the House. Yes we have and we would like the opportunity to debate this more fully, but the Leader of the House has said that we will not be debating committee reports this week. She has cancelled committee report debates this week.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Kawana, can you come back to the motion that is before the House?

Mr BLEIJIE: The honourable member for Everton has acknowledged what is in the report. He has apologised. For the Labor Party to take cheap political pot shots is a disgrace.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Kawana, thank you for your contribution. You narrowly escaped a warning.


Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

FOREST WIND FARM DEVELOPMENT BILL

Resumed from 20 May (see p. 974).

Second Reading

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Cooper—ALP) (Minister for State Development, Tourism and Innovation) (4.53 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I acknowledge the State Development, Tourism, Innovation and Manufacturing Committee report on the bill, tabled on 3 July 2020. I note that the committee made two recommendations to parliament, including one that the bill be passed. I now table a copy of the government's response to the committee's report.

Tabled paper: State Development, Tourism, Innovation and Manufacturing Committee: Report No. 1, 56th Parliament—Forest Wind Farm Development Bill 2020, government response [\[1315\]](#).

The government notes recommendation No. 1 that the bill be passed. Recommendation No. 2 relates to minor amendments to part 8, division 4 of the bill relating to the operation of the Springfield Structure Plan. I take this opportunity to thank the committee members and secretariat for their hard work in considering this bill during the exceptional and uncertain circumstances caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. The government supports in principle recommendation No. 2. The government intends to move amendments during consideration in detail of the bill to reflect the committee's recommendation.

The amendments also address three additional matters raised in submissions to the committee. These matters include modifications to clause 75, which deals with consideration of infrastructure matters by the Ipswich City Council in assessing plan applications under the Springfield Structure Plan, to refine its scope in line with existing provisions under the structure plan. The committee considered this matter in its report but made no specific recommendation.

The second matter relates to three minor exceptions to the requirement under clause 75 that development not start in the structure plan area until all required plans are in effect. These exceptions are already contained in the structure plan. The committee considered this matter in its report, but concluded that it was not sufficiently clear whether it was intended to include the exceptions. I am advised that it would be desirable for the exceptions to be included.

The third matter is an additional transitional provision under clause 76 in relation to plan applications made under the Springfield Structure Plan before the introduction of the bill. The provision protects development under any such plans from the provisions of the bill that limit the development from starting until all required plans are in effect and subjects the development instead to the requirements of the current structure plan. The committee considered this matter under its general consideration of fundamental legislative principles and so made no recommendation about this particular matter.

The main purpose of this bill is to facilitate the establishment of a large-scale wind farm to be co-located within actively managed exotic pine plantations of the Toolara, Tuan and Neerdie state forests in the Wide Bay-Burnett region of the state. With up to \$2 billion of private sector investment, the proposed wind farm would provide significant economic benefits for the state if completed, including the creation of 440 jobs during construction and up to 50 full-time operational jobs. The government considers that the processes proposed under the bill are the most appropriate means of providing a tenure pathway for the construction and operation of the wind farm. Notably, the bill itself does not grant tenure for the project but gives the state the power to grant that tenure, provided the requirements in the bill and the project agreements are met.

The bill aims to ensure that the management, environmental values and integrity of the state's forest reservations are balanced with the development of purpose-built infrastructure aligned with the government's policy commitments to transition to a low carbon energy sector and the Queensland government's renewable energy target. The bill complements the state's existing legislative requirements and processes. This includes environmental matters and development approval under the State Development Assessment Provisions, ensuring the rights in relation to such legislation and processes are not affected.

This bill facilitates much needed employment opportunities to support regional Queensland jobs and investment, and will boost renewable energy generation. The wind farm, as proposed, will have a positive economic and jobs impact for the Wide Bay-Burnett region, as well as for the state.


The bill also amends the Planning Act 2016 to allow for greater certainty in the ongoing administration of the Springfield Structure Plan. The structure plan has guided the development of Springfield since its inception in the early 1990s, to the point where Springfield is now a vibrant innovative community of over 40,000 residents. A key to the successful development of Springfield has been the hierarchy of plans required to be prepared and approved by the Ipswich City Council under the structure plan. Those plans establish a framework for planning and development in which the Springfield community and industry can have the confidence on which to base investment decisions.

However, recent decisions by the Planning and Environment Court and Court of Appeal have established that some of those plans are, in fact, not mandatory. Consequently, a key objective of the bill is to re-establish the planning hierarchy that was widely assumed to have operated before the court decisions and require that development in the structure plan area be consistent with this hierarchy.

The bill also updates dispute resolution processes in the structure plan area. These amendments expand the availability of dispute resolution to include infrastructure matters and modify who may commence and participate in dispute resolution processes, reflecting the substantial growth that has occurred in the structure plan area since the dispute arrangements were originally devised. In conclusion, this bill is an absolute game changer.

A government member: Was that the word of the day?

Ms JONES: I think the word of the day is actually 'Callide'. The bill facilitates the tenure pathway for the wind farm project, which is set to generate opportunities for employment and skill training, utilise renewable energy that will contribute to lowering Australia's carbon emissions and is critical to the economic recovery of the Wide Bay-Burnett region. The bill is also critical to the ongoing development of Springfield, which is a key urban centre and a driver of investment and employment in South-East Queensland. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (4.59 pm): I rise to address the Forest Wind Farm Development Bill, which the LNP will not be opposing. The bill proposes to facilitate a major energy project to be developed across tens of thousands of hectares within the Toolara, Tuan and Neerdie state forests. Under the current legislative framework, the grant of tenure for this type of project is prohibited. The bill achieves this by exempting the proposed development from, or modifying the application of sections of, the Forestry Act 1959 and the Land Act 1994. The project area is the subject of the 99-year plantation licence that was sold to HQPlantations by the former Bligh Labor government for \$603 million in 2010, something that I recall vividly because of the impact on the electorate of Glass House.

The Forest Wind project is a major energy development on a scale that neither of the impacted Gympie or Fraser Coast local government areas have ever seen before. If undertaken, the project will have a significant and lasting impact upon residents, businesses and visitors. Such is the scale of the project, it will clearly be visible from the Fraser Island World Heritage site. As I said, the LNP will be supporting this bill, but we must raise a number of concerns.

It was revealed during the State Development, Tourism, Innovation and Manufacturing Committee's consideration of the bill that the government had been in secret discussions with the project proponent for three years, yet the first in-person community consultation session with residents was held only at the start of this year. Instead of engaging with the local community over a project that will have a significant and lasting impact upon their way of life, the Palaszczuk Labor government had chosen to hold secret meetings with the proponent for three years. Making matters worse for the local community, even though the first in-person consultation sessions were only held this year, the project proponent is expecting to commence construction at the end of this year, as stated in the committee report.

The consultation section of the bill's explanatory notes states that exposure drafts of the bill were provided to the proponent and HQPlantations on Christmas Eve 2019. That is right: 24 December 2019. There is not a single mention of consultation with the local community in the bill or the explanatory notes. Even though local property owners will endure significant and lasting impacts from the development that this bill enables, the Palaszczuk Labor government did not even consider it worthwhile to extend their Christmas Eve consultation to community members.

The Palaszczuk Labor government has also failed to announce details of where the transmission line corridor will be and what properties will be affected. The prospect of high-voltage lines cutting family properties is an ever-present stress for local residents. It is incumbent on the Palaszczuk Labor government to ensure landholders' views are heard and appropriate community consultation is undertaken. The member for Gympie and others in this chamber will have more to say on this point.

This is yet another example, one of a very long list, of the Palaszczuk Labor government riding roughshod over regional communities. Whether it is demolishing Paradise Dam, blocking the New Acland mine, downsizing Rookwood Weir or legislating anti-farmer laws, regional Queenslanders always lose out under Premier Anastacia Palaszczuk. Indeed, it was Premier Anastacia Palaszczuk who sat around the cabinet table when the former Bligh Labor government sold off Forestry Plantations Queensland for \$603 million in 2010. The Wide Bay community was barely consulted then, and now, under the Premier's government, consultation with the local community is not even an afterthought on this bill.

During the bill's public hearing, one local resident, Ms Christine Olsen, revealed that her first face-to-face consultation was only held in February of this year. She said—

What horrified me most was the map that was put up ... I came to live here to look across the water to see Fraser Island and to watch and listen to the birds, not listen to or see wind turbines.

Not only did the former Bligh Labor government sell off the state forests that Ms Olsen neighbours in an asset fire sale; now the Palaszczuk Labor government is enabling development in the forest which would have previously been unimaginable. This previously unimaginable development is enabled by this bill establishing a legislative framework for the development to otherwise be undertaken in the state forest by exempting the project from certain provisions of the Forestry Act and the Land Act.

Timber Queensland's submission to the bill stated it supported the legislation on the condition that there is no net loss in forestry production. The government has so far failed to deliver upon this commitment for no net loss in forestry production. This uncertainty is yet another stress on Wide Bay's timber industry, which is already fighting for certainty before the regional forestry agreement ends in 2026. The Queensland forest and timber industry generates more than \$3.8 billion in value each year and supports 25,000 direct and indirect jobs. The hardwood sawmilling industry in the south-east supports 2,000 direct and indirect jobs and has a mill door value of more than \$200 million per annum.

Labor is deliberately dragging their feet on signing up to a South-East Queensland regional forest agreement with the express purpose of driving operators out of the industry. The current plan ends in 2026 for Wide Bay. The industry needs certainty now on their investments and future business prospects. As it currently stands, all logging of Crown native forest will cease by 2026. Instead of providing stopgap two-year extensions, the LNP will deliver Queensland's timber industry with the certainty needed to create more jobs by updating the 30-year industry plan.

The explanatory notes state that the proponent submitted a detailed proposal under the investment facilitation process for exclusive transactions. The minister also referred to this in her introductory speech and in a media release when the bill was introduced. This is the same process that was established after the monumental market-led proposal failure of former Labor minister and current Treasurer Cameron Dick. The name may have changed, but it is still the same opaque, inefficient and cumbersome process.

Under the former market-led proposals framework, even though the private sector submitted more than 160 proposals, the Palaszczuk Labor government delivered only one. Proposals like the Queensland Maritime Museum aquarium were repeatedly announced by Labor but then quietly shelved. Labor's market-led proposal program was slammed by the Queensland Auditor-General for creating undue pressure to push projects that have not cleared the most basic of hurdles. The Auditor-General found that one market-led proposal was stuck on a minister's desk for 622 days.

Mr Krause: A very business friendly government!

Mr POWELL: I take that interjection from the member for Scenic Rim. I assume he said it dripping with sarcasm.

Mr Krause: Absolutely.

Mr POWELL: I hope that Labor's mismanagement of this process does not turn the proposed Forest Wind farm development into another Brisbane aquarium—multiple announcements and media conferences that result in not a single job being created or dollar invested.

The Wide Bay region needs jobs. At 10.2 per cent, Wide Bay has the highest unemployment rate in Queensland. The Wide Bay youth unemployment rate is also the second highest rate in the state, increasing 5.8 per cent in the last year to a staggering 24.2 per cent. With the highest unemployment rate in the state and youth unemployment sitting in high double digits, the Wide Bay region desperately needs jobs, not hollow promises. Hollow announcements have already started to be issued, with the minister stating that the project could create—and I stress 'could'—440 jobs in construction.

Sadly, this story has played out before, not in Wide Bay but in Far North Queensland, another region which has been forgotten and neglected by the Palaszczuk Labor government. This time Minister Jones was promising 2,300 local jobs in Cairns from the Tropical North Global Tourism Hub. This promise turned out to be yet another broken commitment made to regional Queensland by the Palaszczuk Labor government.

It is no wonder the Queensland Auditor-General made the recommendation that Labor's market-led proposals framework needed clear protocols for communication about such proposals, ensuring that announcements occur once sufficient assessment has been undertaken to determine the project is suitable and sufficiently viable. It is certainly the LNP's hope that this project meets that criteria of being suitable and sufficiently viable.

With Labor already making job announcements for a project that is far from shovel-ready, it is obvious that the Palaszczuk Labor government has ignored the sensible recommendations made by the Queensland Auditor-General. It appears the exclusive transaction process referred to in the explanatory notes is no different to Labor's failed market-led proposal framework.

Unlike the Palaszczuk Labor government, the LNP will not simply rebadge failed initiatives that do not deliver jobs. Instead, the LNP has already announced it will establish Queensland Investment Partnerships. Queensland has huge potential, but it has been wasted for the last five years. To replace Labor's failed market-led proposals and exclusive transaction processes, the LNP will establish Queensland Investment Partnerships to work hand in hand with the private sector in delivering at least \$1 billion of signed and sealed new public-private projects by 2024.


Queensland Investment Partnerships will adopt the Auditor-General's recommendations to ensure consultation is undertaken early and that quality assurance processes are implemented to restore private sector confidence. Importantly, our Queensland Investment Partnerships will also establish communication protocols that restrict announcements to approved projects only. The Property Council of Australia strongly endorses the LNP's plan stating that 'a commitment to genuinely partner with the private sector is a big step in the right direction'.

As I said at the outset, while the LNP will not be opposing this aspect of the bill, we are disappointed that the Palaszczuk Labor government has chosen to progress this project in secret for three years without any engagement or consultation with the local community. Queenslanders have no faith in Labor's failed market-led proposal process or its subsequent exclusive transaction framework that this bill has originated from. Wide Bay has the highest unemployment rate in the state. We fear that instead of new job-creating projects all that Labor is delivering is more media announcements. Let us hope that that is not the case.

Moving to the new provisions for the Springfield Structure Plan—and I echo the words of the minister in introducing this part and again addressing it in her second reading speech—clause 75 of the bill inserts new provisions for the Springfield Structure Plan. These provisions enable the administration of the Springfield Structure Plan to ensure the Springfield City Group has sufficient input into the provision of infrastructure. These amendments are welcomed by the LNP. In essence they are re-establishing what was always the intent from the outset because, as we have already heard, Greater Springfield is a unique community. It has grown to now six suburbs, is home to 43,000 residents, supports more than 20,000 jobs and has a student population—possibly pre COVID—in excess of 10,000 with 11 schools. As the Property Council submission stated, the amendments will assist, preserve and ensure the efficient functioning of the Springfield Structure Plan and allow it to continue to provide certainty and achieve its intended outcomes for the community.

These amendments are required due to a decision from the Planning and Environment Court which had the consequential impact that the Springfield City Group no longer had sufficient input into the provision of required infrastructure. In its submission, the Urban Development Institute of Australia outlined that Greater Springfield is an important example of the results that can be achieved with an integrated planning and infrastructure framework in a critical growth area.

It is worth pointing out that, unlike the Palaszczuk Labor government, the LNP understands the importance of integrating planning with infrastructure. That is why we will insist that land use plans are paired with infrastructure plans. We will deliver Queensland's first fully funded infrastructure plan. To get developments like Springfield building again, the LNP will set new targets for the Coordinator-General to slash approval times for major projects and reinstate publicly reported performance targets for planning approvals. The LNP will move more quickly than Labor and more intelligently too. Instead of blocking growth, the LNP believes governments should drive the smart growth of our communities and economy. Only an LNP government will get Queensland working again and building again.

 **Mrs MULLEN** (Jordan—ALP) (5.14 pm): I am pleased to speak in support of the Forest Wind Farm Development Bill 2020. I wish to specifically focus my contribution today on the second objective of the bill—that is, amendments to the Planning Act 2016 to facilitate the effective administration of the Springfield Structure Plan. As members would know, Greater Springfield is an important part of the Jordan electorate. As the local state member, I have a very strong interest in the continued success of this growing community. Greater Springfield, as the member for Glass House said, is unique in Queensland—a master planned community being developed by a single master developer. The founders of Springfield City Group, Maha Sinnathamby and Bob Sharpless, have previously said—

When you manage to take control of a 2,860 hectare single piece of land so close to a major capital city, you realise you have landed the opportunity of a lifetime.

This has compelled the founders to think boldly and to create a development that is now seen as a model across Australia for how residents can be encouraged to live, work and play all within their community.

The unique nature of how Greater Springfield has been developed has been the continued focus on preserving the Springfield Structure Plan, which was approved in 1997 and is part of the Ipswich planning scheme. The Springfield Structure Plan was originally prepared as a development control plan under the now repealed Local Government (Planning and Environment) Act 1990. I call the Springfield Structure Plan the great survivor. It has survived not one but three planning acts—the Integrated Planning Act 1987, the Sustainable Planning Act 2009 and, most recently, the Planning Act 2016. With each act, the Springfield Structure Plan has been included in grandfathering provisions which seek to continue the recognition of the development of Greater Springfield. It is this continued recognition, this planning certainty, continuity and integrity of the Springfield Structure Plan that has allowed Springfield City Group to make important investment decisions and to develop Greater Springfield so thoughtfully and successfully.


The amendments proposed in this bill are aimed at addressing some uncertainty that has come about following recent decisions in the Planning and Environment Court and the Court of Appeal. As a result of the way the Springfield Structure Plan is established, Springfield City Group is the entity responsible for the delivery of major infrastructure under the plan. The recent court decisions mean that they no longer have sufficient input and oversight into the provision of this required infrastructure. The changes proposed to the Planning Act are there to address these issues and to ensure the effective operation of the Springfield Structure Plan.

Greater Springfield is home to my family and to over 43,000 of my constituents—in suburbs such as Springfield and Springfield Lakes, Augustine Heights, Brookwater and the new area of Spring Mountain, which is growing quickly. It is anticipated that the final population of Greater Springfield will be around 130,000 residents. As outlined in the South East Queensland Regional Plan, over the next 20 years South-East Queensland is expected to grow by almost two million people. Greater Springfield is very important to this and will play a key role in accommodating some of this expected future population.

As the SEQ plan points out, to realise this future we cannot just rely on luck. We need a clear vision to guide this growth. The amendments supported by our government are about implementing this vision. Greater Springfield is designated a principal regional activity centre and is planned to provide employment for 52,000 workers, in a town centre which includes commercial, retail, educational, health and technology facilities.

We know that the COVID-19 pandemic has led to our state facing some of the toughest economic conditions. We also know that our strong health response and the leadership of our Premier means that we can move quickly towards implementing a comprehensive economic recovery plan. Having an efficient and effective planning framework in Queensland is sometimes undervalued, but it is absolutely crucial to achieving sustainable economic development and the creation of jobs.

Greater Springfield has already seen thousands of jobs created, with many more anticipated as the community grows. Our Labor government understands this. Securing the integrity of the Springfield Structure Plan, as proposed by the amendments before us, will allow Springfield City Group and its many development partners to have continued certainty around planning provisions to allow continued financial investment in Greater Springfield. This is very important for the people I represent. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr KRAUSE** (Scenic Rim—LNP) (5.19 pm): As the member for Glass House has pointed out, the LNP will not be opposing this bill. As a member of the State Development, Tourism, Innovation and Manufacturing Committee that examined the bill, I can say that some concerns were raised by various

submitters in relation to the project and also the process through which the parliament has arrived at this point today. I will use my time to address some of those points about the Forest Wind Farm Development Bill 2020.

First of all, one of the primary concerns raised by residents in the region related to the lack of consultation by both the government and the proponent of this project in relation to the impacts it might have on the local community. That came through in the public hearings. We heard that, although the project had been spoken about and worked through within government for over three years, the first community meeting and consultation that took place in relation to it was at the beginning of this year. It is my understanding as well that that has been the only face-to-face consultation undertaken by the proponent of this project with the local community. That does not seem good enough because this proposed wind farm, if it comes to pass, will have a significant impact on the local community and on the environment within which they live.

We also heard during the committee process that approximately 226 wind turbines are proposed to be constructed to generate around about 1,200 megawatts of electricity. We also heard that some of those turbines could be as tall as the Eiffel Tower. These are very significant structures being proposed to be constructed in the local community. For there to be only one open public meeting about that really does not stack up in terms of having good public consultation. I think the government and the proponent need to be called out on that lack of consultation.

The bill proposes to make changes to the Forestry Act 1959 because it presently prohibits the development of inconsistent and incompatible uses with forestry including for things like wind farms. Others across the state and in the community could ask the question: where could that lead to in the future if further projects like this are proposed? Will national parks be the next state tenure to be considered for the construction of a wind farm?

An opposition member: Fraser Island.

Mr KRAUSE: Or Fraser Island or any other terrific natural environment that is owned by the state and there is legislation to protect it, but obviously legislation can be changed to enable other uses because that is happening here today. The proposed project area is presently a plantation licence that was sold to HQPlantations by the former Bligh government in 2010 for \$603 million. The Bligh government sold our forestry assets.

Mr Powell: Who sold the assets?

Mr KRAUSE: Who sold the assets?

Mr Stevens: The Bligh government.

Mr KRAUSE: Yes, that is right.

Mr Powell: Palaszczuk was a minister.

Mr KRAUSE: She was—exactly. That should be called out as well, regularly.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms McMillan): Order! Can we come back to the bill please, member?

Mr KRAUSE: It actually refers to HQPlantations, which is a private company now. All of their assets are private assets because they were sold by the Bligh government. In relation to the time it has taken to bring this bill to the House, as I said, the project has been underway for more than three years within government. Now, at the death of this parliament, in the final stages, this bill is brought before us.

The other thing we need to point out is a submission by Timber Queensland stating that they supported the legislation on the condition that there is 'no net loss' in forestry production. During consideration of the bill, it was revealed under questioning that the proponent still has no firm plans about how they are going to offset the loss of forestry country in those plantation areas. They do not know where it will be made up. I think this should be an issue of concern not just for Timber Queensland and for Forestry Plantations Queensland but for everyone in Queensland who values our state and our nation having a timber industry.

I know that for many people in the area I represent that is a significant concern not only in relation to this bill and the potential that there may be loss of forestry assets but also in relation to the closure of state forests for logging which is presently slated to occur in a few years time and they are not being replaced. Again, this project could have a loss of forestry assets. Where are we going to get that natural product from if state forests are being removed from the logging and timber industry? We will see it lost here as well.

The other issue that needs to be raised is that of the transmission line for power. When we heard from local residents, they had no idea at all where the proposed transmission line will go or whether there will be any compensation for them for loss of amenity as a result of that transmission line. There are so many questions about that project. Whilst I realise that this bill does not relate specifically to all of those details, it is an enabling piece of legislation and I would have thought that the proponent, when they came to talk to the committee, would have had more detail about these very important matters for the community in relation to the transmission line, in relation to the height and the density of the wind turbines, and also in relation to the agreement to be struck between the proponent and the state as it relates to the use of that state land for this project.

I asked the proponent if they had had any draft agreements circulated between them and the state in relation to what is going to be paid by the proponent to the state. They said they had not. Frankly, I find that hard to believe because they are three years down the road in this process. I would have thought that commercial arrangements and commercial issues would have been raised by this point in time.

As it is an enabling piece of legislation, we are not opposing it. It is a case in point where this government has failed yet again through its investment process—whether it is a market-led proposal or any other renamed, rebadged process—to do the right thing by business. We heard about another case that sat on a minister's desk for 622 days before being considered—

An opposition member: How long?

Mr KRAUSE: 622 days.

Mr Powell: No, 662 days.


Mr KRAUSE: 662 days perhaps. It is very long—it is almost two years. It is no wonder that we have one of the highest rates of unemployment in the nation when we have a government that is trying to—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, can you come back to the bill that is being debated please?

Mr KRAUSE: Well, actually, Madam Deputy Speaker, I will come back to the bill.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, member. Come back to the bill without challenging the chair.

Mr KRAUSE: I come back to the bill by pointing out, Madam Deputy Speaker, that there has been a three-year time frame. That is a very slow process to advance these proposals when Queenslanders are crying out for jobs because we have one of the highest unemployment rates in the nation. Having put those concerns on the record, I implore the government to do better in the future—and hopefully they do not have a long future ahead in government—when it comes to getting investment in our state up and going.

 **Mr PEGG** (Stretton—ALP) (5.28 pm): I was going to say that it has been enlightening, but I would be misleading the House to say that. It has been interesting to hear the contributions of those opposite in relation to this bill, which not only will make a substantive contribution to renewable energy in Queensland but also will create investment in green jobs in regional Queensland which is vitally important.


We have heard those opposite talk about the market-led proposal. The market-led proposal of the Logan Enhancement Project in my local area has been a huge success, and I know the members for Algeester and Logan would say the same. It has allowed people in my community to get where they need to go more quickly. If anyone has any doubts about market-led proposals they should come out to Stretton. They will be able to drive out to Stretton a lot faster thanks to market-led proposals.

The other thin green line of attack we have seen from those opposite has been allegedly on environmental grounds in terms of potential damage to state forests. Forgive me if we are not prepared to take lectures from people who opposed ending sandmining on Stradbroke island.

Debate, on motion of Mr Pegg, adjourned.

CORRECTIVE SERVICES (COVID-19 EMERGENCY RESPONSE) REGULATION

Disallowance of Statutory Instrument

 **Mr PURDIE** (Ninderry—LNP) (5.30 pm): I 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.

This motion is being moved by the LNP in response to the Palaszczuk Labor government watering down the supervision of dangerous sex offenders living at large in our community. It baffles me that the Palaszczuk Labor government are at it once again, doing what they do best: favouring criminals over community safety. The Dangerous Prisoners (Sexual Offenders) Act 2003, known as the DP(SO) Act, would ordinarily provide strict supervision measures that apply to violent and child offenders, but the Labor Party government have taken it upon themselves to weaken these measures.

Unlike Labor, the LNP would never put the rights of dangerous and violent sex offenders ahead of community safety, but once again the LNP is forced to stand up in this House and defend the defenceless, innocent children who too often become the prey of evil: vile child sex offenders who are subject to the DP(SO) Act. The DP(SO) Act plays an important role in managing sex offenders living in our community. The overriding objective of the DP(SO) Act is to provide for the continued detention in custody or supervised release of a particular class of prisoner to ensure adequate protection of the community. This particular class of prisoner is one who has served a period of imprisonment for a serious sexual offence. The serious sexual offence must be one that involves violence or one that is against the child.

Currently, under section 16 of the DP(SO) Act it is a mandatory requirement for all supervised offenders to receive visits from Queensland Corrective Services officers and report to a QCS officer at a stated place. This often means that offenders receive visits from QCS officers at their place of residence. On 23 April this year regulation commenced which has the effect of weakening the supervision of the most dangerous sex offenders living in this state. Under section 7(3) of the regulation, a QCS officer may instead supervise the prisoner remotely by using communication technology—

Mr Ryan interjected.

Mr PURDIE: I acknowledge the minister is outraged that some violent sex offenders in the community might catch COVID, but I will get to that.

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

Honourable members interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Pugh): Before I hear the point of order I will wait for silence. I cannot hear the minister's point of order.

Mr RYAN: I take offence at what the member said and ask that it be withdrawn.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: The minister takes offence. Will you withdraw?

Mr PURDIE: I withdraw. Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence at being called a fool by the police minister.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, the member has taken offence. Do you withdraw?

Mr RYAN: If the member has taken offence, I withdraw.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, it needs to be—

An honourable member interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not need your assistance. Minister, your withdrawal needs to be unreserved.

Mr RYAN: I withdraw whatever the member found offensive.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: 'I withdraw' is all you need to say, Minister.

Mr RYAN: I withdraw.

Mr PURDIE: Currently, there are a number of DPSO offenders living in the community on supervision orders who, as a condition of their order, would ordinarily receive visits from QCS. These include Jeremy William Voois, who raped two teenaged girls and committed another violent sexual act whilst in custody. Another offender given the pseudonym KBM offended against a number of young girls aged between three and 13 years. One of his most disturbing offences involved committing various sexual offences upon an eight-year-old girl during a four-hour period after giving her drugs. Most recently Terance Guy Carter, an untreated dangerous child sex offender who has committed a range of vile sexual offences against children, was recently let out into the community on a supervision order. He has a long history spanning three decades of indecently dealing with young boys.

All of these offenders were subject to strict supervision measures, but thanks to the Labor Party government they now will not be. These offenders are lucky to have been granted the privilege to roam the streets despite their heinous offending. They should be watched like a hawk, but instead they will

be monitored remotely by a QCS officer. This will be the new norm up to 31 December. Strict supervision requirements were put in place for a reason, and they form part of a legislative instrument that should not be stripped away by regulation quietly snuck in without scrutiny by this Labor government.

I want to reiterate that these sex offenders are the worst of the worst living in our community. They are manipulative and callous. The latest figures available to the LNP reveal that in 2017, 50 prisoners were released on supervision orders and in that same year 30 breached the conditions of their order. In 2018, 55 were released on supervision orders and in the same year 20 breached conditions of their supervision orders. In the first half of 2019 there were 26 released, with 18 breaching their conditions. The stats highlight just how rife breaches amongst dangerous child sex offenders are.

One of Queensland's most notorious sex offenders, Robert John Fardon, breached his supervision order and went on to reoffend while on a supervision order. On 4 May 2007 he attended a school while on a pre-arranged visit to address year 11 students. On 11 July 2007 he aided a neighbour, who was also subject to a supervision order, to disobey a curfew restriction. On 21 July 2007 he travelled without authority to Townsville and engaged in a prolonged violent sexual assault on a woman. On 3 April 2008 he went unsupervised to the residence of an intellectually disabled person.

Another DPSO offender, Shane Edward Harvey, also breached his supervision order in 2008 by having a male child two years of age at his residence. A repeat child sex offender, Gregory Kynuna, whose supervision order is littered with breaches as described by Justice David Boddice, recently breached his supervision order again by failing to comply with a curfew, consuming drugs and alcohol and disobeying the lawful instructions of QCS officers. His criminal history involved sexual offences dating back to 1987, including a series of sexual offences committed against a 16-year-old boy.

I cannot reiterate enough that DPSO offenders cannot be trusted, and the most stringent of measures must be in place to protect the safety of our community. These sex offenders are the worst of the worst in society, and the government should act with caution. It is a dangerous game to play by those opposite to weaken the monitoring of DPSO child sex offenders who do not respect the law and who have encroached on the basic rights of children.

The explanatory notes to the regulations state that the amendments were designed to reduce physical contact between persons and to ensure the health and safety of officers and offenders, but I question whether the government have properly justified their response, considering it is disproportionate to the potential harm these offenders may cause children. Breaches involving absconding from their approved residence, breach of curfew and allowing children to unlawfully reside at their residence are more likely to occur without strict supervision and physical inspections.

I question why it is not safe for QCS officers to check on a few dangerous child sex offenders, but it is safe for 25,000 people to gather in a stadium or more than 10,000 people to participate in a marathon. Why is it not safe for QCS officers to check on our most violent sex offenders while at the very same time we are asking our uniformed and plain-clothes Queensland police officers to personally attend the homes of confirmed COVID carriers to ensure they are abiding by their isolation orders.

Surely, it would be safe and practical for QCS officers to practise social distancing and engage in other forms of protective measures, like our police, ambos and other frontline staff have been asked to do. Once again, Labor are rewarding prisoners with their honesty system. The move is unfathomable and I question why the Palaszczuk Labor government are expanding child sex offenders' rights, which only acts to diminish the rights of the community. It makes no sense. It is another deplorable decision by this incompetent government.

The weakening of supervision of dangerous sex offenders is not new to the Palaszczuk Labor government. In fact in 2019, when Labor moved amendments to the Child Protection (Offender Reporting and Offender Prohibition Order) Act, the Attorney-General in her media release said—

Queenslanders can rest assured that our State has the toughest post-conviction monitoring system in the country because of the Child Protection (Offender Reporting and Offender Prohibition Order) Act 2004 and the Dangerous Prisoners (Sexual Offenders) Act 2003.

If Queensland does have the toughest post-conviction monitoring system in the country, then I query why not one post-DPSO offender is GPS tracked.

In addition to the list of blunders by Labor when it comes to monitoring sex offenders, who can forget just last month when a child sex offender who posed as a policeman to lure young boys into a school bathroom where he sexually assaulted them was caught living across the road from a Brisbane

primary school? He even told Channel 9 news, 'I'm pretty much known as a very dangerous and violent person.' Again, in May when Labor were caught out trying to let prisoners out on parole early as part of their initial COVID-19 Emergency Response Bill, it was a get-out-of-jail-free card under the guise of COVID-19.

This is yet another example of how Labor's priorities are all wrong when it comes to putting the safety of the community ahead of the rights of prisoners. The so-called tough monitoring of sex offenders by this Labor government is nothing but a sham. Unlike Labor, the LNP is committed to introducing a number of policies that will protect vulnerable Queenslanders. The LNP has committed to introducing a public sex offender register to allow parents to check the background of anyone—


Mr BAILEY: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. We are talking about the disallowance of a regulation, which is a specific regulation. The member is now talking about election policies.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Pugh): I will take some guidance from the table. I ask the member to keep within the motion.

Mr PURDIE: In talking about the strict monitoring of sex offenders in our community, the LNP has committed to introducing a public sex offender register to allow parents to check the background of anyone who has regular unsupervised access—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Ninderry, I ask you to come back to the motion.

Mr PURDIE: Unlike Labor, the LNP intended to crack down on sexual predators. Expanding rights to prisoners will be nonnegotiable under an LNP government. The weakening of the monitoring of dangerous and violent sex offenders is just another embarrassing blunder by this Labor police minister and an embarrassing Palaszczuk Labor government.

 **Ms LAUGA** (Keppel—ALP) (5.43 pm): The No. 1 priority for Queensland Corrective Services throughout the COVID-19 public health emergency continues to be the health, safety and wellbeing of corrective services officers and, importantly, the broader community. Measures to support Queensland Corrective Services to maintain safety throughout the pandemic have included those in the Corrective Services (COVID-19 Emergency Response) Regulation 2020. Section 7 of the regulation was introduced to ensure that all offenders can continue to be supervised in the community during the COVID-19 pandemic, accounting for the unlikely event that the public health directions prevent in-person reporting.

During this pandemic, face-to-face appointments, electronic monitoring and substance testing have all continued based on assessments of risk and relevant health advice. Appropriate levels of supervision to address risk have been maintained and will continue to be maintained during and beyond the COVID-19 pandemic. Any offender who is released by the courts or Parole Board Queensland for supervision in the community is subject to different supervision requirements. These requirements are determined based on the level of risk an offender presents to community safety. A greater risk is met with more intense supervision and more restrictive conditions.


One cohort that is subject to significant supervision requirements is those supervised under the Dangerous Prisoners (Sexual Offenders) Act 2003, the DP(SO)A. This government will always take a hard stance on managing dangerous sexual offenders after they are released from custody to ensure our community safety is maintained at this level.

Mr Hunt interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Pugh): Order! Member for Nicklin, I note that you are on the speaking list. The member for Keppel is not being inflammatory and she shall be heard in silence.

Ms LAUGA: Queensland Corrective Services closely monitors the state's most dangerous offenders under the DP(SO)A orders using 24/7 GPS monitoring, surveillance, curfews and intensive case management and interventions. Supervision orders place significant restrictions on DP(SO)A offenders in the community and are tailored to the specific risks posed by that offender. As an example of how supervision is continuing during COVID-19, the community can be assured that face-to-face contact with DP(SO)A offenders has remained unchanged during the pandemic. In some isolated cases—such as where an offender may have presented with COVID-19 symptoms or is residing at an aged-care or mental health facility—additional supervision methods were required and these were adopted on a case-by-case basis. These could include, for example, rearranging appointments, introducing curfews or increasing surveillance.

Queensland Corrective Services has and will continue to put the safety of the community at the forefront as it adapts to the changing environment presented by COVID-19. Measures that have been introduced to support this effort must remain in effect. This regulation is absolutely essential to keep community corrections officers safe and reduce the potential transfer of this virus within the community. We know from the last time the LNP were in government that they have no respect for the jobs our frontline workers perform. Now we know they have no respect for the safety of our frontline workers. I will be opposing this motion.

 **Mr McDONALD** (Lockyer—LNP) (5.46 pm): To begin, I would like to offer my thanks to the people of Queensland for their resilience, patience and capacity to soldier through in the face of insurmountable odds. I thank the people of Queensland for their efforts in fighting against this pandemic. They have done so in the face of adversity. Over the last five years, Queenslanders have gotten very used to failure. The Palaszczuk Labor government has failed and continues to fail Queenslanders. Nowhere is this clearer than in its failure to protect Queenslanders and our children from becoming the victims of violent sex offenders.

On 23 April the Palaszczuk government's Corrective Services (COVID-19 Emergency Response) Regulation came into effect. This regulation details changes to the supervision of dangerous child and violent sex offenders in our state. Under the guise of health and safety, this regulation removes the requirement for these offenders to be actively monitored in person by Queensland Corrective Services officers. I do not think it can be any clearer to say that this move is nothing short of insane.

Queensland Corrective Services officers deal with the worst offenders in this state. For those opposite to suggest that this bill is there for the protection of those corrective services officers is just insulting to those officers. They have got every personal protection available, and they are professional people who deal with the worst of the worst. To say that this is about their safety is insulting and restricts their operational capacity to do their job.

As we have heard, I am not alone in holding this sentiment. My colleagues in the LNP agree, and that is why I stand to support the disallowance motion moved by the member for Ninderry. It is our duty in this House to hold the government to account for their failures, and this failure is one that cannot be ignored. It simply does not pass the pub test. Who in their right mind would trust convicted sex offenders? These are some of the worst offenders in our community, and our community welcomes harsher punishment and standards not less like this regulation allows.

Under section 16 of the Dangerous Prisoners (Sexual Offenders) Act it is a mandatory requirement for all supervised offenders in Queensland to receive in-person residential visits from Queensland Corrective Services officers. While this alone does not eliminate the potential for reoffending, it goes a long way towards cementing in an offender's mind the fact that they are constantly being watched. Section 7 of the regulation that I addressed today would eliminate this requirement for the period of the ongoing pandemic—up to 31 December at this stage. Instead, offenders would only be monitored remotely through the use of communications technology. That is right, some of our worst violent sex offenders will be monitored via phone calls. I can only imagine how well that will work.

As a former police officer, I can assure this House that many of these offenders will do and say whatever is necessary to tick the box and get right back to their sick offending. When officers visit houses and speak to these offenders in person, they gain so much more awareness of the environment and the nature of the offender. This bill removes that knowledge to the benefit of the offenders.

The member for Ninderry has listed a litany of breaches including 30 breaches in 2019. It is simply ludicrous that this government can even consider maintaining this ridiculous regulation. At a time when 25,000 spectators are able to attend sporting events, 10,000 runners can compete in a marathon and 100 people can attend a gathering for any reason in public, it is nothing less than sheer negligence for the Palaszczuk Labor government to still maintain that it is too dangerous to allow Queensland Corrective Services officers to visit the residences of offenders under supervision. How ridiculous! This is not about the safety of corrective services officers. This is further evidence of standards that are slipping. It is further evidence of a government with no budget that is flying blind.

I say to this House that I can guarantee that someone has told every department to consider their service delivery approaches during coronavirus. That sounds like a reasonable instruction. However, it cannot just be a blanket opportunity across every department. Like losing personal services in many DAF offices across the state, this instruction has gone too far. We cannot use coronavirus as an excuse to change service delivery models, especially to the advantage of sex offenders. This is another example of a government that has its priorities wrong. Anastacia Palaszczuk was the last Premier to announce a—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Pugh): Member, please use the correct titles.

Mr McDONALD: This Premier was the last Premier to announce an economic stimulus package but was the first and only Premier to cancel the budget. No budget means Labor is flying blind through the biggest economic crisis—

Mr RYAN: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Again it is on relevance. This is about a disallowance motion about a very specific part of a very specific regulation and now the member is talking about budgets and all sorts of other things.


Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you for your point of order, Minister. I would ask the member to stick within the motion.

Mr McDONALD: Thank you for your guidance. While the Palaszczuk government is the only state to not deliver a budget, the LNP has committed to deliver improvements to see these sex offenders dealt with properly. If this government is seriously willing to place the lives of Queenslanders at risk just to avoid the inconvenience of taking extra precautions to ensure violent offenders can be visited by officers in a COVID-safe manner, then the government have succeeded in the ultimate act of illusion: managing to make it appear like they are listening to and governing for Queenslanders when they could not care less about their welfare.

We have seen time and again how this Labor government's approach to crime plays out; violent offenders commit crime only to receive a slap on the wrist and be returned to the streets primed and ready to offend. Of Queensland's 3,690 sex offenders, 14 are living in communities without stringent monitoring requirements. What does the government imagine these dangerous offenders will do if their already weak monitoring requirements are weakened further? Do those opposite expect individuals like Robert John Fardon to simply answer the phone and be honest with Queensland Corrective Services officers about his movements and activities? We have seen how well the honesty system works on our borders with breaches upon breaches and that lack of honesty. Perhaps those members opposite may wish to reacquaint themselves with Albert Einstein's definition of insanity: insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting different results.

In the past the LNP has tried to offer this government a lifeline, but like many before, this lifeline was tossed aside and Queensland was left to drown. No-one is being fooled by Labor's claim that our state has the toughest post-conviction monitoring system in the world. Not a single sex offender subject to an offender probation order in Queensland is currently GPS tracked. In fact, under existing laws police can only make an application for an offender to be tracked after they have engaged in concerning conduct. Is being a sex offender not of itself concerning conduct? Do our police who work so hard to protect Queenslanders have to wait for a dangerous offender to come within a touch of offending before they can act? Unfortunately, that seems to be the case.

The implications of this regulation are disastrous and must be opposed at all costs. If the Premier's government wishes to get serious about protecting Queenslanders from violent sex offenders, it need only turn to the LNP for support. Our commonsense solution to this growing problem will be a solution that Labor can adopt. Queenslanders deserve better. The date 31 October cannot come quickly enough for Queenslanders when they will see a Deb Frecklington led LNP government. Another day under the leadership of this Labor government is another day our great state spends suffering. Only the LNP will get Queensland working again. I commend the motion to the House.

 **Mr PEGG** (Stretton—ALP) (5.56 pm): It is always a challenge to speak after the member for Lockyer because he ranges all over the shop. We heard him talk about the amount of crowds that go to the football and we heard him talk about the borders, culminating in him then quoting Einstein. I certainly say to the member for Lockyer: Einstein, you are not.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Pugh): Member, I think that is a bit unparliamentary. I am going to ask you to withdraw.

Mr PEGG: I withdraw. A lot of those things the member opposite spoke about were off topic. We heard quotes from Einstein, and we heard about footy crowds and borders. The reality is—

Mr Russo: Don't forget the marathon.

Mr PEGG: I take that interjection from the member for Toohey. I forgot about the marathon. I do not know how that was relevant, either. Listening to the member for Lockyer probably felt like a marathon for the member for Toohey. That sentiment is shared by members on this side of the House. It is really interesting when those opposite talk about relevance, because I was merely quoting the issues—

Mr BOOTHMAN: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. It is relevance. He has just waffled on. Can you bring him back to the motion, please?

Mr PEGG: I am talking about the same issues that the member for Lockyer talked about.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have heard your point of order and I am going to rule that there is no point of order on relevance. I am sure that the member is going to tie all of his recap to the motion. It would be lovely if we could hear the member in silence.

Mr PEGG: I am reiterating some of the points made by the member for Lockyer. I did not hear any objections from the member for Theodore about relevance during the polemic he delivered recently.

Mr Saunders: He was asleep.

Mr PEGG: I take that interjection from the member for Maryborough. The heart of this issue is the health and safety of our hardworking Queensland Corrective Services officers.

Opposition members interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am listening carefully to the member's contribution. I cannot hear that he is being provocative. I ask that he be heard in silence.

Mr PEGG: The member for Maryborough knows all too well the hard work that Queensland Corrective Services officers undertake day after day. I found it really interesting that, in amongst all those irrelevant issues that he raised, the member for Lockyer purported to speak for corrective services officers in relation to health and safety and said that they do not want these protections. I thought the member might have quoted some Queensland Corrective Services officers he had talked to, but in fact he said that he had talked to his LNP colleagues to form that view.

I strongly encourage the member for Lockyer, those opposite and all those who support the motion—which is probably limited to about 30-odd people on the other side of the House—to put first the health and safety of our Queensland Corrective Services officers. If the member for Lockyer had talked to more people than just his LNP colleagues, he would know that throughout the Public Service—and indeed in this parliament—measures have been taken to protect our health and safety and those across the Public Service. Even in the private sector, measures have been taken. People have been working from home and people have changed their duties.

All of this is extremely relevant and very important. It might be news to the member for Lockyer, but we are in the middle of a global pandemic. You do not need to be Einstein to work that out, but it might be news to the member for Lockyer that we are in a global pandemic which even some of the vast conspiracy theorists opposite did not predict leading into this year.

The health, safety and wellbeing of corrective services officers and the broader community has remained the priority throughout the COVID emergency. Queensland Corrective Services has undertaken significant planning to ensure business continuity, the security of prisons, the safety of our communities and the safety of our corrective services officers. That is really important. Recent legislative amendments have ensured that Queensland Corrective Services has the full range of powers necessary to lawfully maintain security and good order in prisons and to ensure the health and safety of prisoners and offenders for the duration of the pandemic.

I encourage all members of the House concerned about health and safety of prisoners and about health and safety in corrective services to talk to the officers on the ground. I would not be listening to the member for Lockyer; I would be talking directly to Queensland Corrective Services officers on the ground.

I acknowledge the presence in the gallery of Snow Duan. She knows full well the challenges that the COVID pandemic has presented not just to our community but also globally. It is a serious issue, because many people have sadly lost their lives. Sadly, statistically, there will be more deaths due to this pandemic, unfortunately. That is why health and safety needs to be paramount and why this motion is completely ridiculous.

The regulation has extended the time frame that a declaration of emergency at a corrective services facility can be made from three days to 90 days. This declaration has allowed the commissioner to put in place restrictions that address the risk of COVID infections in Queensland prisons. I say to those opposite, particularly the members for Lockyer and Ninderry and whatever other jokers will speak to this motion—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Stretton, I ask you to withdraw.

Mr PEGG: I withdraw. It has gone from three to 90 days. How many days do they think is appropriate? Do you want to maintain the three days?

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Direct your comments through the chair.

Mr PEGG: I would be very interested to hear what members opposite have to say in relation to that.


The regulation also provides an explicit power to screen persons entering corrective services facilities, including staff and visitors, for flu-like symptoms. Those with a high temperature or flu-like symptoms are refused access and referred to a fever clinic or emergency room. That sounds like common sense to me, but those opposite oppose this regulation. These seem like commonsense measures that have been adopted not only in this parliament but also across Queensland and the world, but for some reason those opposite want to oppose a commonsense, evidence based and medically based approach to protecting our community and frontline workers.

Very importantly, both measures have been vital in ensuring that Queensland Corrective Services has been able to keep COVID-19 out of prisons. To date, no prisoners in Queensland correctional centres have tested positive to COVID-19. As I say, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. I am not sure if Einstein said that, but certainly a wise person said that. When we look at the facts and the evidence so far, it is quite clear that this regulation is working and protecting the health and safety of our corrective services officers and the community.

Section 7 of the regulation is another essential measure in supporting the response to COVID-19 in a worst-case scenario. Of course, we have to prepare for the worst and hope for the best. I know that is not another Einstein quote, but I argue that it is still very relevant to this debate. It is much more relevant than some of the member for Lockyer's quotes.

Section 7 supports Queensland Corrective Services operations by ensuring that community based offenders are supervised and managed in accordance with legislative obligations in response to the COVID-19 emergency. Section 7 is necessary to protect the health, safety and wellbeing of our community and corrections officers should they ever need to supervise a person infected with COVID-19. Face-to-face contact and supervision of offenders where required has continued throughout, with the vital support of personal protective equipment and other social distancing measures. It all sounds like common sense to me. As the COVID emergency situation continues to evolve, this measure remains important in ensuring supervision can continue without compromising on community safety if an offender is required to self-isolate because of COVID-19.

In conclusion, those opposite are trying to make people make a false choice between protecting our frontline workers and protecting and ensuring community safety. We do not have to make a choice. The minister has done fantastic work. We can achieve both in these unprecedented times. I urge all members opposite to vote against this motion.

 **Mr HUNT** (Nicklin—LNP) (6.07 pm): It is always a challenge to follow the member for Stretton—as entertaining and as eloquent as his speech was—as he valiantly attempts to defend this absolute farcical regulation in terms of the protection of our children. It is clear that not only is this Labor government soft on crime and dangerous sex offenders; it has completely given up on its responsibilities to protect our communities and our children from predators. Once again, this government has jumped the shark in its response to protect corrective services workers from COVID by protecting sex offenders from proper supervision. Let's go to the honesty system, shall we? It is working well at the borders! We will just give them a call: 'Hey, Mr Fardon, are you at home? No children there? Very good. Well done, chap. Carry on.' We have an honesty system at the borders. We have an honesty system with youth bail. Now we have an honesty system with dangerous sex offenders. The backbenchers opposite must be embarrassed by their government continually trotting out this type of thing.

This Labor government trusts celebrities to self-isolate—it does not trust ordinary Queenslanders—but then it places its trust in dangerous sex offenders to do the right thing and stay where they are supposed to stay, behave how they are supposed to behave and says, 'We'll just give them a ring to double-check.' We can have 25,000 people gather at the footy. We can now go to bars and restaurants and Queenslanders can have 100 people come to their house, just as long as they do not work for Corrective Services and the house has a sex offender in it. What an absolute farce! The Labor government's decisions defy logic and its default position when it comes to criminals is to err on the side of the criminal. We see it time and time again, and it would just be plain embarrassing if it was not so dangerous to the community and put our most vulnerable at risk.

Once again, Labor puts the criminals first and the community second. We all know that dangerous sex offenders are not exactly the most compliant people. They are not the most trustworthy people, but it seems this Labor government places a lot of trust in them despite many examples that should alarm any government and make it highly vigilant against such individuals.

We have seen examples such as Robert John Fardon, the well-known dangerous sex offender who committed numerous breaches while supervised in the community. As the member for Ninderry has already pointed out, those breaches included attending a school on a prearranged visit to address year 11 students in May 2007 and aiding a neighbour who was also subject to a supervision order to disobey a curfew restriction in July 2007. He travelled without authority to Townsville and engaged in a prolonged, violent sexual assault of a woman in July 2007 and went unsupervised to the residence of an intellectually impaired person in April 2008. In another example, Shane Edward Harvey breached his supervision order in 2008 by having a male child two years of age at his residence.

These are the types of breaches in the community that will occur if corrective services officers fail to monitor dangerous sex offenders or monitor them remotely. It sends the wrong message to these criminals that we are lax about security, that we are lax about their supervision and puts the community in danger of them breaching their supervision such as absconding from their approved residence, breach of curfew and allowing children to unlawfully reside at their residence. These things are obviously more likely to occur without strict supervision and physical inspections and this Labor government should immediately support this disallowance motion for the safety of our community. Dangerous sex offenders cannot be trusted. An honesty system such as remote communication will only lead to sex offenders breaching their supervision and preying on vulnerable members of the community and our children.

Labor needs to stop turning to its default offender focused protections and protect the community. We have an alarming 3,690 sex offenders in Queensland, with 14 of our most dangerous living in the community without stringent monitoring. Labor rejected our calls for monitoring by GPS tracking for life and put in its own watered down version which is another honesty system, so we trust sex offenders now until they commit a concerning act, at which point the damage could already have been done. Now we are not even going to visit them; we are just going to give them a call. In contrast, the LNP has a comprehensive set of policies to right Labor's wrongs and protect our—

Mr RYAN: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Deputy Speaker, you made a ruling on a very similar example just before by the member for Ninderry—my point of order is on relevance—and it is exactly the same instance which you ruled out of order in terms of the member for Ninderry.

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

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Pugh): I have not ruled on the previous point of order, member.

Mr HUNT: It is in relation to that point of order, if that is—

Mr Harper interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Thuringowa, I will hear the point of order in silence, thank you very much.

Mr HUNT: I am merely outlining what the LNP's alternate approach would be. I got halfway through a sentence and the minister jumped up because I said the term 'LNP' apparently.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will take some advice; thank you. Member, I am going to ask you to stick to the motion and I am sure you are bringing that back to your central point.


Mr HUNT: Thank you for your guidance, Madam Deputy Speaker. The LNP would do things differently. The LNP would not do this. The LNP would look after our children, would look after our communities and would not err on the side of the criminal as Labor has done with this ridiculous—

Government members interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Toohey, you are very close to being warned.

Mr HUNT: All the speakers on that side continually spoke about protecting workers and protecting everyone other than our children. None of them mentioned protecting children. They are prioritising criminals over children. This Labor government is hoping that on 31 October it can distract Queenslanders from the bigger picture by misleading them that it is protecting them with ridiculous regulations like this, but it is not protecting them. It is not protecting them from the danger of economic devastation and it is certainly not protecting them from criminals and dangerous sex offenders. Time and time again we see examples such as this regulation when it favours the criminal over the community. I support this disallowance motion.

On 31 October the people of Queensland will get the opportunity to send a message to this soft-on-crime, soft-on-sex-offenders government that it is not good enough and elect a Frecklington LNP government that will protect their families, that will protect their livelihoods, that will control crime, that will hold offenders to account and that will have a criminal justice system that reflects community expectations.

 **Hon. MT RYAN** (Morayfield—ALP) (Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services) (6.16 pm): I rise to oppose the motion, and let me make one thing very clear: corrective services officers are continuing to facilitate face-to-face contact and supervision of high-risk community based offenders, including sex offenders and those subject to supervision orders, under the DP(SO) Act and have done so for the entire duration of the COVID-19 emergency. To say it clearly, nothing has changed for these offenders—nothing. They are still subject to strict monitoring and supervision. Nothing has changed. Tonight the LNP's rantings are just scaremongering and insulting to our hardworking QCS officers who every day are doing everything they can to keep the community safe.

Let us talk about a hypothetical for one moment. If a DPSO offender were infected with COVID, what we would do—and this is the advice of the Queensland Corrective Services Commissioner—is put more supervision in place for those offenders. We would put more monitoring in place. This regulation allows QCS, when those offenders are infected with COVID, to be flexible with their monitoring to ensure community safety. That is what this is about. In instances where high-risk offenders catch COVID, we would probably put more monitoring and more supervision in place.

The LNP's motion is reckless and poses a potential danger to the community and to our hardworking QCS officers. The potential consequence of the motion is that it could facilitate the spread of COVID-19 should an offender become infected with the virus. Clearly the member for Ninderry's intent is to block an emergency contingency power that would help stop the spread of COVID-19. Clearly those opposite do not value the jobs of our hardworking corrective services officers and now we know they do not value their health or safety. To suggest that a community corrections officer should meet face to face with an offender with COVID-19 is outrageous and shows that the LNP has no respect for frontline staff responsible for keeping our community safe.

Those opposite have no respect for the health of Queenslanders, they have no respect for the directions of the Chief Health Officer, whom they have publicly criticised, and they are unfit to govern. They do not just want to sack our public servants; they want to expose our public servants to potential health and safety risks. They have been on the wrong side of every decision during this COVID-19 pandemic. How many times did they scream for the border to be opened? Sixty-four times!

Mr HUNT: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. It is along the lines of the minister's point of order during my speech. He is straying into border territory now and nothing to do with the motion before the House. The point of order is on relevance

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Pugh): Thank you very much. I do not need a detailed explanation. Border closure was mentioned by both sides during the debate. The minister has mentioned it. I am listening closely to the substance of his contribution and if I feel he is straying I will certainly rule. Thank you, member for Nicklin.

Mr RYAN: Responding to the comments about the borders, I note that those opposite called for them to be opened 64 times. Even last week there was still an online petition on their website calling for the borders to be opened. Now they are demanding that our hardworking community corrections officers should be exposed to COVID-19 in a reckless and irresponsible way. It is madness.

Here are the facts: the COVID-19 pandemic continues to impact day-to-day life in Queensland, including the operations of Queensland's prisons and community corrections officers. Queensland Corrective Services has undertaken significant planning to ensure business continuity, the safety of our officers and the wellbeing of the people in the care and under the supervision in the community of Queensland Corrective Services. Queensland Corrective Services has implemented strategies to manage operational activities based on assessments of risk of health and safety whilst also ensuring our community stays safe. To suggest for one moment that Queensland Corrective Services would do something that would undermine the safety of our community is an insult and it just shows that those opposite are using this as an opportunity to scaremonger and attack our hardworking public servants. Queensland Corrective Services has been involved every step of the way in ensuring that we have a staged response to COVID-19 and are acting in accordance with the advice and the support of Queensland's Chief Health Officer.

With respect to community corrections operations, as at 3 August 2020 corrective services officers were supervising almost 18,000 community based offenders from 36 district offices and from over 150 reporting locations right across our state. The health, safety and wellbeing of corrective services officers, offenders and the broader community has always remained Queensland Corrective Services' No. 1 priority throughout the COVID-19 emergency. All offenders released to supervision by the Parole Board or the courts have different levels of supervision based on their risk. The greater the risk, the more intense their supervision and the more restrictive their conditions.

During the COVID-19 emergency period, electronic monitoring, substance testing, home visits and face-to-face appointments with community based offenders have continued based on assessments of risk of health and safety. Let me make this clear one more time: corrective services officers are continuing to facilitate face-to-face contact and supervision of high-risk community based offenders, including sex offenders and those subject to supervision orders under the DP(SO) Act and have done so for the entire duration of the COVID-19 emergency. Nothing has changed.

Section 7 of the regulation supports Queensland Corrective Services' operations by ensuring that community based offenders remain supervised and managed in accordance with legislative obligations in response to the COVID-19 emergency whilst not undermining community safety. Section 7 was introduced as part of a contingency plan to ensure corrective services officers can continue to supervise offenders during the COVID-19 emergency period in the unlikely event that public health directions prevent in-person reporting. Let me say that again: in the unlikely event that public health directions prevent in-person reporting. Where in-person reporting is not possible, community corrections officers remain committed to ensuring the robustness of the supervision and rehabilitation of community based offenders by conducting reporting in other ways, and in many instances that reporting will be at an enhanced level. Further, in circumstances where these offenders are unable to report in person, section 7 ensures these offenders are not inadvertently breaching their relevant orders as a result of a public health direction. Section 7 will not affect the supervision of offenders subject to electronic monitoring.

This contingency plan has not been used because no offenders have been infected with COVID-19. Let me say that again: the contingency plan has not been used in respect of high-risk offenders because those offenders have not been infected with COVID-19, and hopefully they never will be. It will only be used if an offender is diagnosed with COVID-19. It would be reckless and just plain stupid to require a COVID-19 infected person to be out in the community, running into people in the community and potentially infecting Queensland Corrective Services staff. What this contingency does is establish a mechanism for the effective ongoing monitoring of an offender in the unlikely event that that person contracts COVID-19. This is a commonsense measure which enhances community safety and protects our staff in Queensland Corrective Services from the potential exposure of COVID-19. For these reasons I oppose the motion.

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

AYES, 43:

LNP, 38—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Gerber, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

NQF, 1—Costigan.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 48:

ALP, 47—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.


Resolved in the negative.

ANTI-DISCRIMINATION (RIGHT TO USE GENDER-SPECIFIC LANGUAGE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading

Resumed from 14 July (see p.1596), on motion of Mr Katter—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Mr BROWN** (Capalaba—ALP) (6.32 pm): Today I rise to oppose the bill introduced by the member for Traeger. I have a lot of time for the Katter party and its members, because they usually introduce into this House bills and motions that stand up for the bush, that champion jobs for the bush and that stand up for local roads and rail in the bush. This week I was surprised to read an article about the Katters backing euthanasia in which the member for Traeger said—


Labor and Liberal love throwing in these social issues to try to make them a priority above anything else.

What are we doing here today? We are talking about a social issue that, from what I hear from the Katter party, relates to only a couple of students at UQ, which is the most elite of the elite sandstone universities. We need to look at the history of this bill. Private members' bills are as rare as hen's teeth. This bill was introduced two years ago, but we are debating it only now. This bill really surprises me, because surely when in opposition you would want to put forward a private member's bill that stands up for jobs, stands up for roads or stands up for rail, yet this social issue has been brought before us. We have to look back to what happened two years ago.

Two years ago was the time of Fraser Anning, which everyone will remember. There was a weird experiment within the Katter party when they let Senator Fraser Anning into the fold, and what a disaster that was. I believe that this bill comes from Senator Anning. I will give the member for Traeger the benefit of the doubt, because while it was a disastrous time it was one that they learned from. In the end they made the right decision, but it was these types of issues that Fraser Anning brought to the Katter party. When the Katter party chucked out Fraser Anning—which was the right thing to do—they should have also chucked out this bill.

As I said, private members' bills are as rare as hen's teeth. There are not many opportunities for them to be debated. I think we should be discussing more pressing issues for the bush and regional Queensland, rather than 'he says, she says' social issues. I find this absolutely bizarre and not in the normal ethos of the Katter party. However, it is important that we stand up to defend this, because it means a lot for our non-binary and transgender comrades, of whom I know plenty. This issue is important to them. It does mean a lot to them. We have heard many speakers talk about mental health issues and even suicides that can be associated with the use of certain language. Language does cut and it does hurt, so this issue is important.

I note that only one LNP speaker defended the bill. On our side, speaker after speaker talked about the importance of recognising everyone in our communities, whether or not they assign themselves a gender and whether or not they call themselves male or female. It does not bother me. I get along with my day and my community gets along with their day. They want me to be in this place to stand up for jobs, education and health. The member for Traeger should listen to his own words when he said that these social issues should not be prioritised. He should go back to standing up for regional Queensland by standing up for roads, jobs and the bush in general. I do not support this bill.

 **Mr POWER** (Logan—ALP) (6.36 pm): Recently, in a separate debate in this place, the member for Hinchinbrook asked members to imagine how others might see the world. In the debate on the Disability Parking Permit Scheme bill, he spoke about people who cannot see. He asked members to try to understand how those who have no sight might feel. He spoke of how important it was that members had put on blindfolds and were led around by guide dogs. He said—

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.

The member's point was that, unless you have walked in the shoes of someone who experiences those challenges in our world and sees our world very differently, you would not really understand the challenges they face.

The member's point was well made and it is a good one. Of course, we can briefly experience blindness by putting on a hood that blocks our eyes. While it can be much more difficult to put ourselves in the shoes of those who have different challenges in life, the point of the member for Hinchinbrook is equally valid. We have to try to understand the special challenges that others face, even if it is not as simple as closing our eyes. The member for Capalaba spoke about those who do not see themselves easily fitting in to male or female roles. Those people face challenges related to how they are addressed and respected. We want to be able to see that, so the member for Hinchinbrook's point is very valid. We want to step into their shoes and imagine how they feel. We want to treat them with respect and make their journey through life that much easier.

One of my problems with this private member's bill—and I have several—is that it does not set the standards that the member himself sets out. It does not ask Queenslanders to try to see the world from a different perspective; to try to walk in the shoes of others through the obstacles of life. Whenever possible, when we speak we can try to be inclusive and polite. We can ask ourselves, 'How would I feel if I were them and such language was used about me?'


This form of speech is in fact the traditional Queensland, welcoming and friendly form of speech. We as Queenslanders get people wanting to experience our state from all over the world—at least they used to, and we hope that they will again. One of the reasons they come here is that we are inclusive and we are polite in the way we deal with people—the traditional Queensland way. To legislate against

the Queensland way of speech that seeks to include every Queenslanders seems to me a step backwards. We need to get back to our good traditions of including everyone in being welcoming. That has been part of the Queensland way of life for a long time.

The other problem I have with this is: exactly what problem are we fixing? Which Queenslanders are worse off if we seek to reasonably include Queenslanders? I listened hard to the speeches of the few MPs who seemed to support this and the only people they could point out to me were a few undergraduates at universities who felt put upon when they were gently reminded of the academic standards of writing that seek to be inclusive of all humans. This has been part of the academic standards of writing for some 50 years or longer in Queensland universities. What exactly is the great problem here? Queenslanders want to reasonably include everyone in their speech. We will not always get it right, but it is a fundamental Queensland value to seek to be inclusive of all.

We perhaps did not include the people who had lived in Australia for thousands of years before Europeans came here. Now we, in updating the Queensland way, try hard to be more inclusive by recognising the people who have endured this connection. In my case, that is mostly the Yugambeh Aboriginal people. This is a positive advancement of Queensland traditions and I am sure it is one that every member in this place supports.

I have to be frank: some people might know that I am not always perfect in my speech. I have not always used inclusive speech. I might never get something right or I might feel that some things are a little clunky to me. However, I can make one pledge to the people in Logan. As the member for Logan, I will always try to include every Logan resident. That is the inclusive Logan way and that is the inclusive Queensland way of speech.

 **Mr KATTER** (Traeger—KAP) (6.41 pm), in reply: I rise to close the debate on this bill and perhaps even try to address some of the concerns raised by members. I will work backwards and start with the member for Logan, who made some very valid points. I will address the question: who is worse off? Perhaps not a lot. There will be some students, and perhaps Rob Katter, who choose to still use the words 'he' and 'she' and inadvertently put those words in a university assignment or whatever else happens in the future. I was told that I was jumping the gun, that there were no penalties, but we were starting to get calls from people. Without any effort at all, I was contacted by people saying, 'I have been discriminated against,' so there are some people. That may not be significant. The member's point remains valid that others still may be offended. There is a counter point there; I acknowledge that.

In addressing that question, the second point of my bill is that sporting organisations, cafes, private businesses and schools may also have to install a third toilet lest they be subject to a discrimination claim. That is something that this bill practically addresses. If someone puts in a third toilet at a cafe, I think that is great—I have no problem with that—but if someone cannot afford to or does not do it and is punished, I think they should have their rights protected.

I can just about address everyone's argument that has been raised in this House—and it became very emotive—by saying that I am not trying to force anyone else to speak anything; I am trying to preserve a place for other people who say, 'I would like to retain the vernacular that I am accustomed to as my primary vernacular.' I think that I and others should be allowed to use that without fear of discrimination. That was described as hate speech and as weaponising language. How does it do that? I have not proposed to force anything on anyone with this legislation. I have simply said that if you happen to have an alternative view then you should have some rights as well. However, it would appear that someone like me who wants to continue to use the words 'he' and 'she' in the foreseeable future will not have their rights preserved.

I agree that if someone says, 'Can you not call me "he" or "she"? Can you call me something else?', most Queenslanders would say, 'Sure, mate, no problem. I totally respect your choices in life and I will call you whatever you prefer.' The thing is, do I want to change my primary vernacular? No, I do not. At the very least, if we are going to make these big seismic shifts in language, let's debate it in parliament. I do not think anyone should have a problem with that.

The member for Capalaba made some pretty good points. Yes, there are other priorities, but we see incremental changes. Many people in my electorate will say, 'Hang on. When did this all happen? When did I start to be penalised just for using that language? I have full respect for people. I don't want to offend anyone, but when did I start getting punished for using these words? I have been discriminated against. My kid got penalised in an assignment because I told them to use the word "forefathers" and it is now "founding signatories" or something.' There should be a point at which this is brought to a head and a line is drawn in the sand. It might seem minor, but I think it is significant. That is why I have brought this bill into the parliament.

There was a double standards argument raised—that you have to walk in other people's shoes. Again, we are not forcing anyone to use language or trying to impose our language on anyone, if I can put it that way. It is not trying to change anyone else's language; it is preserving the right for people to say, 'I prefer to use gender-specific language.' I do not see how there is a problem with that.

The point was made that I am bringing issues to parliament that are not significant, that we should be talking about jobs and so on. That is a circular debate because I can say that the government brings in bills that are insignificant all the time. That is probably being argumentative to bring up that point. I thought it was a silly thing to bring up.

Mental issues and suicide are very real issues. I understand that. It is important to recognise that people do struggle in this regard. However, is maintaining the right to use words like 'he' and 'she' as my primary vernacular weaponising language? Again, I refer members to my earlier comments that most people in Queensland are respectful and compassionate and do not want to offend people. What they do not like is having their rights taken away in regard to freedom of language.

We are starting to regulate language by stealth and I think that is unhealthy. I remember at the start of this debate everyone saying that there is no need for this. I think one of the comments made was, 'Well, it's only a couple of uni students.' That is pretty significant. Even if only one or two people are affected, that is still significant. I say again: look at Jordan Peterson. He was kicked out of the University of Canada for exactly the same sentiment. He was saying, 'I have no problem in addressing people the way they prefer to be addressed, but it is a dangerous thing when people start forcing language on people'—incremental changes not voted on by the people. That is why this is here.

For those who still ask, 'Well, what is the point? Why do we need this?,' let me give some examples. There was a call for compulsory dedicated gender-neutral bathrooms to be part of the building code. The Queensland government committed to build awareness and education around transgender identities in schools by providing information to principals about gender-neutral school uniforms, school camps, use of toilets and participation in sport. There were changes to the Queensland driver's licence to remove a person's sex or gender and changes to details on birth, death and marriage certificates not based on a person's natural sex—male or female.

The University of Queensland has policies to mark down students for language that could be considered gender exclusive, even if that language is grammatically correct. This is curious because they publicly said that that policy did not exist and it did not happen. That contradicted what a number of students who contacted us said. I have observed since then that it is in policy online. It is curious that they felt it necessary to defend the proposition that it was not. The state funded the University of Queensland to the tune of \$34.9 million in 2017, which is significant.

Commonwealth Games volunteers were told to use gender-neutral language to avoid causing offence. Qantas's Words at Work HR resource recommended language such as 'partner' instead of 'boyfriend' and 'girlfriend' or 'husband' and 'wife'. The ADF guide encourages the use of certain language and the outlines potential bullying impact of not using sensitive language. 'They' day is here in the Victorian public service.

There is a big push to change and encroach on our language. We are not saying that we cannot allow that or we should not do that; I am just trying to point out that it is a real thing. My bill is not saying that no-one can use that language; nor is it advising or recommending that people not use it. It is just saying that if people choose not to use it then they should not be discriminated against. I cannot see how that will have a big impact. I fail to see how this can be associated with words like 'weaponising' that the member for South Brisbane mentioned—weaponising the language.

These are important points to make. I would also like to address the comment made by the member for Bulimba, who asked why we need to change things when they are heading in the right direction. I would argue that we are not trying to change anything in here. If I do not want to change the language that I use from day to day, I should have that right preserved. As long as there is no intent to offend, I do not see how that is an offensive proposition. The big question in response to that is: what is it that we are not allowed to say now? If people choose to use different language, they are quite welcome to use it. All we are saying is that if people do not want to use it they have their rights preserved.

The big questions for me remain. If this bill passes, what is the impact on people? The member for South Brisbane made a contribution. I did not hear all of it. I heard one thing. The big thing was the reference to weaponising language. The use of 'his' and 'her' is not really weaponising language. They are words we have been using for years. I will say ad nauseam that I am not sure weaponising language is consistent with someone saying, 'I am going to maintain using "his" and "her" as my primary

vernacular. If someone else prefers an alternative to those gender pronouns I am happy to consider those, but I would prefer to retain my primary vernacular.' What is wrong with protecting someone who is at risk of inadvertently offending someone or causing damage—if any damage could be done—and therefore being subject to a discrimination complaint? I just do not see how there can be a problem with that.

The member for Capalaba asked whether this is needed. I think it is. I think it is important to bring these things here for debate, draw a line in the sand and question whether this is the way we want to go forward. If the opposition and government want to vote against this, that is all right, but I think it is important that members have an opportunity to vote on this and people can see how their members of parliament vote.

I think this bill works in exactly the reverse way to what I have been accused of here, which is promoting hate speech. It is always fun to throw names around in the House. People were referring to Fraser Anning before and trying to tie that into this debate. It hardly warrants a response, but this has absolutely nothing to do with any period in our party or any member who has ever joined our party.

It is a sensible proposition that has been put forward for debate. I think it is an important time to have the debate. There is discussion about this. Not everything we debate in here is about jobs and the economy. Yes, we do like to focus on those things, but there are social and cultural issues that are important to us. We think it is important to stand up for those members of the community who want some rights preserved.

I would certainly be against anyone taking a bigoted approach to this. Any reasonable person would have that attitude. Do not try to paint me into a corner or characterise what I am trying to do in that way. To me this is reverse intolerance. I have a certain set of cultural values. Embedded in that is respect for people from all walks of life. I should be afforded the same respect when it comes to my cultural values and norms. I think that is a pretty reasonable proposition to put to the parliament.

The last point I wanted to make is that it is important to recognise that it is not so much that cultural norms do not exist but that they are different throughout the state. We get people from all walks of life and different cultures in remote Queensland, and that is a wonderful thing. It is sometimes the case that we have the advantage of looking from the outside in, without a lot of the noise created in the media in the big city. It becomes easier to make judgement calls in terms of where one thinks their standards lie.

This is an issue that I think is relevant to bring up for regional Queensland. It is not just tied to North Queensland. It is important to give people choice in terms of the way they use language. It is a discreet way of preserving rights. If this offends people then we are in trouble in the future, because it would seem to me that we could offend anyone by saying anything.

It is very important to recognise that we should not be regulating all of this. There is far too much regulation around where we are going with these things. We should rely on people's goodwill and good nature in how they interact with each other and stop trying to ram things down people's throats. It almost seems contradictory in that I am trying to put this in legislation. I pointed out the evidence where this is continually incrementally encroaching on our lives. This has never been done in parliament.


I put this bill to the parliament and I seek support for it. It is a primary right that should be preserved. We should protect people from discrimination if they continue to want to use words like 'he' or 'she'.

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

Resolved in the negative under standing order 106(10).

ADJOURNMENT

Inala Electorate; Correction to *Record of Proceedings*

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (7.04 pm): It gives me enormous pleasure to rise in the House to speak about my electorate of Inala. It is a wonderful, diverse, multicultural community, and I love being part of it and representing the people of Inala in this House. Nothing is more important to me than protecting the health of all Queenslanders during this time. Our efforts have allowed us to take steps to get our lives back closer to normal and help the Queensland economy recover.

Queensland's economic recovery begins with job creation and, locally, work on our school facilities will help support jobs for local tradies. Work on a new prep building and learning space at Serviceton South State School is scheduled for completion this week. I am also particularly excited to see \$250,000 in funding going towards a refurbishment of the multipurpose courts at Inala State School. As well, the completion of our Cooler Cleaner Schools Program has seen 98 learning spaces air-conditioned in the Inala electorate. Glenala State High School is now part of the solar panel club, along with Inala State School and Richlands East State School.

A number of community organisations recently gained funding under the latest round of the Gambling Community Benefit Fund, sharing in over \$57,000 for their projects. These included the Canine Control Council (Queensland) Ltd to build a new shed, the Sri Lanka Buddhist Monastery to install air conditioning, as well as others.

Inala constituents will also undoubtedly have noticed that close to 200 new girders have successfully been lifted into place over Oxley Creek, continuing momentum on the \$400 million Ipswich Motorway upgrade and 470 jobs as Queensland continues its plan for economic recovery. The girders provide more capacity and safer connectivity for the motorway's 85,000 daily drivers. Queensland's ongoing management of the health impacts means we are able to continue to deliver our plan for economic recovery.

On another matter, on 17 June 2020 in the course of question time I referred to the Newman government sacking 225 child safety officers. I accept there may have been some ambiguity in what I said. I should have said 'explain why 225 Child Safety staff were cut'. I am more than happy to correct the record.

While I am on my feet, I want to pay tribute to all of the community organisations that are working out in my electorate of Inala. I also want to thank any emergency services personnel who live in my electorate who are going above and beyond duty, whether that is working in health care, in our hospitals or in our SES. We know how much people give of their time to work in protecting the health of others.

I am very proud to represent the electorate of Inala in this House. It is a great honour and a great privilege. I am happy to continue to deliver for schools and the economic recovery as part of our Unite and Recover for Queensland Jobs plan as we deal with this world pandemic. I pay tribute to all of the people living in my electorate.

Southern Downs Electorate, Queensland Border Closure



Mr LISTER (Southern Downs—LNP) (7.07 pm): I rise to speak in the House tonight about the matter of the border closure. In my electorate of Southern Downs we have 400 kilometres of border country stretching from Killarney to just short of Mungindi. In the last couple of days my office—my staff and I—have been inundated with concerns from residents on both sides of the border, not just from my constituents but from those who live on the other side of the border in New South Wales and for whom Queensland is their community of interest.

We have had complaints from a tyre shop proprietor, Betsy Turner, who is unable to reach places like North Star and Croppa Creek, where she sells tyres, and from a veterinary surgeon in Killarney, David Thomson, who has clients throughout the area on the other side of the border. It is calving season and he cannot reach Bonalbo and some of the communities that he needs to reach because those postcodes are not included in the bubble along the border. Another one that springs to mind is Greg Carey, who runs Carey Bros Abattoir. His premises are just outside one of the postcode locations which are exempted along the border. Some of his staff work in Yangan but come from just across the border. These restrictions are proving very difficult for business, for families and for ordinary workers as they try to go about their daily business.


I support and understand the necessity of closing the borders. It is something that I think most people in Southern Downs would understand. What I would like to see is an expansion of the bubble, as we put it, in the country areas that I represent. On the southern Gold Coast and Tweed we are talking about a bubble of several postcodes deep—maybe 100 kilometres from end to end—where people can cross the border backwards and forwards. What I would like to see is an expansion of the area deeper into New South Wales and deeper into Queensland. We are talking about areas which are much less dense in terms of population and I think would be significantly less risky than the urbanised areas which are currently covered closer to the coast.

I have spoken with the Goondiwindi Regional Council. I understand that they and their local chamber of commerce, and also the Balonne council, have expressed to the government a request that the border zone be expanded to incorporate an entire local government area on both sides of the

border. I have earlier today written to the Premier asking for an expansion to 50 kilometres and any postcode which is touched by that. I think the proposal by the council seems quite sensible and easy to enforce.

Those who are struggling with the closures are not asking for the border to be opened. They just want a fair go because in country areas people need to travel a lot further than a few kilometres from either side of the border. The economic impacts are very hard on businesses that have already struggled with drought. They employ people and pay taxes to pay for politicians and pay for all of the things that we scrutinise in this House.

Bulimba Electorate, School Infrastructure; Correction to *Record of Proceedings*, Apology


 **Hon. DE FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (Minister for Child Safety, Youth and Women and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (7.10 pm): On 17 June 2020 I said in the course of question time that those opposite sacked 225 child safety officers. There was ambiguity in what I said. To be perfectly clear, I should have said that those opposite sacked 225 Child Safety staff. While I clarified it almost immediately, I apologise now for any confusion about just whom the LNP sacked, which may have been caused by my use of ambiguous language. In any event, the safety of children was made deliberately riskier, which was the main point being made.

While I am on my feet, I do want to talk about some really great news for schools across Queensland. I was thrilled today to hear the Minister for Education saying that the Palaszczuk Labor government would be committing to an investment of \$220 million in Queensland state schools, supporting more than 720 jobs. This funding is so welcome for local communities and also for the local tradies who can tender for those projects. Even the really small projects that are included in this list make a big difference to students.

I was particularly excited to know that schools in my beloved electorate of Bulimba will benefit from the program to the tune of \$7.4 million. While all the state schools in the electorate are going to benefit from around \$500,000 in maintenance and minor works, it is Morningside State School and Bulimba State School which have been singled out for today's announcement, and they are such worthy recipients. They are schools that the education minister has personally visited, and I know she was really thrilled to see the work they do at those schools. She of course visited Morningside State School in the week it was devastated by fire almost two years ago. In fact, the second anniversary of that fire is coming up in October. The school is literally like a phoenix rising from the ashes not only because of the fantastic new buildings we see going up, which have completely transformed the school, but in the way the whole school has worked together after adversity. They are really an outstanding school community, and a better example of community and school working together you could not find.

Meanwhile, at Bulimba State School we are seeing just over half a million dollars being invested for a new outdoor learning area. This will be a great addition to the school, which is very challenged in terms of space on quite a difficult site. I know that their outdoor areas are very precious to them, so I want to thank them for their patience and the meticulous planning they have done to make sure they use every single bit of space. This program comes on top of our Cooler Cleaner Schools program. In terms of the installation of solar rooftops across the state, well done to all the schools in my electorate and across Queensland that are going to benefit.

State Election

 **Dr ROBINSON** (Oodgeroo—LNP) (7.13 pm): This election is a referendum on the member for South Brisbane's economic performance in recent years. She has told the Premier she is not going anywhere, and we know that if Labor is returned she wants the top job. This election is a choice between new and higher taxes and budget blowouts under former treasurer Trad and Labor and no new taxes, and in South-East Queensland a \$1 billion jobs-creating, traffic congestion-busting construction program under a Frecklington LNP government.


In my region, Redlands coast residents will benefit from a big and bold \$100 million duplication of the Cleveland Redland Bay Road. This is the biggest road infrastructure program in our region in decades. It means our residents will spend less time stuck in traffic and more time with their families and friends. As we recover from COVID, the LNP's South-East Queensland road building program will create jobs and stimulate the local economy. The LNP is investing after decades of Labor neglect. Anything that Labor might have done has been little and late.

It was great to stand with LNP leader Deb Frecklington and the LNP's Redlands candidate Henry Pike at the Thornlands skate park for this historic announcement of \$100 million for Redlands' roads. Henry Pike will make an excellent member of parliament, and his election is critical to ensuring that a bad Labor government is consigned to history. An LNP government will resurrect the Eastern Busway project, committing \$5 million to a study to get this project out of a Labor induced coma and back on track. At the 2017 election Labor promised to upgrade five intersections between Coorparoo and Capalaba as part of the smaller scale transitway. Mr Deputy Speaker, three years on do you know how many intersections have been upgraded between Coorparoo and Capalaba? The answer is none—a big zero. Labor talks but does not deliver.

Prior to COVID Queensland had the nation's highest unemployment, most bankruptcies and lowest business confidence. After two terms of Labor it is clear they have failed. The LNP has an ambitious plan to stimulate the economy—in large part through traffic congestion-busting construction—create a decade of secure jobs, and drag Queensland out of this recession. Our vision is to make Queensland the economic powerhouse it used to be, but there is one threat to the \$100 million Redlands coast road infrastructure spend and Eastern Busway.

Independent candidates can talk a big game but do not deliver. Only an LNP government will deliver. Labor-backed GetUp! candidates dressed in Zali Steggall aqua and yellow masquerading as independents fool no-one. A vote for an independent this election is a vote for four more years of hard Labor ultimately led by the member for South Brisbane.

Economou, Mr A; Commonwealth Bank of Australia

 **Mr PEGG** (Stretton—ALP) (7.16 pm): This evening I want to draw the attention of the House to the plight of Angelo Economou, who is in the gallery this evening, his family, and the challenges they have suffered as a result of the actions of the Commonwealth Bank of Australia. I will declare that I am a shareholder of CBA, and that is declared on my register of interests.


The nightmare for Angelo and his family began when his mother-in-law, Poppy Castrisios, signed a reverse mortgage with CBA. At the time she was 73 years of age and had medical conditions that would seriously bring into question her capacity to enter into a reverse mortgage. In fact, Angelo and his family have obtained medical reports which demonstrate that his mother-in-law did not have capacity at the time she signed that reverse mortgage. Nevertheless, that reverse mortgage went ahead and it has created a nightmare for Angelo and his family.

Unfortunately, Poppy passed away in December last year and that is when the nightmare really began for Angelo and his family. CBA has refused to meet with the family. They have sent numerous letters of demand. The family is facing their home being taken away by CBA, and Angelo's wife Tina has become suicidal. It has had a tremendous detrimental impact on the family. I note that reverse mortgages are no longer offered by CBA, so I think that is really instructive about the situation that Angelo and his family find themselves in. I would say to the Commonwealth Bank of Australia, 'Please meet with Angelo and his family and try to get this matter sorted.' I think it is ridiculous not to meet with the family face to face. That is unconscionable conduct in my view, particularly when they have had medical evidence showing that Poppy did not have capacity at the time. She was 73 years old when she signed a reverse mortgage.

The Labor Party federally forced the Turnbull government to have a royal commission into the banks. We have seen the banks take action in relation to this pandemic in terms of people with mortgages, and I ask CBA to front up and do the right thing by this family in my electorate, who is doing it tough. In the limited time I have remaining I just want to shout-out to Alphaeus Glaros, who is a friend of Angelo's family. He suffered an incident a couple of years ago, and it is good to see him on track to recovery.

(Time expired)

Coomera Electorate, State Election

 **Mr CRANDON** (Coomera—LNP) (7.19 pm): It is always an enormous pleasure to talk about the northern Gold Coast and the Coomera electorate. When Deb Frecklington and the LNP take government in October this year, there will be some great news for the northern Gold Coast. For a start, there is a \$4 million master plan for the northern Gold Coast's state-of-the-art hospital and health precinct. There is nothing from the Labor government. There will be \$25 million to fix exit 45, with a second exit 45 south of the Pimpama River and a further entry on to the M1 at the Mirambeena Drive

overpass. There is \$6.5 million for a Police-Citizens Youth Club—something that has been knocked back by this government through two petitions that I have put to the House. We forced Labor into funding exits 41 and 49. The federal government chipped in \$96.3 million.

Mr Bailey interjected.

Mr CRANDON: They came kicking and screaming to the table and finally put their money in, but the sad thing is that it is just go-slow. What is the minister doing?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Whiting): Order! Member, take a seat. I was just about to say that members know there should be no cross-chamber banter. It needs to go through the chair.

Mr CRANDON: The sad thing is that it is just go-slow!

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member will take his seat. Member, when you continue, please continue in the vein that I have let you speak.

Mr CRANDON: The sad thing is that it is go-slow by this government. They are stuck in the slow lane. There is still no commitment regarding exit 38. There was an \$87 million business case in 2018, and there is still no funding commitment from this government. There is still no commitment for the second M1. Labor are still talking about 'the plan'. It is always 'the plan'. They are always doing a business case. Why don't they get on with it and do something about it?

Mr Bailey interjected.

Mr CRANDON: In 2017 Labor promised the Pimpama train station, but they did not tell us that it was going to be delivered in 2024. Hang on a second—we have just seen a massive blow-out in Cross River Rail, so does that mean they are going to pull the money out of the Pimpama train station? We are pushing for fast-tracking of that station.

Mr Bailey interjected.


Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Miller, you are getting close to a warning. If you continue, you will get a warning.

Mr CRANDON: Thank you for your protection, Mr Deputy Speaker. We finally got the police station fast-tracked after a lot of work and a lot of petitions. People power and petitions did it again. We still need 35 police to staff that station.

I now go to the train stations. At Ormeau, they were going to give us 70 car parks to replace 125. After a lot of fighting, we received \$4.2 million to give us 125 car parks. For the Coomera train station, there is \$15 million from the federal government still sitting there. We were promised the money from the federal government in May last year. Have we got a business case? No. There is no business case from those opposite. They are absolutely hopeless. It is go-slow with this government on the northern Gold Coast. I cannot wait until 1 November when we take government and sort things out.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I once again remind members of the standing order which requests that comments must go through the chair.

Algester Electorate, Coronavirus Response

 **Hon. LM ENOCH** (Algester—ALP) (Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef, Minister for Science and Minister for the Arts) (7.23 pm): In the midst of the global pandemic, what has been made abundantly clear is the strength of Queensland's community spirit. In recent weeks, the news about people who travelled to Victoria and then returned to Queensland angered and upset many, particularly across my electorate of Algester. Every Queenslanders has been making sacrifices for months now for the health and safety of the whole state, and I know the action of these individuals was disappointing.


However, Queensland stood strong. As the Premier and the Chief Health Officer have pointed out, people came forward quickly and responsibly to get tested and to ensure that we could prevent any potential spread of the virus. In my electorate of Algester in particular, locals were frustrated and concerned about having positive cases within our local community. However, hundreds of people flocked to fever clinics and hospitals for testing, and they have done an amazing job. The Algester community has shown strength and humility. The 'get in and get it done attitude' that Queenslanders and those in the Algester electorate are best known for was well and truly on display. Through flood, fire and now pandemic, our community remains stronger than ever. I want to pay special tribute to

Belong in Acacia Ridge which have continued to assist many local residents throughout the pandemic and during this latest threat to the hard work of the community. I also mention our schools, which have stepped up every day to support students and their families.

It does not stop there. Although locals in the Algester electorate have worked hard to keep COVID-19 out of our community, the impacts have been felt far and wide financially and emotionally. Some small businesses in Algester remain closed, while others have had to cut back their opening hours and make do with the little income they have. I am proud to be part of a government that has recognised that small businesses in particular require a boost right now. In my electorate of Algester, small businesses recently received over \$1.1 million as part of the Palaszczuk government's Small Business COVID-19 Adaption Grant. From hairdressers to home sellers, chiropractors to coffee shops, travel agents and tax accountants, Algester's small businesses have the support of the Palaszczuk government. That means that rents can be paid, staff can remain employed and services can be implemented during this difficult time.

I have been fortunate enough to meet with some of the many small business grant recipients across the Algester electorate in the past few weeks and months. Their determination and resilience is simply awe-inspiring. For example, brothers David and Andrew Harvey from Trailer Spare Parts Australia in Archerfield received \$10,000 for their small business to supply, install and integrate accounting software. The integration will assist their business to increase and optimise online sales, allowing them to remain competitive during these tough times and beyond. I am absolutely proud to be the member for Algester and to see incredible work happening in our electorate.

Queensland Greens, State Election


 **Mr BERKMAN** (Maiwar—Grn) (7.26 pm): I think one question has been crucial in Queensland politics for decades, and never more so than at this election. That question is this: how do we use our state's enormous wealth? Both major parties are on a unity ticket here. They are content to funnel it towards mining billionaires. The Greens, on the other hand, think it should go to ordinary Queenslanders. Under Labor and the LNP, multinational mining corporations have ripped Queenslanders off and been praised for it. Between 2010 and 2020, they exported over \$480 billion worth of coal, minerals and LNG and paid only seven per cent of that in royalties. Both major parties rely on the fiction that mining is an unmitigated good for regional Queensland, so why is it that every time a mining company packs up all they leave behind are giant holes and 20 per cent youth unemployment? Meanwhile, our public health and education systems remain chronically underfunded and a few mining CEOs get richer and richer.

The Queensland Greens have a very simple message for this election: imagine if we used that enormous mining wealth for all Queenslanders. Under our royalties plan, even with a planned phase-out of thermal coal by 2030, we could raise an extra \$55 billion to invest in thriving regional economies that are no longer reliant on just mining. We could create the following: construction jobs building 100,000 public homes; jobs building 100 per cent publicly owned renewable energy; jobs in expanded health services and world-class education; and jobs in a revived manufacturing industry.

It is blatantly obvious by now that we cannot trust these mining corporations to create good, secure, well-paid and long-term jobs, but it seems like we cannot trust the major parties to do it either. Labor gave mining corporations a royalty freeze in the same month they froze the wages of 250,000 public sector workers—ripping \$500 million out of spending from the economy. This is Labor. This is the party of the worker. It is a joke. Which workers would they be? They are certainly not the teachers or nurses who had their hard-won wage agreements ripped up this year.

When you see the supposed party of the worker giving a royalty freeze to mining billionaires in the middle of a recession at the expense of ordinary people, it is no wonder people are so sick of politics. But change is coming. This election, the Greens have tripled our campaigning capacity and we are on track to win multiple seats in this parliament in October. This means an unprecedented platform to finally tip the scales in favour of ordinary people. Really, what we are asking for is pretty simple—when it comes to Queensland's enormous wealth, we just want more for Queenslanders and less for mining billionaires.

Coronavirus, Small Business

 **Ms McMILLAN** (Mansfield—ALP) (7.29 pm): Our resilience and experience in past natural disasters has enabled the Palaszczuk Labor government to lead the state with a strong health response that has been recognised around the world during this pandemic. Our response has allowed the Queensland economy to reopen more quickly, including the Mansfield electorate's small business

community. I am delighted to announce that through the innovative Small Business COVID-19 Adaptation Grant Program the Palaszczuk Labor government has funded more than \$1.6 million to 177 small businesses across my electorate to adapt and sustain operations and build resilience during these unprecedented times.


While time does not allow the indulgence of naming all businesses, I can say that the Palaszczuk Labor government has funded businesses across many sectors including health and fitness, medical, education, retail, tourism, manufacturing, hospitality, financial and legal services, beauty, human resource management, and trade and technical services. Not only is this a solid investment for small businesses in the Mansfield electorate but it is also an injection of nearly \$200 million for small businesses across the state. The Palaszczuk government is the only government that has offered nearly \$200 million in grants and \$1 billion in interest-free loans to businesses.

I commend the Premier on her strong stance to keep the borders closed to protect the health of Queenslanders, which has also allowed the Queensland economy to reopen more quickly. The opposition leader called on the government to open the borders 64 times. This would have completely decimated Queensland's small businesses. Over the past few months I have spoken with many small businesses in my community and they have said that they would not survive a second wave of COVID-19 like we are now seeing in Victoria. It has also been an honour that the Treasurer and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning and the Minister for Employment and Small Business have regularly visited my electorate to see firsthand how small businesses have adapted and sustained operations and built resilience as part of the Queensland government's plan to unite and recover and finish the job of kickstarting the Queensland economy together.

Mansfield electorate's small businesses are so resilient that I have had the pleasure of opening two new businesses during the past week. The Treasurer and I officially opened Tabouli, a delicious Mediterranean restaurant and takeaway in Wishart. What was particularly special about this opening was the final sentence on their official opening plaque, a testament to unite and recover from the COVID-19 pandemic.

Our message is resonating very clearly in the Mansfield business community: Annastacia Palaszczuk and Labor support small business and we have a plan to unite and recover.

Coronavirus, Queensland Border Closure

 **Mrs GERBER** (Currumbin—LNP) (7.32 pm): It is my job to be a voice for my community. Since the Premier announced on Twitter last Wednesday that she was closing Queensland's borders and this week has thrown up the possibility of bursting the border bubble—a border bubble with a locals pass that my community and I fought so hard to achieve—my office has been flooded with calls, emails and visits from constituents who wanted to share with me how this is going to severely and negatively impact their lives and their work. It is my job to give them a voice in this parliament. Mike from Currumbin writes—

The negative impact on border community businesses and postcode restraints is already causing serious economic stress but to 'burst the bubble' will devastate border businesses with workers, and work, on both sides of the border. This is not in Queensland's interests, nor in the national interest.

Rebecca from John Flynn Hospital writes that her antenatal patients from outside the border bubble, many of whom are at the 36-week mark in their pregnancy, will now not have continuity of care and will have to find a different hospital to have their baby. Katrina from Coolangatta writes—

As you would understand we have been juggling the border restrictions for months ... I haven't complained before, even when my 3 and 21 month old are screaming in the afternoon as we sit in traffic for an hour just to get home, but I have no other options now.

Her manufacturing business, just 30 minutes from her Queensland home, is just outside the border bubble. She writes—

We risk closing down the facility and putting over 20 families on jobkeeper.

Tracey from Currumbin Waters writes—

We are self employed with a truck and excavator. For the past 4 months my husband has been working on job sites in Ballina and Lennox Heads. If we don't go to these job sites to work we will go broke. Please help us.

That is why I am calling on the Premier: to allow Queensland workers working in northern New South Wales an exemption to go to work while these communities remain COVID-free; to rule out bursting the border bubble that my community and I fought so hard to achieve; and to rule out yet another drastic change to conditions on the border that will cause nothing but chaos and confusion for my community.

Threatening to burst the border bubble, discriminating against the majority because of a few bad eggs, is sheer hypocrisy from the Premier, who is happy to have Victorian football players who flout the rules stay in Queensland. Please, while our communities are COVID-free, do not prevent Queenslanders who live near the border from being able to go to work, from being able to run their small businesses and from being able to go about the essential parts of their daily lives that all Queenslanders and people right across Australia are able to do right now. It is so important to my community that we get the Premier to do these things that I have called for.

The House adjourned at 7.35 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Andrew, Bailey, Bates, Batt, Bennett, Berkman, Bleijie, Bolton, Boothman, Boyce, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Costigan, Crandon, Crawford, Crisafulli, D'Ath, Dametto, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Frecklington, Furner, Gerber, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hart, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Hunt, Janetzki, Jones, Katter, Kelly, King, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Lauga, Leahy, Linard, Lister, Lui, Lynham, Madden, Mander, McArdle, McCallum, McDonald, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Mickelberg, Miles, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Mullen, Nicholls, O'Connor, O'Rourke B, O'Rourke C, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Perrett, Pitt, Powell, Power, Pugh, Purdie, Richards, Robinson, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Trad, Watts, Weir, Whiting, Wilson