



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-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT

Tuesday, 28 March 2023

Subject	Page
ASSENT TO BILL	599
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	599
Absence of Member and Minister	599
PRIVILEGE	599
Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House	599
SPEAKER'S RULING	600
Tabled Paper, Out of Order.....	600
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	600
School Group Tours.....	600
PETITIONS.....	600
TABLED PAPERS.....	601
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS.....	602
Housing	602
Cost of Living; Regional Forums	603
Olympic and Paralympic Games, Legacy	604
Housing	605
Housing	606
School Infrastructure; Housing.....	606
Housing	607
Housing	607
Olympic and Paralympic Games, Legacy	608
Perinatal Mental Health Services	609
Torres Strait and Northern Peninsula Area, Cost of Living	609
Southern Queensland Correctional Precinct.....	610
ABSENCE OF MINISTER	610

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 28 March 2023

PERSONAL EXPLANATION	610
Comments by Leader of the Opposition	610
<i>Tabled paper: Article from the Redland City Bulletin online, dated 26 March 2023, titled 'Former Chamber of Commerce leader eyes state seat for LNP'</i>	610
LEGAL AFFAIRS AND SAFETY COMMITTEE	611
Information Commissioner, Report	611
<i>Tabled paper: Information Commissioner Report 3: 2022-23—Publishing official information assets: Supporting the push model through proactive disclosure: Right to Information Act 2009 (Qld)</i>	611
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	611
Housing Investment Fund	611
Griffith University, Emergency Housing	612
Public Assets	613
Housing, Granny Flats	614
Housing	615
Clayfield, Social Housing	615
Housing	616
Rent Increases	616
Infrastructure	616
PRIVILEGE	617
Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House	617
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	617
Infrastructure	617
Gabba Redevelopment	617
<i>Tabled paper: Media release, dated 27 March 2023, titled 'Clarifying statement on Brisbane Gabba Redevelopment—Matt Carroll'</i>	618
Education	619
Gabba Redevelopment	619
Emergency Departments	621
Rent Increases	621
Coomera Connector	622
<i>Tabled paper: Article from the Gold Coast Bulletin online, dated 25 April 2014, titled 'End of the road for traffic relief plan as road corridor quietly scrapped'</i>	622
Kaiser, Mr M	623
Women	623
PRIVILEGE	624
Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House	624
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	624
Women	624
LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION	625
Division: Question put—That leave be granted.....	625
Resolved in the negative.....	625
PRIVILEGE	625
Comments by the Member for Everton	625
MOTION	626
Business Program; Cognate Debate	626
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to.....	630
Resolved in the affirmative.....	630
LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION	630
Division: Question put—That leave be granted.....	631
Resolved in the negative.....	631
MOTION	631
Suspension of Standing Orders	631
HOUSING LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	631
Second Reading	631
<i>Tabled paper: Housing Legislation Amendment Bill 2022, amendment to second reading motion moved by Dr Amy MacMahon MP</i>	641
Deputy Speaker's Ruling, Amendment Out of Order	641
MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST	644
Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance	644
Liberal National Party, Performance; Member for Southern Downs	645
Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance	646
Training and Skills	647
Kaiser, Mr M	648
Redlands Electorate	649
TikTok	650
Torres Strait and Northern Peninsula Area Cost-of-Living Summit	651
Police Communications Centres	652
Women in Sport	653


Table of Contents – Tuesday, 28 March 2023

HOUSING LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	653
Second Reading	653
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from <i>ABC News</i> online, dated 21 February 2023, titled 'Could prefab be a quick fix for the housing crisis?: Queensland's government thinks so'.....	660
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from <i>ABC News</i> online, dated 8 February 2023, titled 'Queensland housing crisis leaving essential health workers without a place to rent'.....	661
Consideration in Detail	680
Clauses 1 to 3, as read, agreed to.....	680
Clause 4—.....	680
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Housing Legislation Amendment Bill 2022, explanatory notes to Hon. Leeanne Enoch's amendments.....	680
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Housing Legislation Amendment Bill 2022, statement of compatibility with human rights contained in Hon. Leeanne Enoch's amendments.....	680
Amendments agreed to.....	680
Clause 4, as amended, agreed to.....	680
Clauses 5 to 28, as read, agreed to.....	680
Third Reading	681
Long Title	681
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	681
Second Reading	681
ADJOURNMENT	699
Beaudesert PCYC; Canungra Development	699
The Gap, Community Battery	700
Animal Welfare	701
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Statement by Australian Pork, dated 28 March 2023, titled 'ABC's 7.30 Report: CO2 stunning in pigs'.....	701
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, undated, titled 'Australian Pork: Virtual Tour of the Australian pork supply chain'.....	701
Multiculturalism	701
Currumbin Wildlife Hospital	702
Jordan Electorate, Community Events	702
Policelink, Crime Statistics	703
Bundaberg and Wide Bay	704
Body Corporate Legislation	704
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Email, dated 15 March 2023, from Sales, Marketing and Acquisitions Consultant, Ray White, Mr Alex Day, to Professionals John Henderson Real Estate, Mr Luke Henderson, regarding Yallabee Lodge Unit Holders.....	704
Nundah Women of the Year Awards	705
ATTENDANCE	706


TUESDAY, 28 MARCH 2023

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 BILL

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

The Honourable C.W. Pitt MP
Speaker of the Legislative Assembly
Parliament House
George Street
BRISBANE QLD 4000

I hereby acquaint the Legislative Assembly that the following Bill, having been passed by the Legislative Assembly and having been presented for the Royal Assent, was assented to in the name of His Majesty The King on the date shown:

Date of Assent: 22 March 2023

A Bill for An Act to amend the Bail Act 1980, the Criminal Code, the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000 and the Youth Justice Act 1992 for particular purposes

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

Yours sincerely


Governor

22 March 2023

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 22 March 2023, from Her Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to a certain bill on 22 March 2023 [\[370\]](#).


SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Absence of Member and Minister

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I have received advice from the member for Gladstone, the Hon. Glenn Butcher MP, and the member for Condamine, Mr Pat Weir MP, that they will be absent from this week's sittings of the House. The members' notifications comply with standing order 263A.

PRIVILEGE

Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House


 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, on 21 March 2023, I tabled a ruling regarding a matter of privilege relating to a complaint by the member for Maroochydore alleging that the Premier and Minister for Olympic and Paralympic Games deliberately misled the House in response to a question without notice on 1 December 2022.

On 23 March 2023, I tabled a ruling regarding a matter of privilege relating to a complaint by the Leader of the House that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition deliberately misled the House during his contribution to the business program motion debate on 21 February 2022.

I ruled that both matters did not warrant the further attention of the House via the Ethics Committee. I now refer to these matters so that if any member wishes to exercise their rights in respect of those matters under the standing orders they may do so immediately and identify the matter in question.


SPEAKER'S RULING

Tabled Paper, Out of Order

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, during the second reading debate on the Strengthening Community Safety Bill in the last sitting week, the member for Toowoomba South tabled a document containing messages and emails from Toowoomba victims of crime. The Table Office unpublished the document when its unparliamentary language was brought to their attention. The document also contains references to multiple criminal allegations that the member was unable to confirm do not offend the sub judice rule in standing order 233. Accordingly, I rule the document out of order and have directed the Table Office to remove it from the database.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

School Group Tours

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I wish to advise that we will be visited in the gallery this morning by students and teachers from Marist College Ashgrove in the electorate of Ferny Grove and Hope Adventist School in the electorate of Bundaberg.

PETITIONS

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

Borumba Hydro Project, Transmission Infrastructure

Mrs Frecklington, from 816 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure that the transmission infrastructure required for the proposed Borumba Hydro Project to the Tarong/Halys substation is built on existing state-owned land corridors and to minimise the impact on private landowners, the environment and on traditional owners [\[364, 365\]](#).

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

Youth Crime, Boot Camps

Mr Boothman, from 4,755 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure juveniles who commit crimes, as part of their punishment, participate in programmes or boot camps which address their antisocial behaviours [\[366\]](#).

Bruce Highway Upgrade, Merinda

Mr Last, from 396 petitioners, requesting the House to revise the upgrade of the Bruce Highway at Merinda project to incorporate flood immunity prior to the recommencement of work [\[367\]](#).

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

Cambanoora Gorge, River Crossings

392 petitioners, requesting the House to urge the Southern Downs Regional Council to halt plans for the cementing of the natural river crossings through the Cambanoora (Condamine) Gorge and assist the community to instead create an economically and environmentally sustainable future for the gorge [\[368\]](#).

Solar Power

657 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure solar panels are used in all homes and businesses by 2040 [\[369\]](#).

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 March 2023—

- [325](#) Transport and Resources Committee: Report No. 31, 57th Parliament—Inquiry into the economic and regulatory frameworks for Queensland Island resorts
- [326](#) Queensland Family and Child Commission—Seeking safety: Keeping children safe when they remain at home during Child Safety interventions, summary report
- [327](#) Queensland Family and Child Commission—Seeking safety: Keeping children safe when they remain at home during Child Safety interventions, summary report, government response
- [328](#) Ministerial Gifts Register—Reportable Gifts 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022

21 March 2023—

- [329](#) Economics and Governance Committee: Report No. 42, 57th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 9 November and 29 November 2022
- [330](#) Ruling by the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, Hon. Curtis Pitt—Alleged contempt of the Parliament by the Premier and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games

22 March 2023—

- [331](#) State Development and Regional Industries Committee: Report No. 40, 57th Parliament—Subordinate Legislation tabled between 26 October and 29 November 2022

23 March 2023—

- [332](#) Response from the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice, Minister for Women and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence (Hon. Fentiman), to an ePetition (3821-22) sponsored by the member for Burnett, Mr Bennett, from 17,039 petitioners, requesting the House to reject Recommendation 39 of the Queensland Human Rights Commission's report on the Anti-Discrimination Act and allow all religious schools in Queensland to continue employing staff who share the beliefs of the school
- [333](#) Response from the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice, Minister for Women and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence (Hon. Fentiman), to an ePetition (3779-22) sponsored by the Clerk under provisions of Standing Order 119(4) from 799 petitioners, requesting the House to hold a referendum to amend the preferential voting system to one whereby all preference numbers are given a value equal
- [334](#) Response from the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice, Minister for Women and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence (Hon. Fentiman), to an ePetition (3786-22) sponsored by the Clerk under provisions of Standing Order 119(4) from 269 petitioners, requesting the House to follow the request of ePetition 3779-22 and hold a referendum to amend the preferential voting system with modified preference weightings
- [335](#) Response from the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services (Hon. D'Ath), to an ePetition (3840-22) sponsored by the member for Burnett, Mr Bennett, from 887 petitioners, requesting the House to dismiss the Board and Chief Executive of the Wide Bay Hospital and Health Service
- [336](#) Response from the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services (Hon. D'Ath), to a paper petition (3872-23) presented by the member for Warrego, Ms Leahy, and an ePetition (3849-23) sponsored by the member for Warrego, Ms Leahy, from 51 and 647 petitioners respectively, requesting the House to ensure proper community consultation in relation to the Tara Hospital redevelopment
- [337](#) Ruling by the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, Hon. Curtis Pitt—Alleged contempt of the Parliament by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition
- [338](#) Response from the Minister for Education and Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Racing (Hon. Grace), to an ePetition (3798-22) sponsored by the Clerk under provisions of Standing Order 119(4) from 640 petitioners, requesting the House to stop the proposed development of Perrin Park and undertake a proper consultation process
- [339](#) Response from the Minister for Communities and Housing, Minister for Digital Economy and Minister for the Arts (Hon. Enoch), to an ePetition (3795-22) sponsored by the member for South Brisbane, Dr MacMahon, from 2,818 petitioners, requesting the House to develop and enforce standards for treating mould in rental properties
- [340](#) Response from the Minister for Energy, Renewables and Hydrogen and Minister for Public Works and Procurement (Hon. de Brenni), to an ePetition (3842-22) sponsored by the Clerk under provisions of Standing Order 119(4) from 518 petitioners, requesting the House to amend legislation to mandate that solar panels and storage batteries be put on all freestanding houses
- [341](#) Response from the Minister for Energy, Renewables and Hydrogen and Minister for Public Works and Procurement (Hon. de Brenni), to an ePetition (3831-22) sponsored by the Clerk under provisions of Standing Order 119(4) from 2,141 petitioners, requesting the House to remove all state legislative barriers to the use of nuclear power and facilities in Queensland
- [342](#) Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Hon. Bailey), to an ePetition (3843-22) sponsored by the member for Mirani, Mr Andrew, from 497 petitioners, requesting the House to discard the current design for the Yeppoon Road intersection upgrade with Dairy Inn and Artillery Roads and either construct an over/underpass or a roundabout at this intersection

[343](#) Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Hon. Bailey), to a paper petition (3865-23) presented by the member for Southern Downs, Mr Lister, and an ePetition (3844-22) sponsored by the member for Southern Downs, Mr Lister, from 2,249 and 347 petitioners respectively, requesting the House to reconsider the closure of driver reviver sites in Queensland, especially the Gladfield site

24 March 2023—

[344](#) Response from the Minister for Energy, Renewables and Hydrogen and Minister for Public Works and Procurement (Hon. de Brenni), to a paper petition (3866-23) presented by the member for Gympie, Mr Perrett, and an ePetition (3847-23) sponsored by the member for Gympie, Mr Perrett, from 193 and 2,411 petitioners respectively, requesting the House to ensure the transmission infrastructure required for Powerlink's Borumba Pumped Hydro Project to the Woolooga substation is built on existing state-owned land corridors and to minimise the impact on private landowners and the environment

27 March 2023—

[345](#) Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Hon. Bailey), to a paper petition (3871-23) presented by the member for Callide, Mr Head, from 381 petitioners, requesting the House to allow the Queensland Country Women's Association's Gin Gin Branch, and other supporting volunteers, provide a Driver Reviver service to the town of Gin Gin

[346](#) Queensland Independent Remuneration Tribunal—Remuneration Determination: 2021-22 Review of Allowances—Determination 27/2023, 27 March 2023

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS (SO 32)

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

The following statutory instruments were tabled by the Clerk—

Racing Integrity Amendment Act 2022:

[347](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 14

[348](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 14, explanatory notes

Heavy Vehicle National Law Act 2012:

[349](#) Heavy Vehicle (Vehicle Standards) National Amendment Regulation 2023, No 15

[350](#) Heavy Vehicle (Vehicle Standards) National Amendment Regulation 2023, No 15, explanatory notes

[351](#) Heavy Vehicle (Vehicle Standards) National Amendment Regulation 2023, No 15, human rights certificate

Building Industry Fairness (Security of Payment) Act 2017:

[352](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 16

[353](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 16, explanatory notes

[354](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 16, human rights certificate

Building Industry Fairness (Security of Payment) Act 2017:

[355](#) Proclamation repealing previous proclamation [SL No. 31 of 2022], No. 17

[356](#) Proclamation repealing previous proclamation [SL No. 31 of 2022], No. 17, explanatory notes

[357](#) Proclamation repealing previous proclamation [SL No. 31 of 2022], No. 17, human rights certificate

Recording of Evidence Act 1962:

[358](#) Recording of Evidence Amendment Regulation 2023, No. 18

[359](#) Recording of Evidence Amendment Regulation 2023, No. 18, explanatory notes

[360](#) Recording of Evidence Amendment Regulation 2023, No. 18, human rights certificate

Superannuation (State Public Sector) Act 1990:


[361](#) Superannuation (State Public Sector) Amendment Notice 2023, No. 19

[362](#) Superannuation (State Public Sector) Amendment Notice 2023, No. 19, explanatory notes

[363](#) Superannuation (State Public Sector) Amendment Notice 2023, No. 19, human rights certificate

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Housing

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games) (9.35 am): Today our government is reconvening the Queensland housing round table to continue our work to address the current state of housing—both state provided housing and private housing. Last September we held our first round table, with 30 important bodies representing the housing sector. It was just the beginning, leading to the Housing Summit from which our government shaped a comprehensive suite of more than 50 actions to address housing supply and support—backed by an additional \$56 million in funding on top of the \$1 billion boost to our Housing Investment Fund.

I will return to those initiatives in a moment, but first I want to confirm that at today's meeting we will announce our plan to take decisive action to address the situation in the private rental market. There are more than one million Queenslanders who are renters, and every single one of them must be given a fair go—a fair go to pay rent they can afford and not be penalised for the cost-of-living situation all Australians are finding themselves in. Our government will act immediately to place a limit on the number of rent increases that can be imposed on tenants each year. We will limit annual rent increases to just one. Reducing the frequency of increases from six months to 12 months is also consistent with most other jurisdictions throughout the country.

The great majority of landlords do the right thing and look after their tenants, but for those who do not this is a wake-up call. We must act and will act to deliver reforms that balance the rights and interests of Queenslanders who rent and property owners to sustain healthy rental supply. This is fair and it is required at a time when we have seen the cost of living soar and families continue to struggle.

I also recognise that people are sleeping rough. Today I can announce we will provide an additional \$28 million to continue the Immediate Housing Response Package for another year. That \$28 million package will increase support for our most vulnerable Queenslanders facing homelessness and housing stress. These extra funds will provide more than 600 emergency hotel accommodation places across Queensland, rental and bond support payments to help tenants keep a roof over their head, and food relief services to help renters put food on the table.

I can also announce a further \$3.9 million to extend and expand food and emergency relief throughout Queensland in 2023-24. That includes \$3.3 million to continue the provision of emergency relief supports—including vouchers, food parcels and contributions to payments, such as electricity bills—and \$630,000 for SecondBite and OzHarvest to increase the food relief services they provide across the state.


Yesterday we announced the official opening of the QBuild rapid accommodation centre at Eagle Farm, and today I can announce a second rapid accommodation centre will be built in Cairns that will deliver another 26 homes each year and will be at full productivity by 2024. The public works minister will provide more detail about this later this morning.

In the meantime, our government has made significant progress implementing the Housing Summit commitments. Since last year's Housing Summit, we have: delivered \$10 million to expand private rental assistance to help households in rental stress stay in their homes; provided \$11 million to expand tenancy support to sustain current tenancies of our most vulnerable Queenslanders; provided additional support of \$8.5 million for after-hours outreach in five priority locations—Brisbane, the Gold Coast, the Sunshine Coast, Townsville and Cairns; and doubled emergency relief for vulnerable Queenslanders in partnership with a network of 86 non-government organisation providers statewide.

Critically through our Immediate Housing Response Package for families, we have supported more than 4,000 families with over 44,000 nights of accommodation. Since 2015, our government has added 4,290 social housing dwellings. That includes 816 new dwellings since July 2021. Another 588 new social housing dwellings are under construction with many more to come.

Our government is moving forward and working with stakeholders, federal and local governments to deliver solutions to the current national housing situation, a necessity given the rising cost of living has presented Queensland families with one of the most challenging situations in a generation.

Cost of Living; Regional Forums

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games) (9.40 am): As we know, cost-of-living challenges are being felt right across the country, especially in remote communities like the Torres Strait and the Northern Peninsula. Our government made a promise after we held cabinet in the region last September to hold a cost-of-living summit to get to the bottom of some of these concerns to find out what we can do to alleviate some of these pressures. The summit, which was held last Monday, was co-chaired by the Minister for Transport and Main Roads and the member for Cook. It was also attended by the Attorney-General who is the ministerial champion for the region; the energy and public works minister, Mick de Brenni; and the housing minister, Minister Enoch. I thank them all for their hard work to support these communities.

The summit was community-led and brought together stakeholders from all sectors, including local businesses, community organisations and local government including mayors from the Torres Shire Council and the Torres Strait Island Regional Council and the Northern Peninsula Area Regional Council. Freight services, marine and transport infrastructure, energy, food security and housing were all key challenges which were discussed.

As a result of the summit, we are now working with community to deliver a \$64 million freight funding package. This will support freight services for key essentials such as food, non-alcoholic beverages and essential household, building and construction items. We will also invest \$80 million in joint federal and state funding to improve marine infrastructure, including jetties, boat and barge ramps. I know the member for Cook is very delighted at this news because we went there, we listened and we are responding. We are also providing \$10 million towards an energy and bills savings package for Thursday Island and First Nations communities.

These are just some of the outcomes which will help ease the cost-of-living pressures, and they are just the start. Our government will continue to listen and work closely with the community, industry leaders and all levels of government to design and deliver these measures and achieve community-driven solutions for the Torres Strait and Northern Peninsula regions.

I would like to thank cabinet ministers, members of parliament and forum members for attending the first of our regional forums for 2023 last week. They were held in Gordonvale, Ingham, Mackay, Blackall, Emerald, Cherbourg and St George. The historic Queensland Energy and Jobs Plan was again a focus for several regions, with plenty of interest in projects which will transform the power grid. We were able to lead a conversation about the next steps on our Path to Treaty with a number of First Nations people among our forum members. I want to thank everyone involved who continue to contribute their insights to these very important forums to deliver a better, brighter future for regional Queenslanders.

Olympic and Paralympic Games, Legacy



Hon. A PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games) (9.42 am): The Olympic and Paralympic Games have never been about a few weeks of the games. They are about making the most of this once-in-a-lifetime opportunity for decades to come. To ensure this, we have established the legacy process. In short, it means asking our communities right across Queensland what they want to be left behind long after the closing ceremonies are over.

Last week, I was pleased to join 500 business, sport and community representatives for a legacy forum to share ideas and chart a course, not just to 2032 but to 2042 and beyond. Their ideas were in addition to 12,000 online submissions received from our Hopes and Dreams survey. This is all about ensuring our games are the people's games.

Just like South Bank is a lasting legacy of Expo 88, the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games will leave behind lasting benefits to the people of this state. Among the suggestions last week was an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultural centre or university; a legacy forest planted with five million trees, one for every Queenslander; and greater connectivity around our cities with new walks, more shade and more opportunities for Queenslanders and especially young children to be fit and healthy.

We asked attendees what they wanted from our games more than anything and the answer came back overwhelmingly in one word: inclusion. People want our games to break down barriers so that everyone feels a part of our communities and a part of Brisbane 2032. It means more opportunities for our regional communities and businesses to be involved. It means promoting First Nations languages and multicultural communities. It means volunteering. It means encouraging more people with disabilities into the health and mental wellbeing benefits of participating in sport.

Three out of four Australians with disabilities want to participate in sport just like everybody else, but only one in four can. That is why I have announced my government's support for the Paralympic Centre of Excellence at the University of Queensland. The university is one of the leading centres of sport medicine research in the world. A centre of excellence combines this expertise with innovation, participation and treatment. Importantly, it will not only benefit elite athletes but also the entire community of people with disabilities. Paralympian Kurt Fearnley spoke passionately about watching his first Paralympics as a nine-year-old. It changed his life forever. His family and his community helped him to make his dream come true. He said 2032 is our chance to do the same for hundreds more Australian children.

One in five Australians lives with a disability. Anyone could find themselves with a disability at any time. This is an example of the permanent benefit that hosting the 2032 games will leave behind. An interim report will be released in April before a final legacy report is released at the end of this year.

I want to publicly thank everyone for their involvement, including Minister Stirling Hinchliffe who is guiding the legacy process, and the Deputy Premier for attending as well. I would also like to thank the many school children who attended. They are inspirational. It is their future we are building.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr Healy interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Deputy Leader of the Opposition, you will cease your interjections. The member for Cairns will cease his interjections.

Ms PALASZCZUK: We would welcome ideas from the member for Kawana.

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, Minister for Education.

Ms PALASZCZUK: It is their future that we are building, and the 2032 games will be the catalyst that makes it even brighter than ever.

Housing



Hon. SJ MILES (Murrumba—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister Assisting the Premier on Olympic and Paralympic Games Infrastructure) (9.46 am): Queensland is the best place in the world to work, live and raise a family, so it is no wonder that people are moving here in droves. We are determined to ensure everyone has a place to call home. To do that, we need every level of government, the private sector and not-for-profit sectors to all work together.

This is a national challenge. Over 95 per cent of people get their housing from the private market affected by national economic conditions. Local government also plays a critical role. Councils are responsible for much of the planning and lot approvals. That is why we are helping councils by reviewing regional plans, preparing and delivering local housing action plans for rural and remote councils and providing catalytic infrastructure funding to unlock growth.

In South-East Queensland, where the pressure is building the fastest, we are fast-tracking a review of the SEQ Regional Plan. Following the last housing round table and summit, the Palaszczuk government has implemented a comprehensive package of planning reforms and investments into the housing market. We have made developing rooming accommodation easier, changed the planning rules for small-scale rural workers' accommodation, and sped up approvals for emergency housing in disaster-affected communities.

We committed \$23.5 million in new funding for more accommodation and services for people experiencing homelessness, and we are investing \$21.7 million in extra support for those struggling to find a home in the private rental market or who cannot afford to pay their rent.

We expanded the Housing Supply Expert Panel, we are auditing all state government-owned land and buildings to identify new opportunities, and we have made social and affordable housing projects eligible as community infrastructure. We have doubled the Housing Investment Fund to \$2 billion.


A key part of our approach to provide more affordable and diverse housing to Queenslanders is to open up more lot supply in Queensland's Priority Development Areas. To assist development by helping deliver necessary infrastructure within the PDAs, the Palaszczuk government's Catalyst Infrastructure Fund is playing an important role in unlocking lots for development.

In the last budget we boosted the government's Catalyst Infrastructure Fund with a further \$150 million in equity funding to help deliver communities in Ripley Valley and Greater Flagstone. This is all about building the infrastructure so that homes can be built for Queenslanders who need them. I am pleased to announce \$5.91 million as part of an initial \$40 million in catalyst funding to deliver essential infrastructure within the Ripley Valley PDA. This funding will see Stockland develop Barrams Road in Ripley Valley that will unlock 5,600 lots. Eventually Ripley Valley will have 48,750 dwellings and will house a population of 131,000 people.

Today we will meet with experts and industry at the housing round table, but we also want to hear directly from Queenslanders. Following the housing round table the new housing opportunities portal will go live. Queenslanders are encouraged to share their ideas that can help improve Queensland's housing supply and unlock housing solutions throughout the state. Submissions will be assessed by the state development department in consultation with relevant agencies and may be referred to a cross-agency working group for further consideration.

The Palaszczuk government is delivering real action on housing but there is more work to be done. I look forward to gathering with experts and industry today to deliver more housing for Queensland families.

Housing

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Treasurer and Minister for Trade and Investment) (9.50 am): The Palaszczuk Labor government is committed to using all policy levers at our disposal to bring more housing to market sooner. Across Queensland and around the country the private construction sector is at capacity. That means we need innovative ideas to create more pipelines for housing supply. That is why we worked with industry and stakeholder groups at last year's Housing Summit. It is why we will do so again at today's housing round table. Today I can announce that after working with the property industry we will enact a series of tax concessions to incentivise the construction of more build-to-rent projects.

Developments that meet a set of criteria, including providing at least 10 per cent of rental homes as affordable housing, will be able to enjoy a number of concessions: firstly, a 50 per cent discount on land tax payable for up to 20 years; secondly, a full exemption for the two per cent foreign investor land tax surcharge for up to 20 years; finally, a full exemption from the seven per cent additional foreign acquirer duty for the future transfer of a build-to-rent site.

These measures will make it more commercially attractive for property developers to construct build-to-rent projects. More build-to-rent projects will mean more homes available for long-term rental including more with affordable rents. As we do so, our government will consult with the property industry around the administration and operation of these tax concessions to ensure they deliver more homes for Queenslanders as quickly and as efficiently as possible. We will continue to work with—

Ms Simpson: Will it be public?

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Maroochydore.

Ms Simpson: Will it be public?

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


Mr DICK: They are attacking it already. I cannot finish the ministerial statement without the LNP attacking it.

Mr SPEAKER: Please continue with your statement.

Mr DICK: We will continue to work with industry to identify more innovative ways to deliver more housing supply sooner.

I also thank federal housing minister, Julie Collins, for agreeing to my request to extend the deadline for HomeBuilder recipients to submit their paperwork. The new deadline of 30 June 2025 resolves one of the design flaws of the program created by the former Morrison LNP government. The deadline extension is a great example of what can be achieved when federal and state governments work together.

School Infrastructure; Housing


 **Hon. G GRACE** (McConnel—ALP) (Minister for Education, Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Racing) (9.53 am): Our over \$10 billion investment in education infrastructure since 2015 has seen new halls, classroom buildings and new schools constructed right across Queensland. We stand proudly on our record of delivering world-class facilities for students, staff and school communities including air-conditioning every classroom, library and staffroom across the state, delivered ahead of time and on budget—in fact, six years ahead of any alternative approach.

This record infrastructure commitment also extends to our teachers—ensuring we attract and retain teachers to deliver world-class education to all students, particularly in regional and remote schools. The Palaszczuk government provides housing for teachers in many rural and remote areas and housing assistance in other locations. To meet our housing needs, my department is providing innovative solutions such as two three-bedroom prefabricated and transportable buildings that we are delivering on Queensland Education owned land at Kilcummin State School in the Burdekin electorate. We are also building a new duplex on Saibai Island in the Torres Strait and we are investing \$10 million this budget for housing acquisitions to support emerging housing requirements.

Since 2015 we have invested around \$92 million to upgrade and maintain teacher housing across the state, including the Housing Improvement Program, which commenced in 2017-18, helping to attract and retain teachers in rural and remote communities by modernising teacher accommodation. Works under the HIP include: upgrades to kitchens; bathrooms; laundries; flooring; air conditioning; replacement of doors, security screens and windows; carpports; and external painting.

My department is also working with QBuild, which is delivering the biggest investment in government employee housing in a generation. The half a billion dollar package will build another 439 homes for around 550 frontline staff across Queensland's regional and remote communities. The department is also exploring opportunities to work with the newly opened QBuild Rapid Accommodation and Apprenticeship Centre where we will build state-of-the-art factory built houses for our frontline workers including teachers and staff. These innovative solutions are delivering housing for teachers and frontline workers throughout Queensland. They deserve nothing less.

Housing

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (Minister for Energy, Renewables and Hydrogen and Minister for Public Works and Procurement) (9.55 am): In a world where time is a precious commodity, skilled labour is at a premium and we are at the mercy of some of the wildest weather on the planet. Building homes for Queensland's frontline workers and the community's most vulnerable calls for innovative approaches, a rapid innovative approach—in fact, a rapid accommodation and apprenticeship centre.


Yesterday the Palaszczuk government opened the first Queensland made approach not just to housing construction but also for workforce training to bring more housing supply to the market more quickly, to add to our traditional methods of housing construction and to free up homes to bring down the cost of renting. This rapid housing factory is all about prefabricated house frames, bathroom modules, flat pack kitchens and homes for rapid assembly onsite across remote and regional Queensland. This is the most rapid part: it can cut construction times by up to 75 per cent, slashing up to 40 weeks for homes in the most remote parts of Queensland.

We have also partnered with industry to triple our rapid efforts. Together with our industry partners, QBuild will deliver up to 80 homes this financial year and 114 more this calendar year. These industry partners will deliver our rapid construction designs across Queensland. They include Eco Cottages, Salt Air Modular and Modscape Commercial with more to come. In this financial year, though, through the rapid accommodation centre, which has been in its establishment phase, we have already delivered 14 frames for new homes in places like Charleville and Laura, we are delivering six bathroom pods and our partners are working on the delivery of a further 50 social houses—and we only officially opened the factory yesterday. Not only is the Eagle Farm factory starting to scale up, but we are doubling down. As we have heard from the Premier this morning, the Palaszczuk government will deliver a second QBuild Rapid Accommodation and Apprenticeship Centre in Cairns. I can confirm that the Department of Energy and Public Works is moving to immediate site identification as we speak.

The Cairns rapid accommodation and apprenticeship centre will ramp up capacity by adding further capacity for 26 homes for North Queensland per annum, employing 39 tradies and QBuild apprentices. This facility will be incredibly important, especially for North Queensland regional and remote communities where the wet season creates significant challenges for building. Heavy rainfall often shuts down site works; cyclones can make building work dangerous; and when flooding closes roads, freight must halt, closing off supplies and risking worker isolation. With this facility we can mitigate all of those issues by prefabricating homes and components in the factory undercover with supplies pre-ordered.

This new factory will mean that rapid work will continue through extreme weather. When the rains dry up, our battalion of QBuilders will have these houses ready to be rolled out and installed rapidly. Through this initiative we can deliver homes more quickly with better value for money, freeing up Queensland tradies to build even more homes for Queenslanders.

Housing

 **Hon. LM ENOCH** (Algera—ALP) (Minister for Communities and Housing, Minister for Digital Economy and Minister for the Arts) (9.59 am): At today's housing round table, we will build on the successful outcomes delivered through last year's historic Housing Summit. Since last year's budget and the Housing Summit, \$25.5 million has been allocated to specialist homelessness services across Queensland under the Immediate Housing Response Package for families. The funding has already

supported more than 4,000 families with over 44,300 nights of accommodation. We are pressing full steam ahead with a social housing construction program that represents the largest concentrated investment in Queensland's history.

Since the announcement of our second housing action plan in July 2021 we have completed 816 new social housing builds under our QuickStarts program, with a further 588 currently under construction and more in the pipeline. That means that we have completed more than one new social housing home every single day since July 2021 against a backdrop of increasing pressures in the building industry. This is why we are seeking innovative new approaches to increase the supply of social and affordable housing for vulnerable Queenslanders.

We have recently purchased two former retirement villages, one in Clayfield and one in Toowoomba, for conversion into social and temporary housing, providing around 60 new homes for people in need. Today I can announce that the department of communities and housing has also leased a former retirement village in Redlands to house vulnerable Queenslanders. The property will be used as temporary accommodation for people experiencing or at risk of homelessness and it will include 26 studio units plus two three-bedroom houses. I thank the members for Redlands and Capalaba for their passionate advocacy for housing support in their community. These spot purchases are on top of our investment in 52 prefabricated homes which will put new social housing stock into the system sooner. Eighteen of these prefabricated homes are being constructed by VOLO Modular, a local manufacturer in Yatala which the member for Macalister and I recently visited. Once complete, these homes will be sent right across Queensland including to rural and regional parts of the state. This investment is supporting local business and local jobs while delivering more social and affordable housing for Queenslanders.

Since the summit, as the Premier has outlined today, we have provided extra funding to help vulnerable renters keep a roof over their head and provided additional support for after-hours outreach for people who are experiencing homelessness or sleeping rough. These initiatives are being delivered right now in partnership with specialist homelessness services across the state. They are another sign of the Palaszczuk government's commitment to increasing the supply of social and affordable housing and to providing more homelessness support. Since 2015 the Palaszczuk government has commenced 5,299 social housing dwellings across Queensland, and we are on track to meet our target of 13,000 commencements by 2027. While our government's investment is substantial, we know that the state government alone cannot provide all of the solutions to the housing pressures we are facing. I look forward to today's round table, where we will continue working in partnership with key stakeholders from across the housing system.

Olympic and Paralympic Games, Legacy




Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Minister for Tourism, Innovation and Sport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Olympics and Paralympics Sport and Engagement) (10.02 am): Last week we saw the gargantuan potential of Brisbane 2032 to transform Queensland's future, with thousands of big, bold ideas being shared at the Brisbane 2032 Legacy Forum. School students, community and industry leaders, mayors, games partners, traditional owners and sporting greats came together to discuss the legacy and what it means to them.

The Premier announced that the Queensland government would provide \$44 million funding towards the University of Queensland's Paralympics centre of excellence. This will place Brisbane and Queensland as a world leader in para sport research, sports tech and rehabilitation. As the first of its kind globally, the Paralympics centre of excellence is a terrific example of how Olympic and Paralympic legacy can change people's lives. This is just the first of many tangible positive legacy outcomes that will come from hosting the 2032 games. Other ideas discussed on the day included a volunteer passport; greening all the pathways connecting venues; a First Nations cultural centre; and Olympic villages providing housing supply prior to as well as after the games. I note the government's broader work in this important area, including at today's housing round table.

This is what legacy is all about—the lasting benefits to our community 10 years into and 10 years after the event. From the consultation done so far, two enduring themes of celebrating the world's oldest living cultures and creating a barrier-free society for people with a disability weave their way through all of the visions and themes articulated. The input provided by Queenslanders and Australians to the Hopes and Dreams survey along with the discussions of the legacy forum delegates is now being synthesised into a draft vision that will be released for public consultation through April and May. I urge the community to keep the momentum going and provide feedback. The Brisbane 2032 legacy plan will

be finalised later this year. Brisbane 2032 is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to profoundly shape the community, city, region and nation that we all want to see in 2042. I thank the Brisbane 2032 Legacy Committee and everyone involved in the work of shaping a great games legacy.


Perinatal Mental Health Services

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Minister for Health and Ambulance Services) (10.05 am): Many of us in this chamber have experienced the life changes that occur when a baby comes into the world. It can be joyful and overwhelming, and sometimes all at once. We know that during this period one in five mums and one in 10 dads will experience some form of perinatal mental health challenge. While our hospitals and health services provide a range of perinatal mental health services, sometimes specialist support is needed.

When the Palaszczuk government established the Mental Health Select Committee in December 2021, we were determined to shine a light on how we can make better the lives of Queenslanders living with various mental health disorders and the services we provide them. One of the recommendations from the committee was to expand perinatal mental health services. Last week our government delivered a significant initiative to achieve this. On Wednesday I was honoured to join Mater Health to officially open Catherine's House at the Mater Mothers' Hospital campus. Catherine's House is a perinatal mental healthcare facility that will provide a broad spectrum of care, made possible by a partnership between Mater Health, the Palaszczuk government and generous community donations.

The Palaszczuk government has invested \$7 million in capital funding and more than \$11 million in annual operational funding to deliver eight new public health beds for mums who need specialist inpatient mental health support from a dedicated mother and baby unit. As I heard last week from mums and families who have experienced severe perinatal mental health disorders, the treatments received in mother and baby units save and change lives. They are the preferred model of support for mothers experiencing severe perinatal mental health challenges. By co-locating mother and baby, a mum can receive specialised treatment while continuing to care for her baby in a safe and supported environment. Our investment with Mater Health will increase the number of public mother and baby beds in Queensland to 12 over the coming months. Just like the Lavender Mother and Baby Unit the Palaszczuk government delivered in 2017, the new beds at Catherine's House will be available to all people across Queensland via referral from a health professional. I am proud to be part of a government which continues to grow and invest in mental health services, backed by a record \$1.645 billion investment.

Torres Strait and Northern Peninsula Area, Cost of Living


 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (10.07 am): We know that cost-of-living pressures are being felt across Queensland. Whether it is putting food on the table, fuel in your car or a roof over your head, things are more expensive now than a year ago due to the record inflation left by the previous Morrison LNP government. These impacts are especially tough for our remote communities. Earlier last week I travelled to Thursday Island for the Torres Strait and Northern Peninsula Area cost-of-living summit, co-chaired by the member for Cook and attended by the Attorney-General, the ministerial champion for the Torres Strait; the Minister for Energy; and the Minister for Housing.

We heard from the community that the price of basics like bread and rice can be up to three times mainland prices. The high cost of freight is a big factor, and we heard firsthand what community-led solutions look like. It was a chance to be there face to face and to listen, as good governments do; it allows the community to drive the outcomes they desperately need. What was clear is the need to make transport more affordable, not just for residents but for the wider supply chains they rely on as well. That is why we are committing more than \$64 million in freight subsidies for the Torres Strait, the cape and the gulf to make that happen. This commitment will help to ease the cost pressures on local suppliers, reducing one of their biggest costs—freight—to drive down the cost of basic food items, clothing and other essential items for families.

In Queensland we rely heavily on the Bruce Highway, but in the Torres Strait they rely on the blue highway. The waterways are essential for travel and have been for many millennia. That is why we announced, in partnership with the Albanese federal Labor government, an \$80 million package to upgrade marine infrastructure in the Torres Strait. This will include upgrading the pontoons, boat ramps and jetties that these communities rely on. A further half a million dollars is going towards an emergency maintenance package for commercial operators to get critical maintenance work done on their vessels at the earliest possible opportunity.

We are delivering a new bus for school transport for the kids on Thursday Island, and I want to thank my colleague the Minister for Education for working so well with us on that. We are also helping the Torres Shire Council grow its active transport infrastructure, with kilometres of new shared pathways around Thursday Island which I saw firsthand being very well used by local residents. These key investments will help ease the cost-of-living pressures in the Torres Strait, in the northern peninsula, in the gulf and in Cape York. I congratulate the co-chair of the summit, the member for Cook, for her strong advocacy for all of her local communities.


Southern Queensland Correctional Precinct

 **Hon. MT RYAN** (Morayfield—ALP) (Minister for Police and Corrective Services and Minister for Fire and Emergency Services) (10.10 am): This government has a reputation for building infrastructure and creating jobs, and we are certainly delivering in my portfolio area. We deliver on those infrastructure and jobs plans, and we deliver well. The Southern Queensland Correctional Precinct stage 2 is one of Queensland's biggest infrastructure projects. It is a massive project with massive benefits and more than \$427 million in trade packages have already been awarded to date to local Queensland suppliers—\$427 million to local Queensland suppliers. Nearly 1,400 workers have been inducted to work on the site and preparation is now beginning to operationalise the facility at a fast pace.

Eight project streams including operations, offender rehabilitation, prisoner industries, psychology and allied health, case management, finance and procurement, digital services, and people and engagement are currently designing and delivering the products that will ensure a health and rehabilitation focused centre. The health and rehabilitation operating model of the 1,500 beds at this centre will be delivered by more than 600 staff across the following work streams: custodial operations, psychology and clinical operations, case management, offender rehabilitation, education and program delivery, health services, sentence management, administration, and information technology.


Queensland Corrective Services will be seeking Queenslanders from a diverse range of roles and skills to deliver this health and rehabilitation centre and is currently engaging in recruitment and awareness activities in the local region and beyond and has a plan of attraction, recruitment and engagement across the state. Mr Speaker, you will be pleased to know that the general manager of the centre has already been appointed and recruitment now for the management team and broader positions such as custodial operations, administration and professional staff will commence over coming months. This is a massive project delivering hundreds of jobs right now and into the future. Infrastructure and jobs: it is what our government plans for; it is what our government delivers.

ABSENCE OF MINISTER

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (10.13 am): I rise to advise that the Minister for Regional Development and Manufacturing and Minister for Water will be absent from the House this week due to medical reasons and, as such, I advise the House that the Minister for Communities and Housing, Minister for Digital Economy and Minister for the Arts will act for all of Minister Butcher's portfolio areas for this week's sitting.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Comments by Leader of the Opposition

 **Ms RICHARDS** (Redlands—ALP) (10.13 am): I rise to make a personal explanation. On Sunday during a press conference when speaking about the LNP's Redlands candidate, the Leader of the Opposition made comments about me which are untrue and I find personally offensive—

Mr POWELL: Mr Speaker—

Mr SPEAKER: Member, please resume your seat. There is a point of order.

Mr POWELL: I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising. The article that the member is referring to does not refer to her. Indeed, it does not refer to any member of parliament. I table it.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Redland City Bulletin* online, dated 26 March 2023, titled 'Former Chamber of Commerce leader eyes state seat for LNP' [371].

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order, members!

Mr POWELL: I believe the member is misleading this House and I will be writing to you accordingly.

Mr SPEAKER: Procedurally you are within your rights to rise to a point of order. However, the member has not even given the personal explanation and you are presuming to know what she is seeking to do within that—


Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order, members! I ask you to refrain from interrupting the personal explanation, as is what we generally do in terms of convention in this House.

Ms RICHARDS: I would ask the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw the comments and apologise.

LEGAL AFFAIRS AND SAFETY COMMITTEE

Information Commissioner, Report

 **Mr RUSSO** (Toohey—ALP) (10.15 am): I lay upon the table of the House a report of the office of the—

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Nanango, I called the House to order. You are warned under the standing orders.


Mr RUSSO: I lay upon the table of the House the Office of the Information Commissioner's report No. 3 to the Queensland Legislative Assembly for 2022-23 titled '*Publishing official information assets*'. I commend the report to the House.

Tabled paper: Information Commissioner Report 3: 2022-23—Publishing official information assets: Supporting the push model through proactive disclosure: Right to Information Act 2009 (Qld) [372].

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr SPEAKER: Question time will conclude today at 11.16 am.

Housing Investment Fund

 **Mr CRISAFULLI** (10.16 am): My question is to the Premier. Yesterday marks 650 days since the Housing Investment Fund was announced by the Palaszczuk government. After almost two years and three housing forums, can the Premier point to a single Queenslanders living in a property built by this fund?

Ms PALASZCZUK: Obviously the member does not know how the fund works because the fund has only just been set up. The fund has only just been set up and it takes time—

Opposition members: Two years!

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Ms PALASZCZUK: So rude, always so rude—and it is always the men. At the housing summit in October last year we boosted the Housing Investment Fund to \$2 billion, with an annual funding of \$130 million now available. Their record is they did zero total; on housing in general, nothing to show for it. The Housing Investment Fund is on track to deliver 5,600 social and affordable home commencements by 30 June 2027. I am advised that to date—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members to my left will cease their interjections. I am trying to hear the Premier.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am advised that to date over 1,500 homes have been approved for support. The government—

Opposition members: Ha, ha.

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order, members! Members to my right. I would like to hear the Premier's response to the question as asked, member for Toowoomba South.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The government has made a number of announcements regarding this fund. This includes the two projects at Chermside and Redcliffe which will be underway this year. Those two projects will form part of a partnership with the Australian Retirement Trust, Queensland's own big super fund, to deliver up to 1,200 new homes. I am advised that total financial assistance of \$105 million has been committed to date under the Housing Investment Fund to successful proponents. That includes funding support to community housing—

Mrs Gerber: So nothing built.

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

Ms PALASZCZUK: The first thing the opposition might like to do is support the federal government in the House down there and stop blocking—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Premier, you have 30 seconds remaining.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That includes funding support to community housing provider peak bodies Q Shelter, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Housing Queensland and the Community Housing Industry Association of Queensland as part of the government's \$5 million commitment to support a capacity and capability program for community housing providers. I am further advised about the timing and amount of specific payments. We will make further announcements about these projects. The Treasurer and the housing minister are working very closely—

(Time expired)

Griffith University, Emergency Housing

Mr CRISAFULLI: My question is to the Premier. In September, the Premier said accommodation at Griffith University would be ready within six months. With three housing forums, can the Premier point to a single Queensland living in the Griffith University crisis accommodation?

Ms PALASZCZUK: The Deputy Premier is in charge of that—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Resume your seat, Premier. Members of this House, I ask you to show some maturity. The Premier has barely started her response and I am hearing heckling and laughing. This is not a place for those matters to be put forward, regardless of whether you agree or disagree with the statement. Premier, you have the call.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I think the opposition is—

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, this is not an opportunity to then retaliate. I ask you to stick to the question as asked.

Ms PALASZCZUK: With all due respect, I have not even started my response.

Mr SPEAKER: I am trying to set the tone because today the behaviour in the House is becoming unseemly. It is unparliamentary.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I was giving an answer previously and I am talking about housing. I said that in relation to the Griffith campus, the Deputy Premier is working on those issues and will update the House accordingly. What the opposition seems to forget here is that the private housing market is around 95 per cent and five per cent is social housing. We have put on record how we are building extra social housing for people. We have put on a record over 4,000. Today the housing minister just announced the acquisition of a retirement village to also house people. The housing minister is out there nearly every week opening new housing for Queenslanders. It is not just in the south-east; it is across the state. Unfortunately there are people at the moment who are sleeping rough. That is why I announced today millions of dollars for extra support to help those most vulnerable into accommodation to get a roof over their head. Unlike those opposite, we did not sell off caravan parks.

Mr POWELL: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance under standing order 118(b). The question was very specifically about the Griffith University crisis accommodation.

Mr Dick interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Treasurer, there is no need for that kind of comment. Premier, you are being relevant—

Mr Janetzki interjected.

Mr Dick interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Can I just say to the member for Toowoomba South and the Treasurer, you are both warned for cross-chamber quarrelling. Premier, you are being relevant, but there is a specific element to the question. I ask you to could come back to it under standing order 118(b).

Ms PALASZCZUK: Housing is a critical issue. We understand that and as a government we will always stand up for people in social housing. Unlike those opposite who wanted to get them out of social housing and sell off the social housing stock, we understand the value and the importance of having a roof over your head. That is why this is the second round table we are holding. We have held a housing summit. All we have from those opposite is no plan and no ideas.

Public Assets

Mr SKELTON: My question is of the Premier and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games. Will the Premier please update the House on the benefits of keeping Queensland's assets in public hands and is the Premier aware of any alternative approaches?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Nicklin for that question because on this side of the House—

Mr Crisafulli: 'We sell assets'!

Ms PALASZCZUK:—we stand on the side of Queenslanders. I say to the Leader of the Opposition—

Mr Crisafulli: Who was the transport minister who lost it all?

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is incorrect. I find that offensive and I ask the member to withdraw.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is not correct. I ask you to withdraw; you are lying.

Mr SPEAKER: Order, members!

Mr CRISAFULLI: I withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, Leader of the Opposition.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Mr Crisafulli: You sat around the cabinet table.

Ms PALASZCZUK: No, that was you with Campbell Newman. That was the member for Broadwater who sat there with Campbell Newman and made the decision with the member for Clayfield to sell off the assets. Well, Leader of the Opposition, have a look at the New South Wales election. The privatise agenda of the LNP was rejected; it was absolutely rejected on Saturday. They rejected the sale of the energy assets and the potential sale of Sydney Water. They put a stop to it because they recognise that keeping assets in public hands is the right thing to do. We have not seen the member for Broadwater or the member for Clayfield or the member for Kawana or anyone who sat around that cabinet table stand up and apologise for the cuts, the sackings and the sale of assets by the Newman government. Not once did they apologise. Not once!

Dr Rowan interjected.

Mr Powell interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Moggill and member for Glass House, you are both warned under the standing orders. The level of interjections is too high. I ask that we can hear the person on their feet.

Ms PALASZCZUK: On this side of the House we will stand up for our frontline workers as well. We will stand up for the men and women of Queensland who serve their state every day with respect and with dignity. Do not think for a moment, Leader of the Opposition, that people out there have forgotten your record in Queensland. They do not forget. They come up and they talk to me all the time about the absolute damage and carnage you did to Queensland. In three short years you took that wrecking ball to Queensland—

Mr SPEAKER: Through the chair, please.

Ms PALASZCZUK:—decimated communities, sacked workers and had the biggest privatisation sale on record ready to go. Now, because we have our energy assets in public hands—we retained that—we are able to give back a rebate, and there will be more, as I said during the last parliament. This budget will be a cost-of-living-relief budget. The Treasurer, the Deputy Premier and I are committed to that.

Mr Saunders interjected.

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

Housing, Granny Flats

Mr MANDER: My question is to the Premier. In September the Deputy Premier said changing the restriction on who can live in granny flats 'will mean many cheaper properties will enter the rental market, helping thousands of people across our state'. As a result of this announcement, six months on and with three housing forums, can the Premier point to a single extra Queensland living in a granny flat?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I can tell members that thousands of people have been helped through our emergency accommodation. Thousands of people have a roof over their head because we put money into emergency housing. I will not be lectured to by the member for Everton after the devastation that that member caused when he was the minister for housing. Not only did they not build any new social housing, they wanted to kick out people from their houses. They could not even take a holiday: 'Public housing tenants will have their holidays cut short ... under a new plan to crack down on absentee tenants'. That was their respect for families in this state. The member for Broadwater, the member for Everton, wanted to sell off the housing stock to the highest bidder—

Mr POWELL: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance under standing order 118(b). The question was very specifically about granny flats.

Mr SPEAKER: The Premier still has one minute and 51 seconds remaining to talk around the contextual arrangements here. Premier, I ask you to address the question.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I will say to the member for Kawana that there is not one policy from those opposite. It is a desert over there—an absolute desert.

Mr Bleijie: Eight years of this government; nothing to show for it.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Kawana, I used to have to warn the former member for Hervey Bay about this. You have no cover when it is just you. You are warned under the standing orders.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I find that personally offensive and I ask him to withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: The Premier has found the comment personally offensive.

Mr POWELL: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The comment was about the government and not about the Premier personally.

Mr SPEAKER: I appreciate that.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I will continue. I will stand up on our record against that of those opposite. Has the member for Kawana driven up the Bruce Highway recently? We are building that. I was there. Gold Coast members should be thanking me because we are building the second M1. The light rail was built by a Labor government. Suncorp Stadium, Townsville stadium—

Mr POWELL: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order again on relevance under standing order 118(b). We have had another minute and still we have not heard anything about granny flats.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am merely responding to interjections.

Mr SPEAKER: The Premier is correct: interjections of any sort are not actually meant to occur in the chamber but when they do a member has the right to respond to that.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Mr SPEAKER: Members to my right! However, Premier, I will ask you again: there were some specific elements to the question that I have not heard you touch directly on. I would like to hear a response to the question.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The Deputy Premier and I announced that people would be able to put granny flats on the back of their houses. We are making it easier for them to choose to do that so they no longer have to apply to the council. We are cutting the red tape for councils. Councils have a role to play here in releasing more land supply. This is not just the state government on its own; it is about the councils as well.

Finally, I say this: those opposite may want to pick up the phone to their mate Peter Dutton and tell him to support the federal housing legislation and the federal housing fund because at the moment their comrades down there are blocking it. They are blocking billions of dollars into housing.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: So childish; so immature.

(Time expired)

Housing

Mr RUSSO: My question is of the Premier and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games. Will the Premier please update the House on what action the Palaszczuk government is taking in response to national housing issues and is the Premier aware of any alternative approaches?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Toohey because—

Mr Mickelberg interjected.

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

Ms PALASZCZUK: I know the member for Toohey was proud to turn the first sod on the 33 new social housing units being built in his electorate. There is so much happening across this state when it comes to our commitment to social housing. As I have said, we know that the private market occupies most of that space. That is why today we stand on the side of over one million renters to ensure that incremental price increases happen only once per year. Does the opposition support that or not? I would like to hear whether or not they are on the side of renters—over one million of them. We have invested \$3.9 billion in social and affordable housing. Of course, as I have said, it is about renters having a fairer go.

Since 2015, our government has completed an additional 4,290 social homes through construction and purchasing—4,000. As I said earlier, right now there is a bill before the Senate in Canberra that would back even more social housing being built in Queensland and the blockers are those opposite and the same party in Canberra. They should ring up their friends down there and tell them to vote for the legislation otherwise—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Ms PALASZCZUK:—on housing. The federal LNP and the Greens are working together to block 30,000 new social homes. It is absolutely disgraceful. I am happy to talk about the LNP's record and contrast it with our record any day of the week. They cut 30 jobs from QBuild. They axed the tenants' advice and advocacy service in Queensland. They cut it so tenants had nowhere to go to seek advice. That was the attitude of those opposite. That service helped keep—

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: No, it is not funny to cut that service. It is not funny at all. That shows how much you care about people who are renting and social housing.

Mr SPEAKER: Through the chair, please, Premier.

Ms PALASZCZUK: They tried to sell three government owned caravan parks—in Cannon Hill, Woombye and Hervey Bay. We all remember that very well. The member for Everton wanted to increase rents for the most vulnerable.

(Time expired)

Clayfield, Social Housing

Mr LANGBROEK: My question is to the Premier. In January the housing minister said that a Clayfield retirement village would provide social housing in a couple of months. Tomorrow marks two months since that promise was made. Following three housing forums, can the—

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I am sorry, member. Members to my right, I have asked that questions be heard in silence. Please continue, member.

Mr LANGBROEK: Following three housing forums, can the Premier point to a single Queenslander living in that Brisbane retirement village?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I think that is a very ridiculous question if ever I have heard one.

Mr Minnikin interjected.

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

Ms PALASZCZUK: The minister has purchased these properties. They make them accessible and then they go out and match the accommodation with people on the register. This question comes from a long-serving member of parliament who was a minister in the Newman government that wanted to sell off social housing, that did not commence new builds and that wanted to increase rents for the most vulnerable. They axed the tenants' service, they axed QBuild and they axed the social housing garden awards. How low can you go! Queenslanders know that we are on their side and Queenslanders know that you cannot trust the LNP.

Housing

Mrs MULLEN: My question is of the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister Assisting the Premier on Olympic and Paralympic Games Infrastructure. Could the Deputy Premier advise the House how the Palaszczuk government is working to ensure Queenslanders have access to housing and is the Deputy Premier aware of any other approaches?

Dr MILES: I thank the member for Jordan for her question. She knows that people are flocking to live here in Queensland. They are flocking to experience our fantastic jobs market and our fantastic Queensland lifestyle, including many people who are moving to the member for Jordan's community which is one of the fastest growing parts of our state. That is why it is important that all levels of government as well as industry work together to address population growth, to unlock the supply of houses and to deliver the infrastructure and services that Queenslanders need and that are fundamental to maintaining the Queensland lifestyle that is attracting people to places such as the community of the member for Jordan. The biggest threat to that lifestyle, those public services and that new infrastructure is that those opposite would cut them.

We have already heard that they will not fund \$10 billion of increased building costs. If they will not fund the increased building costs then they have to cut the program—a massive cut to the state's record infrastructure program, risking sending our state back to Newman government levels of unemployment, risking Queenslanders missing out on the infrastructure and services they need.

The member for Chatsworth has said that the LNP has identified billions of dollars worth of savings. He did not call them cuts; he called it pruning. I am not much of a gardener, but my understanding is that when you prune something you cut it. Imagine all those public servants out there thinking, 'What a relief! I'm not going to get cut; I'll just get pruned.' The LNP never learn. Yet another state has rejected their agenda of cuts and of privatisation, but those opposite continue to call for cuts. Whether you call it cuts or pruning, whether you call it slashing or saving whether you call it sacking or 'denecessarifying', Queenslanders know and remember that the LNP stands for one thing alone, and that is C-U-T—cuts to services and cuts to infrastructure, selling off the assets that Queenslanders own.

Rent Increases

Mrs GERBER: My question is to the Premier. What percentage of Queensland rental agreements increased rent more than once a year?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am happy to get the housing minister to get back to the member. I do not have those details off the top of my head.

Infrastructure


Mr SULLIVAN: My question is of the Treasurer and Minister for Trade and Investment. Will the Treasurer update the House on how the Palaszczuk government ensures Queenslanders are delivered the infrastructure they deserve, and is the Treasurer aware of any alternative approaches?

Mr DICK: I thank the member for Stafford for his question. No government in the history of this state has delivered more infrastructure for this state than the Palaszczuk Labor government. It does not matter whether you live in Chermside, Cairns, out west or in the Torres Strait; our government delivers infrastructure. We made a \$50 billion guarantee as part of our COVID-19 recovery plan. In every budget since, we have delivered that infrastructure guarantee. It has increased—\$59 billion in the last budget—because that is what Labor governments do. That would not be the case if members opposite occupied this side of the House. We know about the Leader of the Opposition’s infrastructure hit list. We heard last week about the projects across Queensland that they would cut. Last Friday the member for Chatsworth put flesh on the bones of the LNP horror show.

Interruption.

PRIVILEGE

Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House


 **Mr POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (10.42 am): Mr Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising. We addressed this matter last week with the Deputy Premier. I have written to you with regard to the Deputy Premier misleading this House—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have a matter that I may be considering, but that is not cause to pre-empt any decision by me.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Infrastructure

Resumed.

 **Mr DICK:** The member for Chatsworth said, ‘We have got areas where we’ve already identified a couple of billion dollars worth of savings.’ ‘Billions of dollars worth of savings’ means one thing and one thing alone: cuts. That is entire hospitals gone; schools that will never be built; the Housing Investment Fund shut down, with 5,600 homes never built in this state. The member for Chatsworth went on to say, ‘There are a range of areas where we know already that we could prune things back.’ Pruning things back means one thing to the LNP: cuts.

I call on the Leader of the Opposition to unveil the cuts planned. It is quite obvious from the member for Chatsworth that that is their plan—billions of dollars worth of savings, pruning ready to go to cut back on Queenslanders. Is it the new hospital in Moranbah to be funded by progressive coal royalties? Is it the new police training centre in Townsville? Is it social and affordable housing? We know that they will cut that because they did that before. The members for Everton, Kawana, Broadwater and Clayfield sat around the cabinet table—

Mr Lister interjected.

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

Mr DICK:—and relished cutting social and affordable housing, putting vulnerable Queenslanders into distress, because that is what they do. The Leader of the Opposition should be honest when he stands up today at his press conference. I am calling on the gallery to ask him to reveal the cuts. What are the billions of dollars worth of savings? Members on this side know that that is the LNP plan. Queenslanders know that that is the LNP plan, because that is what they always do. The Leader of the Opposition has learned everything he knows about government from Campbell Newman and has learned nothing from successive election defeats. LNP, release the list of cuts today.

Gabba Redevelopment

Mr BLEIJIE: My question is to the Premier. I refer to the Deputy Premier’s statement claiming the Olympics were at risk without the \$2.7 billion spend on the Gabba and the conflicting statement made by the Australian Olympic Committee’s Matt Carroll. Can the Premier explain the big difference between the conflicting views of the Australian Olympic Committee and the Palaszczuk Labor government?

Dr MILES: I rise to a point of order, Mr Speaker. Mr Carroll has corrected that statement, in fairness to him.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I need to hear this point of order, members.

Dr MILES: It is misleading the House to not take account of the corrected statement that Mr Carroll has issued.

Mr SPEAKER: Is there action arising from your point of order, though, member? I appreciate the statement, but there has to be—

Dr MILES: In my view, the member should restate the question containing facts or verify the statement, because the statement has been contradicted by the person he is quoting.

Mr SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier has asked that the question be authenticated. He is within his rights to do so. Member for Kawana, will you restate the question?

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, I can authenticate the story that was on every national news across Australia last night. If it assists you, Mr Speaker, I will restate the question.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member.

Mr BLEIJIE: I refer to the Deputy Premier's statement claiming the Olympics were at risk without the \$2.7 billion spend on the Gabba and the early morning original conflicting statement made by the Australian Olympic Committee's Matt Carroll. Can the Premier explain the big difference between the original conflicting views of the Australian Olympic Committee and the Palaszczuk government?

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, you can answer this any way you like.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Mr Speaker, I am quite sure that the Deputy Premier will give due consideration to writing to you, because I believe that the member for Kawana could have deliberately misled the House with the wording of the first question. Then the second question admitted that there was an earlier statement. For the member for Kawana, I have a little piece of paper here. The member for Kawana is well aware of this statement, but we are happy to read it into *Hansard*: 'The AOC supports the Gabba redevelopment, and that position hasn't changed.'

Mr Nicholls interjected.

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

Ms PALASZCZUK: I table this for the member for Kawana.

Tabled paper: Media release, dated 27 March 2023, titled 'Clarifying statement on Brisbane Gabba Redevelopment—Matt Carroll' [\[373\]](#).

Do the LNP support the Olympic and Paralympic Games or not? If they do not support it, they should take it out of their titles. The Lord Mayor supports it.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Members to my left will cease their interjections.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The Lord Mayor supports the redevelopment of the Gabba. We support it. The federal government supports it.

Mr Crisafulli interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition will cease his interjections.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The only people who keep sniping from the sidelines, who keep whingeing and whining—

Mr Crisafulli interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, I just asked you to cease your interjections. You deliberately went and did it again. You are warned under the standing orders.

Ms PALASZCZUK:—are those opposite.

Mr Watts interjected.

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

Ms PALASZCZUK: As I said earlier in this House, if it were not for our government there would not be a Townsville stadium because those opposite did not support it. The federal LNP government did not support it. They had to be dragged kicking and screaming to support the Townsville stadium. Now that stadium will be utilised for the Olympics and is a legacy item.

With the Commonwealth Games, in joint arrangements with the federal government and, in some respects, the councils we invested in lasting infrastructure which is not only a legacy item but will be utilised for the Olympic Games. Eight-five per cent of our venues already exist.

In a landmark agreement we struck with the federal government over \$7 billion is going to be spent on the infrastructure. There are going to be brand new venues that will be utilised by community groups, schools, Paralympians and children with a disability for decades to come. They will be utilised before the games and after the games. Those opposite should support the games and stop their whingeing.

Education

Mrs GILBERT: My question is of the Minister for Education, Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Racing. Can the minister update the House on how the Palaszczuk government's education policies are benefiting Queensland students and schools and is the minister aware of any alternative approaches?

Ms GRACE: I thank the member for Mackay for the question. As a former teacher she knows that we have employed more teachers and teacher aides since this government came to power than the previous government. It is a strong record. We have employed 4,000 teachers in the last two years. We are 1,540 teacher aides ahead of our election commitment. She knows that across the state we have the best student-to-teacher ratios in the nation. I am very proud of that.

Our teacher retention rates are 95 per cent. We have a vacancy rate of around two per cent. For a department of 92,000 workers to have that kind of vacancy rate is unheard of. It is absolutely fantastic. We have programs like the turn to teach and trade to teach programs. We are part of the National Teacher Workforce Action Plan. Our EB is the best in the nation. If a teacher goes to a rural or remote area their starting salary is \$8,000 a year more than if they stayed in SEQ. There are incredible things in our EB. We have highly accomplished teachers. We have 330 health and wellbeing people assisting teachers. We have GPs in schools and the list goes on.

What a train wreck of an interview it was two weeks ago by those opposite. They get up and start talking about teacher numbers, workforce planning and strategies. The Leader of the Opposition fudges the question. He said, 'The member for Moggill will answer that question. He is very passionate about it.' I am glad he was passionate because the journalist asked the question about any workforce planning policy they had not once, not twice, but three times, and they failed to get one answer. They got absolutely nothing. They tried to feed it to the member for Moggill—'Please give me something that I can write about', and there was absolutely nothing.

I can point to how passionate they were when the Leader of the Opposition sat around the Campbell Newman cabinet table. Not only did they not employ any teachers; they needed 500 extra and did nothing. They stand up and want to lecture us on our programs. It is breathtaking and embarrassing. I do know one member who likes our policies very much and that is the member for Mundingburra. She hands out cheques—

Mr Bailey: Mudgeeraba.

Ms GRACE: Mudgeeraba, sorry. I cannot apologise more. She hands out fake cheques, she is a member of fake unions and they have fake policies.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Mundingburra, did you take personal offence?

Mr WALKER: No.

Gabba Redevelopment

Mr JANETZKI: My question is to the Premier. Given the importance of the Gabba to the Olympics and the confusion created yesterday, can the Premier finally provide the full costings for all options considered for the Gabba upgrade?

Ms PALASZCZUK: Does the member support the Gabba being redeveloped or not? That is the simple question. What the member is doing is criticising—

Dr Miles interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am going to get to that. The member is criticising the infrastructure funding package—all of it—which is over \$7 billion. Let us go through the funding for the regional infrastructure so the House is aware of it. I will come back to the Gabba at the end.

The nine existing venues to be upgraded are: Wyaralong; the Sunshine Coast stadium—do you want that upgraded or not?—the Brisbane Aquatic Centre and precinct, and Barlow Park in Cairns. We are doing that. Here is one—the Toowoomba sports ground. Do you support that?

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

Ms PALASZCZUK: Do you want that or not? It is all part of the package. Does the member support that or not? Do you want the funding for Toowoomba? Does the member want the funding?

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

Ms PALASZCZUK: You do want that funding.

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, please resume your seat.

Mr POWELL: The Premier continues to direct her comments directly to members on this side of the chamber rather than through the chair.

Mr SPEAKER: As a general rule, I have given guidance to the House. Premier, I ask that you direct your comments through the chair.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The member for Toowoomba South can let the House know whether he supports the upgrade to the Toowoomba sports ground.

Mr Mander: We support transparency.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The member for Everton is the same member who swore on a stack of bibles, but he did not really.

An opposition member: Through the chair.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Well maybe do not interject and it will not be made fun of. The Sunshine Coast mountain bike centre is going to get funding. The Anna Meares Velodrome, the Queensland Tennis Centre—

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

Ms PALASZCZUK:—the Breakfast Creek indoor sports centre, Chandler—

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, please resume your seat.

Mr POWELL: The question was specifically about the Gabba and the release of the full costings of all options considered for its upgrade.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member. The Premier clearly outlined how she would be responding at the outset of her response. I am waiting for her to come back to the part of the question that you are referring to.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The Moreton Bay Indoor Sports Centre: we definitely want that. The Redlands Whitewater Centre: we definitely want that. Perhaps those opposite should go and talk to some of the mayors because all the mayors are very supportive of this. In the Scenic Rim, do they want the upgrade to the rowing centre? It is a package.

There is also the Brisbane arena. I do not hear any criticism about the live music venue which is also going to be used for the swimming. I do not hear one single criticism about that. That is the same funding as the Gabba. We know that there have been supply issues. The project valuation report is there for the Gabba—\$2.7 billion. It will be a world-class facility and it has reached end of life.

(Time expired)

Emergency Departments

Ms HOWARD: My question is of the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services. Can the minister advise how Queensland's emergency departments are performing and advise of any relevant comparisons?

Mrs D'ATH: I thank the member for Ipswich for her question. I know she is a passionate supporter of the great health services that we deliver in this state. I am always proud to stand up as the health minister and talk about the work that our health professionals do each and every day, and that includes in our emergency departments. While those opposite like to run around this state holding their whingeing town hall meetings where all they do is talk down the services that are delivered by our doctors, nurses and allied health professionals each and every day, we are talking about how well we are performing compared to the rest of the country. We are certainly one of the leading jurisdictions, if not the leading jurisdiction, in many of the measurements.

The most recent report on government services data shows that Queensland has the second-best performing emergency departments in the country, and the most recent quarterly data shows we are now the best in the country, surpassing New South Wales when it comes to seeing emergency department patients within recommended times. I do not just need to compare to other states and territories: I can compare to the LNP's record when it comes to emergency department performance. Our ED seen-in-time performance of 72 per cent is the same as it was under the LNP despite a 36 per cent increase—

Ms Bates interjected.

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

Mrs D'ATH: The median state wait time for the last quarter was 16 minutes; under the LNP's budget papers it was 19. On the Gold Coast the median ED wait time under the LNP was 32 minutes; under us it is 15. In Mackay it was 17 minutes; under us it is 10. In West Moreton it was 27 minutes; under us it is 15. When those on the other side run around this state talking down our health services they have zero credibility. We know they have zero ideas, zero plans, no money, no beds and no staff. We know one thing they do have, and that is cuts. You would think they would have walked away from the hit list the leader put out the other week, but no. The member for Chatsworth has doubled down and said—

Ms Bates interjected.

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

Mrs D'ATH:—'We are absolutely cutting and we can find more than that. In fact, we know already that we could prune things back.' That's in addition to a couple of billion dollars' worth of savings, including ambulance stations, satellite hospitals, the new Burdell Ambulance Station and northern regional office and the Gold Coast Secure Mental Health Rehabilitation Unit. It is shameful! As if it was not enough that you closed the Barrett centre, now you want to cut mental health rehabilitation units. The Goondiwindi Hospital remediation, further ambulance stations, the Thursday Island Hospital facility upgrade project—

(Time expired)

Rent Increases

Dr MacMAHON: My question today is to the Premier. The Premier is a landlord, the opposition leader is a landlord and the housing minister is a landlord. With no limits to the amount landlords can increase rents by, can the Premier—

Ms ENOCH: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member is misleading the House. I am not a landlord. I ask the member to withdraw.

Dr MacMAHON: I withdraw. With no limits to the amount landlords and real estate agents can increase rents by, can the Premier explain why renters should trust her government?

Ms PALASZCZUK: As the member correctly points out, people on both sides of the House do own properties. What we do know is that there have been instances where renters have been saying very clearly they are seeing massive increases over short periods of time of up to \$200 or \$400 a week. We recognise that, and that is why we are acting today to ensure those rent increases happen only once a year. Secondly, can I say to the member that perhaps her party might want to support the federal legislation—

A government member interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is right; how much? Ten billion. As I said earlier, billions of dollars that would unlock over 30,000 social homes. The biggest single thing the LNP and Greens could do is support that national legislation. On this side of the House we stand with those over one million renters across Queensland. It will be very interesting to see whether or not those opposite support what we are doing today.

We hear a lot of whingeing from those opposite. We see no ideas and we see no plans, but what we do see is a massive list of cuts. We know they will cut because, as everyone has said in the House today—nearly everyone—the LNP spokesperson Steve Minnikin, the member for Chatsworth, said, 'Well, we know at the moment that if you look at the budget we've got areas where we've already identified a couple of billion dollars of savings.' 'Already identified!' We know they have been identified because the Leader of the Opposition published his hit list of billions of dollars of projects and jobs that would be at risk—hundreds, if not thousands, of jobs at risk—including Cross River Rail, Gold Coast Light Rail, Coomera Connector, upgrades, Centenary Bridge, the new QPAC theatre, satellite hospitals, the Gabba—they did mention Brisbane Live—CopperString et cetera as well as health cuts. We know their record in office is to cut, sack and sell. If there is one clear message out of New South Wales, it is that the public wants essential services, they want a government that listens and they want a government that protects their public assets and keeps them in public hands.

Coomera Connector

Mr POWER: My question is to the Minister for Transport and Main Roads. Can the minister update the House on the major milestones of the Coomera Connector project, and is the minister aware of any other approaches to this budget?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the member for the question. He is a strong supporter of the Coomera Connector infrastructure here in Queensland. This will be the single largest road project in the state, funded by Labor governments. It was great to join the Premier, the member for Gaven and Senator Murray Watt. We even had some help from former AFL star 'Spida' from Triple M, who brought his own shovel with him. Bless him! He helped us with the sod turning. It was a pretty worn shovel too; it had done a few yards.

It was great to see the sod turning happen on the Coomera Connector—or second M1, as people know it—a full 16 kilometres under this government, including six lanes from Helensvale Road to Smith Street, keeping our election commitment. They would get no lanes under the LNP. We know they blocked this project when they were in power when the former member for Thuringowa sat in the cabinet. I table this document from the *Gold Coast Bulletin* from 25 April 2014 when the LNP blocked the Coomera Connector.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Gold Coast Bulletin* online, dated 25 April 2014, titled 'End of the road for traffic relief plan as road corridor quietly scrapped' [\[374\]](#).

Mr BAILEY: We know their record on the Gold Coast: there was not a single new dollar for the M1, there was nothing for light rail and they blocked the second M1. That is the LNP's record on the Gold Coast. What we get with this government are 1,000 jobs and an alternative to the M1. We are getting on with it. Do you think the former member for Thuringowa and the member for Chatsworth have learned anything? No. The member for Chatsworth said on Friday, 'We know at the moment that if you look at the budget we have got areas that we have already identified a couple of billion dollars' worth of savings. At the moment there are a range of areas that we know already that we would prune things back.' He said it twice already. This is the member who described the Newman government's cuts as 'tough love'.

I looked up 'prune' in the dictionary and it says, 'to cut out and get rid of'. We might have to change cut, sack and sell to prune, hack and sack or whinge, whine and privatise. We all know that it means the same thing. They have an ideological obsession with cutting. You can call it 'prune', you can call it 'tough love' or you can call it whatever you want, but we know it is in the LNP's DNA. Whatever they say here, we know that projects like the Coomera Connector will get cut.

(Time expired)

Kaiser, Mr M

Ms SIMPSON: My question is to the Premier. Mike Kaiser is a self-confessed electoral rorter and former Labor MP. In 2000 Premier Beattie said he did not want people who break the law in the Labor Party, but the Palaszczuk government has welcomed and repeatedly promoted him.

Mr Brown interjected.

Ms SIMPSON: Can the Premier confirm media reports concerning the appointment of Mike Kaiser as the director-general of her department?

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Capalaba, you clearly interjected during the question. I have asked for silence. You are warned under the standing orders.

Mrs D'ATH: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order under standing order 115(b). I believe there are certainly imputations in that question in relation to a public servant that I think are very unparliamentary. I ask that the question be ruled out of order.

Mr SPEAKER: I will allow the question. Premier, you can respond as you see fit.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Let me say this very clearly. Firstly, Rachel Hunter is the director-general of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. Secondly, Mike Kaiser is a very well respected head of the Deputy Premier's department. Thirdly, let me say that today the LNP has shown its true colours—once again, attacking public servants.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Pause the clock. Member for Ninderry, member for Currumbin and member for Mermaid Beach, you are all warned under the standing orders.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Mr Kaiser had been working at KPMG. He applied and was selected on merit for the position of the head of the Department of Resources, and he was later moved to the Deputy Premier's portfolio. Let me say that it is absolutely disgraceful—

Mrs D'Ath interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is right. This just goes to the heart of the DNA of the LNP—to attack and sack 14,000 people. We also know that in the past they had a hit list and they worked through the list in government and they just got rid of the people they did not want. I think the member for Maroochydore should go and have a long hard look at herself and think about the disgraceful question she has raised in this House, which is not worthy of any further comment.

Mr POWELL: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance under standing order 118(b).

Mr SPEAKER: No. Clearly you did not listen. I allowed the question on the basis that the Premier was able to answer as she saw fit. The member was quite lucky to get the question through, and I have allowed it on that basis. Premier, did you have anything further to add?

Ms PALASZCZUK: No.

Women

Ms RICHARDS: My question is to the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice, Minister for Women and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence. Can the Attorney-General please inform the House how the Palaszczuk government is uplifting the voices of women in Queensland and is the Attorney-General aware of any alternative approaches?

Ms FENTIMAN: I thank the member for Redlands for the question. She is truly a tireless advocate for her community, with a long track record of delivering. In fact I was proud to join the member for Redlands late last year to announce a new high-risk team to better protect women and children experiencing domestic and family violence. It would not have happened without her advocacy.

Mr Speaker, you cannot be what you cannot see, which is why this government absolutely prioritises women in leadership positions. On this side of the chamber, as I am fond of reminding those opposite, we have 21 hardworking women MPs just like the member for Redlands. I often ask how the LNP can ever hope to represent modern Queensland with just six women in the chamber. It is absolutely

disgraceful. After all their failed opportunities to actually put more women into this chamber—with the Callide by-election and running a male candidate in Stretton—I was pleased to see on the weekend that the member for Broadwater has announced three new women candidates. I was pleased, until the member for Broadwater opened his mouth at the very same press conference and described the member for Redlands as a nodding donkey.


Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Members to my right.

Interruption.

PRIVILEGE

Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House


 **Mr POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (11.14 am): I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising. The minister is referring to the same matter the member for Redlands did, which as I said at that time was false and misleading. I will also be writing to you regarding the statements made by the Attorney-General.

Mr SPEAKER: I will await the correspondence.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Women

Resumed.

 **Ms FENTIMAN:** On the same weekend we saw an outgoing premier and an incoming premier talk about lifting the standard of politics, we see the Leader of the Opposition attacking a hardworking woman MP. It is comments like this that turn women off running for politics.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. This is a complete misrepresentation of what the Leader of the Opposition has said and I believe that—

Mr SPEAKER: Member, it is not the appropriate time to debate the issue. I have had the Manager of Opposition Business rise to a point of order regarding a matter of privilege suddenly arising. I have allowed him to do so and I await his correspondence. Unless you have anything further to add, I will ask you to resume your seat.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: It is clear the Attorney-General is misleading the House.

Ms FENTIMAN: The member for Broadwater has form. Let us not forget when he called Jeannette Young, our now Governor, a punch-drunk bureaucrat who was power hungry. That was an extraordinary and shameful attack on a hardworking public servant.

Ms Camm interjected.


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

Ms FENTIMAN: They have form, don't they? The Leader of the Opposition is just one of the blokes in the LNP. Let us not forget when the member for Everton said there were too many women on the Parole Board and then swore on a stack of Bibles that he did not hurl abuse at Kate Jones and then of course had to admit it was in fact him—or when the member for Burleigh said when it comes to providing safe workplaces for women that the pendulum has swung too far. Shame on them. They can never represent modern Queensland.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, I could not be heard over the din in here. Your interjections are getting out of control. I will start not offering you the opportunity to be pre warned; I will just simply warn you or ask you to leave the chamber. The period for question time has expired.

LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION

 **Dr MacMAHON** (South Brisbane—Grn) (11.17 am): I seek leave to move general notice of motion No. 3 standing in my name.

Division: Question put—That leave be granted.

AYES, 6:

Grn, 2—Berkman, MacMahon.

KAP, 2—Dametto, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 81:

ALP, 49—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Bush, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Hunt, Kelly, A. King, S. King, Linard, Lui, Madden, Martin, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Skelton, Smith, Stewart, Sullivan, Tantari, Walker, Whiting.


LNP, 32—Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Gerber, Hart, Head, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Watts.

Pairs: Butcher, Weir; Lauga, Molhoek.

Resolved in the negative.

PRIVILEGE

Comments by the Member for Everton

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice, Minister for Women and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (11.22 am): I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising. During my answer to a question from the member for Redlands, I am advised that the member for Everton interjected when I referred to the comments 'nodding donkey' and said, 'Look in the mirror.' I am not sure if he made those comments, but if he did, I ask him to withdraw.

Mr MANDER: Their desperation is—

Government members interjected.

Dr Miles interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Members to my right. The Deputy Premier will cease his interjections. This has to be a point of order, member for Everton, not a defence. I ask that you either withdraw as requested or you provide a reason as to why you should not withdraw.

Mr MANDER: Because that was not the context in which it was said. It was about—

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I will hear the member!

Mr MANDER: It had nothing to do with anybody's appearance or any attribute of the person. It was about looking at their own standards.

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, today has been, I would suggest, quite personal with some members, on both sides. I ask that you have a think about today's question time. When we come back tomorrow for question time, I hope that it can be conducted with a little bit more civility. Member, you rose to the point of order. You asked for a withdrawal. The member has suggested otherwise. I am happy to consider the matter if you wish to write to me on that matter.

Ms FENTIMAN: Because I take personal offence, I ask him to withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: The member has taken personal offence. Convention says that it is a withdrawal, member. Will you withdraw? I will further consider the matter upon review.

Mr MANDER: Thank you. I withdraw.

MOTION

Business Program; Cognate Debate



Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (11.24 am): I move—

1. That the Police Powers and Responsibilities (Jack's Law) Amendment Bill and the Police Service Administration and Other Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) be considered 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.
2. That the following business will be considered this sitting week, with the nominated maximum periods of time as specified:
 - (a) the Housing Legislation Amendment Bill, a maximum of four hours;
 - (b) the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, a maximum of four hours; and
 - (c) the Police Powers and Responsibilities (Jack's Law) Amendment Bill and the Police Service Administration and Other Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) to complete all stages by 5.55 pm on Thursday, 30 March 2023.
3. The following time limits for the bills listed in 2. apply:
 - (a) the minister to be called on in reply:
 - (i) for the Housing Legislation Amendment Bill and the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, 45 minutes before the expiry of the maximum hours for those bills; and
 - (ii) for the Police Powers and Responsibilities (Jack's Law) Amendment Bill and the Police Service Administration and Other Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2), by 5.10 pm on Thursday, 30 March 2023.
4. If the nominated stage of each bill has not been completed by 5.55 pm on Thursday, 30 March 2023, 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.

In respect of the motion before the House, members will see that there are four bills slated for debate this week, they being the Housing Legislation Amendment Bill, the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, the Police Powers and Responsibilities (Jack's Law) Amendment Bill, and the Police Service Administration and Other Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) which will be debated cognately. The motion also sets out the time frames for these bills to be considered pursuant to the sessional orders. This week the House will also move a motion of condolence for Billy Gordon, the former member for Cook.

I note that last sitting the opposition supported this motion and the debate of this motion was brief. I appreciate the collegiate nature of the discussions at the Business Committee meeting last night, and I look forward to the same approach by the opposition today.



Mr POWELL (Glass House—LNP) (11.25 am): I rise to address the business program motion for this coming week. I am sorry to disappoint the Leader of the House, but we will not be supporting it. Despite the fact that discussions during the committee meeting may be collegiate, it does not imply that there is a standing level of support from this side of the chamber when it comes to what is conducted in the House during this sitting week.

An outsider might look at the business program and suggest there is an equitable distribution of time for the legislation that we will be debating this week, but all you need do is look at the speaking list for the first bill and realise that there is no way possible for that speaking list to work its way through to completion in the time allocated for the Housing Legislation Amendment Bill. Equally, as I advised the Leader of the House in the meeting last night, the LNP will have a similar number of speakers on the other two/three bills, given we are cognating two of them, and therefore I can guarantee you that in each of those instances we will see a guillotining of the debate.

We have offered solutions as to how we can ensure opposition members, indeed government members—I believe it was their own members who were guillotined during the debate last week—and the crossbench as well are guaranteed an opportunity to address legislation that they want to speak on. We have said it before, we will say it again: that is what we are elected to do. That is why we come into this chamber each and every sitting week, to speak on behalf of the constituents that we represent on legislation that matters to them. Therefore, we will be opposing this motion. We do not believe the government is genuine in trying to ensure that all members have that opportunity. We will sit later on

each and every night if necessary, to ensure that that is possible. However, those offers are rejected, and what we see is a shortening of the time that members have to speak. The opposition will be opposing this motion.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Before I call the next speaker, I would like to remind the House of those members who on a warning: the members for Nanango, Woodridge, Toowoomba South, Moggill, Glass House, Maryborough, Kawana, Buderim, Chatsworth, Southern Downs, Clayfield, Broadwater, Toowoomba North, Mudgeeraba, Capalaba, Currumbin, Mermaid Beach, Ninderry and Whitsunday.

Hon. MC BAILEY (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (11.27 am): Once again, another whingeing, whining effort from an opposition with no policies and no plan, trying to confect something that is not factual. What we are doing here is the ordinary ordering of business for this week, similar to any other chamber in this country and any other democracy wherever else beyond Australia. There will be ample time for everybody to have their say. People will need to be disciplined in what they have to say. We need to see less repetitive speeches from the opposition using the same old key lines and themes, reading out the same old stuff and repeating what each other has said. What we need is original contributions from those opposite, hopefully respectful ones that do not involve sledging female members of this parliament, as the Leader of the Opposition did on Sunday and as the member for Everton doubled down on and would only withdraw when he was made to withdraw.

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Pause the clock. Resume your seat please, Minister. What is your point of order?

Mr POWELL: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege as I raised previously in relation to the members for Redlands and Waterford. I will also be writing to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, regarding the comments just made by the member for Miller.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, that is not a point of order.

Mr MANDER: I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence at that comment and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member has taken personal offence. Will you withdraw?

Mr BAILEY: I withdraw. What we need in the business of this week—

Ms Pease interjected.

Mr MANDER: I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence at the interjection—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no need for gesticulation.

Mr MANDER: I cannot remember which electorate she represents—the member for Lytton—and I ask her to withdraw.

Ms PEASE: I withdraw and I rise to a point of order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can I just rule on that? Thank you for the withdrawal. Yes, member for Lytton, what is your point of order?

Ms PEASE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I take personal offence at the member for Everton pointing to me and his comments towards me, and I ask him to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member has taken personal offence, member for Everton, and I ask you to withdraw. Will you withdraw?

Mr MANDER: Can I seek a point of clarification please, Mr Deputy Speaker? How can you be offended by a withdrawal request?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will take some advice. Resume your seat.

An honourable member interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not need any assistance thanks. Member, while you did withdraw, you also used some other language around that withdrawal. The convention is that if a member—

Mr O'Connor interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Bonney, I am giving a ruling here and I do not appreciate your gestures and attitude while I am giving this ruling. The convention is, member for Everton, that if a member takes personal offence the member has a right to ask—

Mr MANDER: I withdraw.

Mr BAILEY: What we see here is some kind of confected argument from the opposition about their alleged defence of democracy and yet we saw the rowdiest and most disrespectful behaviour from those opposite for the entire question time. Then they flipped the switch suddenly and said, 'Oh my God, this is a matter of democracy.' Everybody can see through it; it is a nonsense.

What we need to see is an outbreak of respect in this place in the way people behave. If people have said inappropriate things that are crystal clear, like the Leader of the Opposition did on Sunday, they should apologise and actually have the integrity to say they got it wrong.

Mr MANDER: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. On a matter of relevance, what does this issue that the main roads minister is referring to have to do with the business program motion before the House?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before you respond, member for Miller, I will make a ruling. I will just take some advice. Thank you, member for Everton. While the minister's commentary is not necessarily relevant to the motion, the member is responding to lines of argument that have been put forward by previous speakers. I would ask the minister to come back to the motion.

Mr BAILEY: Certainly, Mr Deputy Speaker, and I thank you for your guidance. What we are seeing here in this discussion is a wave of people trying to defend their flailing leader, who has embarrassed himself. Here we are back to the same old debate wasting the time of this chamber when we need it for debate. It is an orderly, normal business program motion being put forward by the Leader of the House. It ought to be supported.

We see respect on this side for the normal conventions of democracy. We support family friendly hours; let me make it clear. The discussion earlier was to some degree about women in this parliament. If members want family friendly hours we need to have a business order that respects—

Ms Camm interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Resume your seat. Member for Whitsunday, you were on a warning. You can leave the chamber for one hour.

Whereupon the honourable member for Whitsunday withdrew from the chamber at 11.33 am.

Mr BAILEY: This government supports the modern conventions that are genuinely inclusive of all kinds of people—

Mr Hart interjected.

Mr BAILEY: There is an interjection from the member for Burleigh. We heard the sorts of comments mentioned by the Attorney-General about what he said—not exactly contemporary standards or values I might say, and I am being generous.

Mr HART: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence at what the minister is saying. I ask him to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, personal offence has been taken. I ask you to withdraw.

Mr BAILEY: In relation to what?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: No—

Mr BAILEY: I withdraw. The member for Burleigh is well known for saying that public transport is obsolete.

Mr BROWN: I rise to a point of order.

Mr HART: I rise to a point of order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will deal with the member for Capalaba's point of order first.


Mr BROWN: It is my understanding that the member for Bonney is on a warning and continues to interject during the contribution of the member for Miller.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Your understanding is not correct. Member for Burleigh?

Mr HART: I take personal offence at what the minister is saying. I ask him to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, personal offence has been taken.

Mr BAILEY: Mr Deputy Speaker, I withdraw. This motion ought to be supported. It is an orderly, run-of-the-mill business program motion. There is ample time for members to speak. They need to talk to their respective whips and get on the speaking list. I urge the members of the opposition to not just repeat ad nauseam the key lines and themes they are handed by the office of the former member for Thuringowa.

 **Mr DAMETTO** (Hinchinbrook—KAP) (11.35 am): I rise to speak against the business program motion for this week. Regional MPs spend a lot of time away from our electorates when we come to Brisbane to attend parliament. We hear about family friendly hours—

Mr O'Connor interjected.

Mr Bailey interjected.


Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Pause the clock. I had asked both members to come to order. Member for Bonney and member for Miller, you are on a warning.

Mr DAMETTO: Thank you very much for your protection, Mr Deputy Speaker. We hear a lot about family friendly hours in this House and the reason for the business program motion is to support that. However, when it comes to regional MPs who travel for a long time away from their electorate to come here to represent their constituents, family friendly hours mean nothing to us. We do not get an opportunity to shoot back to our electorate office at the end of the day to sort out a few things, go to the P&C meetings or go to our local Lions Club to find out what is going on in our electorate. We come here to work.

We are seeing truncated times in debate. Regional MPs have people back home who are very interested to hear their point on all these debates, whether it is the housing legislation, the environment or the Police Service administration legislation that is before this House. I do not think it is fair to regional MPs or their electorates when only a short amount of time is allocated but there are a number of people who still wish to speak. It costs a lot of money to send regional MPs to Brisbane. Queenslanders are footing the bill to have MPs sitting in this House this week who may want to speak on this legislation but will not be afforded that opportunity, and I think that is a travesty. I think it is an absolute travesty. No matter how many members want to speak on whatever bill is before the House, their point in the debate should be heard.

We hear members say, 'Get your act together and make sure you get on the speaking list.' However, there are people from competing sides trying to get on those speaking lists. It might be easier to orchestrate getting on that speaking list when you are in government. However, when there is a mix on this side of the House of crossbench MPs and opposition MPs, it can be quite difficult to get that pecking order right.

The reality is people in regional Queensland deserve to have their voice heard. There is a number of MPs this week who will not be able to speak on this legislation. Therefore, I cannot support this business program motion.

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (11.38 am): I rise to contribute to this debate because it is important that our voices in opposition are heard. I cannot sit here and listen to the Minister for Transport's contribution and let it go unargued. Seriously! This is a government that in its first term took pride in being elected on openness, transparency and accountability. Where is that openness, where is that accountability and where is that transparency when members of the opposition and the crossbench cannot even contribute to a debate in this House? They are saying we will be guillotined. They say, 'Get on the list.' We do get on the list.

Those opposite need to understand that we on this side of the chamber represent the good people of Queensland in the same manner that they do. It is unacceptable that we have to sit in this chamber and be diminished as women on this side time and time again—every single time. Just because I am a female on this side of the House does not mean I do not understand and it does not mean that I do not represent my community just like anyone else in the chamber.

We have a voice and we are here to use it, not be guillotined. The crossbenchers do not always get a say because the government guillotine them; the opposition do not always get a say on behalf of their constituents because we get guillotined. I would like to speak on the housing bill, on the environment bill and on Jack's Law, which is before this chamber, but so would everyone else in this House. How in heaven does the government genuinely believe that four hours is enough time for all of

the members in this chamber to have their say? How is it enough time for the voices of our constituents to be heard? It beggars belief that the Minister for Transport has the hide to stand up and talk about family friendly hours. Goodness me! The member for Hinchinbrook said it. I do not get to go home at night and have dinner with my family, like Brisbane members do. On taxpayers' money, we have to travel down here and be away from our families, week after week.

We knew what we were getting into when we were elected to this place. My three daughters knew exactly what would happen to their childhood if I was elected. We have to work through it, and that is exactly what we on this side of the House try to do. We are here in this House and we want to debate those three important bills—the environment bill, the housing bill and Jack's Law, a criminal law bill—but this House will guillotine us because the Palaszczuk government is so determined to keep us quiet that it is not funny.

It is completely unacceptable that the former attorney-general, the health minister and the transport minister think it is fine to stand up and use their time not only to completely diminish the comments by the Leader of the Opposition that were taken completely out of context but also to talk about women on this side of the House. The minister has no clue.

Mr BAILEY: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I find the member for Nanango's comments personally offensive and inaccurate and I ask that they be withdrawn.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I withdraw. I have only a minute and 28 seconds left, so I really do not want to waste it on the Minister for Transport.

This debate is about allowing every member in this chamber to have their voice heard. It is important. There are important bills before this House. I have here the speaking list for the housing bill. The Palaszczuk government are so desperate to keep us quiet that they have given us only four hours for debate. If you look at the list you will see that there are many of us who would like to speak. I think nearly every one of us is facing housing desperation, but the Palaszczuk government are desperate to keep us quiet. This government was supposedly elected on openness, transparency and accountability, but there is none. There is no time for us on this side of the House to have our constituents' voices heard on those extremely important topics, yet the Palaszczuk government is going to guillotine not one debate and not two debates but three debates this week.

Mr Powell: Four debates.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Four debates. I take the interjection from the Manager of Opposition Business. The Palaszczuk government this week will guillotine four debates, not allowing the voices of over half of Queensland to be heard. It is a shame.

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

AYES, 49:

ALP, 49—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Bush, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Hunt, Kelly, A. King, S. King, Linard, Lui, Madden, Martin, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Skelton, Smith, Stewart, Sullivan, Tantari, Walker, Whiting.

NOES, 38:

LNP, 31—Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Gerber, Hart, Head, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Watts.

Grn, 2—Berkman, MacMahon.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.


PHON, 1—Andrew.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

Pairs: Butcher, Weir; Lauga, Molhoek.

Resolved in the affirmative.

LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION

 **Ms BOLTON** (Noosa—Ind) (11.48 am): I seek leave for the member for Scenic Rim to immediately move general notice of motion No. 2, standing in the member's name.

Division: Question put—That leave be granted.

AYES, 38:

LNP, 31—Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Gerber, Hart, Head, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Watts.

Grn, 2—Berkman, MacMahon.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 49:


ALP, 49—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Bush, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Hunt, Kelly, A. King, S. King, Linard, Lui, Madden, Martin, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Skelton, Smith, Stewart, Sullivan, Tantari, Walker, Whiting.

Pairs: Butcher, Weir; Lauga, Molhoek.

Resolved in the negative.

MOTION

Suspension of Standing Orders

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (11.51 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

That, with respect to the Police Service Administration and Other Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2), standing orders 87 and 150 be suspended to allow the bill and any amendments circulated by the minister to be moved and considered.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.


Motion agreed to.

HOUSING LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from 16 March (see p. 592), on motion of Ms Enoch—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Mr MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (11.52 am): I rise to speak on the Housing Legislation Amendment Bill. In the first part of my contribution I want to refer to some of the comments that the minister made in her second reading speech, in particular her reference to the Housing Summit and the government announcements that have been made in the housing space. Today we have our third housing round table/summit and questions have to be asked and were asked today in question time: what are the real results of the Housing Summit? Today we heard that the government made a major significant announcement a couple of months ago about granny flats when the Deputy Premier said that thousands of Queenslanders would benefit from that. Today the Premier could not answer the question on how many extra people are in granny flats. The housing minister has been asked this before and she could not answer. As well as that, the Deputy Premier had been asked and none of them can point to a single person being housed under the so-called granny flat legislation.

Ms ENOCH: Mr Deputy Speaker Kelly, I rise to a point of order on relevance. The bill is very clearly about two particular items and I feel as though the member might be straying from that.

Mr MANDER: Just a point of clarification that might help, Mr Deputy Speaker?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): I will allow it.

Mr MANDER: Mr Deputy Speaker, I have the minister's speech in front of me where she has gone into some detail about the Housing Summit and the announcements that came out of the Housing Summit. I am simply referring to her own speech about the Housing Legislation Amendment Bill and having a counterview to what she has put forward.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will take some advice.

Ms PEASE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Already this morning Mr Speaker has spoken frequently about the correct use of titles and the member is not doing so and I ask that he be reminded to refer to members by their correct titles.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, I would give a general reminder to everyone to use correct titles please. I will take some advice. I will allow the member to continue because he is responding to statements made in an earlier speech, but I would ask you to at some point come back to the long title of the bill.

Mr MANDER: I will most definitely do that, Mr Deputy Speaker. We have had one of those significant announcements from the previous housing summits and we have had very little results. As well as that, the Griffith University accommodation was announced. On the original announcement there should have been people there a couple of weeks ago living in that accommodation of, I think it was, 250 units. From memory, from the original Housing Summit or just before that, the announcement was made that the Catholic Church was donating 90 properties. I have not heard one thing about the development of that very generous offer by the church.

We have heard about the Housing Investment Fund, and the minister continues to crow about that fund, but today again when asked in the parliament whether one single person had been housed from that fund that was announced two years ago we were told that construction still has not started on those north side projects at Redcliffe and Chermside. Another thing that came out of the Housing Summit was a so-called audit of state government land and houses which was announced on 1 December. We were told that it was going to be done in three months, yet it is now well past three months and we have seen no results from that audit. Then I think it was at the second round table that the minister announced that a retirement village at Clayfield would be housing people within two months, but the two months is up and there is no sign whatsoever that there will be people housed in that former retirement village anywhere in the near future.

Announcement after announcement after announcement from the housing summits have provided very little results. Then we have today's round table. I do not think there can be a greater example of contempt as has been displayed by this government towards the people coming to this housing round table today. It has been treated so insignificantly that it has been put on a parliamentary sitting day, squeezed into the lunch break. That is the first thing.

The second thing is that this morning this government made an announcement about tenancy changes without going to the housing round table to get its thoughts or opinions. The government is imposing its view on the round table, so it is just ticking a box and going through the motions once again. Somebody who is going to the round table has shown me how the government is engaging with people. It is engaging with people through a digital survey, so those people attending today are coming with three questions that they have to answer which are so inane and there has been no proper consultation or discussion about real issues. This is about ticking a box.

Today's announcement that is coming out of the housing round table comes from a week of chaos with regard to rents. The Premier said that there was going to be a rental cap. Whether that was a thought bubble or whether that was prearranged, no-one knows. Then we had the Deputy Premier coming out the next day and saying, 'Yes, there might be caps, but we'll cap it to CPI.' After the blowback from those who know how damaging those types of announcements would be to the economy, the Premier went on TV and said, 'No. The public misinterpreted what I said.'

Mr Langbroek: And went off on a tangent.

Mr MANDER: Yes, went off on a tangent. That is what the Premier said. Chaos, chaos, chaos: that is what we are seeing in this space with regard to trying to solve what is most definitely a housing crisis. The government continues to talk about the inroads it is making into addressing the current housing crisis. The minister addressed that in her speech.

Over the weekend I received an answer to a question on notice that asked how many social housing properties we have today compared to six years ago. In that period of time—in six years—the number of properties has only increased by three per cent, despite all the announcements that the government makes, despite the fact that the number of those on the housing waiting list has blown out by 60 to 70 per cent. It also is very concerning that in the Inala Housing Service Centre, which covers the Premier's electorate, there has been not one single extra social housing property in six years. The number that was there six years ago is the exact same number that was there on 1 January 2023.

Dr Rowan: Disgraceful!

Mr MANDER: Absolutely disgraceful. I will take that interjection. The stock is not being renewed. The number of properties that are 40 years old and over has increased by 38 per cent in the last six years. We do have a housing crisis. It is important that we have real policies that address this now, not in five years time. When I talk to community housing providers they talk about the now and the wow. All these statements about the future they put in the category of 'the wow': 'Wow, look at that.' What about now? What is happening right now to get people into houses?

We have a minister who is clearly out of her depth in this space. Let me give members an example. This week the minister was on radio and urged people who had a housing need to ring the housing hotline.

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hart): Pause the clock. Members, there is too much interjection. I note there are several people out of their seats.

Mr MANDER: She urged people to ring the housing hotline if they were suffering from housing stress. The announcer asked the very obvious question, 'Okay, Minister, what is the hotline number?' She did not know the hotline number of her own department despite urging people to ring that number.

Mr Bailey interjected.

Mr MANDER: She could not provide it. It is absolutely embarrassing. You could not make this stuff up. At least the Treasurer said, 'Ring my electorate office'. I ask Queenslanders in housing stress to ring the Woodridge electorate office and see if the Treasurer can help you—because he cannot.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Miller, you are under a warning. Leave the chamber for an hour.

Whereupon the honourable member for Miller withdrew from the chamber at 12.03 pm.

Mr MANDER: We have had plenty of announcements, we have had plenty of bluster about what the government is doing, but the opposition continues to show that these announcements come to nothing. I have rattled off half a dozen examples already where they have made these empty promises and they cannot keep them. Yesterday the government made an announcement about the rapid build accommodation, the prefab homes. They are downsizing their ambitions in the next six months from what they originally announced. It is nothing short of an embarrassment.

We will not be opposing this bill because it is very uncontroversial. The reason it is not controversial is that there is not a heck of a lot of substance in it. As I have already mentioned, and we have seen it consistently not just in this term but over the last eight years, when it comes to housing and this government there is a lot of talk, a lot of rhetoric, plenty of announcements, but it is rarely ever matched with outcomes and the delivery which is promised. This Housing Legislation Amendment Bill 2022 in some ways brings that point to the fore. It is no secret that we are in the middle of a housing crisis. We do not use the word 'crisis' lightly, but that is definitely what we have.

Mr Whiting: You use it all the time!

Mr MANDER: I will take the interjection. We use it all the time because we have a housing crisis, we have a hospital crisis and we have a youth crime crisis. This government lurches from crisis to crisis. There is nothing but chaos with this government. What people are looking for is stability and good decision-making and they are not getting it from this government. The interjection was very relevant and I thank the member for that interjection.

There are some people who simply cannot get a house. Some people have never experienced housing stress before. Some people are not able to afford their rent as the cost of living increases right across this state. They are trying to scrape together every cent they can to pay the rent. Some people have no place to live. It is important that we do everything that we can do. The government's own admission is that this piece of legislation is in response to the crisis which is unfolding in our suburbs and towns right across the length and breadth of this state. More to the point, the legislation is in part a response by the government to issues raised at the Housing Summit in October last year.

This bill amends the Housing Act 2003, the Housing Regulation 2015 and the Retirement Villages Act 1999. The amendments to the Housing Act and the Housing Regulation deal with the establishment of the Homes for Homes donation deed model in Queensland, which I will focus on first. As I have alluded to, bringing the Homes for Homes donation deed model to Queensland was 'a key action' of the *Queensland Housing Summit: outcomes report*. Again we have had another announcement, lots of press releases, but the tangible change in outcomes is limited. With the establishment of Homes for Homes in this legislation we need to have a mature and honest conversation about what it is reasonably

likely to achieve. The opposition will not stand in the way of the Homes for Homes initiative which was raised at the Housing Summit. Homes for Homes is an organisation trying to do its bit to put a roof over people's heads and we, as the opposition, commend them for that. It is an independent, not-for-profit company that raises funds to provide social and affordable housing through people making a tax deductible 0.1 per cent donation from the sale of their property and was established by the social enterprise, the Big Issue.

I note the Community Support and Services Committee's report on the bill cited that Homes for Homes is operational in all Australian states and territories and has granted over \$1.28 million in funding for 13 projects in Victoria, Queensland, the Northern Territory and the Australian Capital Territory. Giving people the option to voluntarily make these donations is great, and we certainly will not stand in the way. However, as I said earlier, let us be honest and mature about the scale of donations that we can expect and subsequent investment which we are likely to see as a result of this legislation.

Everybody in Queensland is very aware of the cost-of-living pressures that we are all facing. Many individuals, couples and families are scratching together every last cent they can to put a deposit on their home, let alone making the ongoing repayments in the face of rocketing interest rates. As such, we are being realistic about how much money this is likely to raise, and we hope that the government is too. There is no getting around the fact that with less disposable income in the pockets of Queenslanders the likelihood of someone voluntarily making a donation under this model is reduced. We have to be up-front about this initiative. It will not be the panacea for all the problems that I mentioned earlier that we have here in Queensland in regard to housing.

I want to stress that this is not a criticism of Homes for Homes and the work that they do. It is just a reality of the world in which we live where paying for the necessities like groceries, fuel, rent and mortgages is becoming increasingly more difficult. The reality is that the donations collected through the Homes for Homes model will be a drop in the ocean of what is needed given the sheer enormity of the housing crisis that Queensland is in the grips of. In her explanatory speech, when talking about the Homes for Homes initiative the minister said every bit helps and I agree. However, we are going to need a lot more than this to solve our housing crisis.

I note that the Community Support and Services Committee made three recommendations in relation to the Homes for Homes provision of the bill. The recommendations suggest some minor technical changes and clarifications along with ensuring that clear communication of any donation is voluntary. They are valid recommendations that the LNP supports. My fear is that, while the worthwhile establishment of Homes for Homes is a good thing, the government may try to sell it as some sort of silver bullet to work their way out of a political bind. The situation is far too dire for that so I implore those opposite not to peddle false hope but to get on with delivering.

I move on to address the components of the bill relating to the changes to the Retirement Villages Act. The explanatory notes for the bill cite the following objectives of the bill in relation to retirement villages—

1. Address limitations in the RV Act's existing provisions and regulation-making power for achieving the policy goal of more transparent, accountable, and consistent financial reporting
2. Improve financial transparency of village operations by increased access to financial documents
3. Strengthen public confidence in a financially transparent and accountable retirement village industry.

The government has stated that the amendments will increase access to particular village financial documents for village residents, the department and the public register for retirement villages. I will say from the get-go that the LNP appreciate that these amendments are well-intentioned but we do fear that there may be some unintended consequences associated with this proposal.

Although the intention of the bill is clear in improving transparency and compliance in financial reporting for retirement village operators, the LNP fear that the consequence of these amendments will be increased obligations and, therefore, costs for village operators. We all know what that means: it means that those costs are often passed on to residents and that is a concern that we have. There is a concern that smaller operators that previously may have been able to deal with financial reporting requirements internally will now have to engage external accounting services to meet the proposed requirements. Again, there is a cost associated with outsourcing work previously done in-house and it will be the residents who will have to pay for that.

It is important to bring some context to this debate in relation to the Retirement Villages Act. These amendments follow a string of consistent legislative changes brought on by issues identified in the act over recent years. The most recent amendment to the Retirement Villages Act, prior to this bill, was in the Housing Legislation Amendment Bill 2021. Included in those amendments was an exemption

for freehold resident operated retirement villages from existing statutory buyback requirements. I think, Mr Deputy Speaker, you will recall that very well. The issue was highlighted by LNP members in 2017 and 2019 respectively and yet on both occasions the government did not listen. We hope that these changes will not be a case of *deja vu*.


While the LNP will not oppose the amendments to the bill we take that position with some reservation due to change after change made to the Retirement Villages Act, which the government has overseen after amendments that it introduced proved to be unworkable in the past. The government must choose to implement these changes in a commonsense fashion. It cannot be burdensome and it has to be practical. We have to get the balance right. Every effort possible must be made to ensure that the implementation of these changes does not add to the cost of running villages—a cost that will be passed on to residents at a time when they can ill afford it.

Both the Property Council of Queensland and the Urban Development Institute of Australia highlighted their concerns, which we share. Both noted that, though well-intentioned, these amendments would likely lead to increasing obligations and costs for retirement village operators. Both groups shared their concern that those costs would likely be passed on to retirement village residents. The Property Council was particularly direct with their concerns, stating—

In the wake of the Housing Summit, the Government has stated that increasing housing affordability and availability is a top priority. The Bill appears to be counterintuitive to this priority ...

The LNP will closely monitor this situation with the hope that the government implements these changes sensibly so that retirees and pensioners are not forced to pay more in the middle of a cost-of-living crunch. We do not want to come back here again, as too often we have with the Retirement Villages Act, so fixing up these issues at the time of implementation is vital.

That is my contribution to the Housing Legislation Amendment Bill 2022, which the LNP will be supporting. Whilst well-intentioned, these amendments will not make a significant difference to the housing crisis that we have. It is very important that this government responds quickly to those people who are desperate for a home and those who are desperately trying to pay their rent. The only way that the problem can be solved is by supplying more houses for those who want to buy a house, for those who want to be in affordable housing and for those who desperately need social housing. Until we have enough properties, this crisis will continue and, unfortunately, I cannot see it being solved in the near future.

 **Ms McMILLAN** (Mansfield—ALP) (12.15 pm): In following the member for Everton I note that he encourages the minister and the Labor government to get the balance right. I can absolutely assure the member that Labor has a much greater chance of getting the balance right than the LNP had, certainly under his leadership.

I am pleased to speak in favour of the Housing Legislation Amendment Bill 2022. I chaired the Community Support and Services Committee, with the support of the Acting Chair, Chris Whiting, through our examination of the Housing Legislation Amendment Bill 2022. The committee's report was tabled in the House last year. The bill amends the Housing Act 2003 and the Housing Regulation 2015 to establish a charitable donation deed model in Queensland. This significant amendment will allow for donation deed models like Homes for Homes to operate in our state. It also amends the Retirement Villages Act 1999 to increase the transparency, accountability and consistency of financial reporting in Queensland retirement villages.

These important reforms build on the Palaszczuk government's commitment to delivering more social and affordable housing together with housing support for vulnerable Queenslanders, such as the 32 one-bedroom-unit apartment block in Mount Gravatt, which is being built at a cost of \$6.3 million, or the money given to Southside Community Care in my electorate, which will support those who are most vulnerable. These reforms also highlight our continued commitment to transparency and accountability in government.

The committee I chaired recommended that the bill be passed, along with eight other recommendations. The committee report acknowledged that most stakeholders were in support of the amendments to the Housing Act and the Housing Regulation to allow the operation of the Homes for Homes donation deed model in Queensland. The committee also acknowledged suggestions by the Queensland Law Society to improve the clarity of the drafting.

The committee noted a concern about the clarity of the process for the removal of an administrative advice and whether a registered owner who was not a party to the donation deed would be able to remove an administrative advice. The committee recommended that government consider

whether the definition of 'party' to the charitable donation deed should be clarified to ensure a registered owner can remove an advice and whether further specification of the process and evidentiary requirements are needed. The committee also recommended that explanations of the process for lodging and removing the administrative advice be outlined clearly and simply in community messaging.


The committee recommended amendments to the drafting to add the words 'in the State' to section 941(b)(ii), which relates to the definition of a charitable donation deed. The purpose of the additional wording is to be consistent with the wording elsewhere in the provision and to provide certainty about the requirement that funds raised in Queensland should be used for social and affordable housing projects within Queensland.

For retirement villages, several recommendations refer to ongoing consultation with key stakeholders about the next stages of the work to implement the financial reporting reforms. The report acknowledges a range of stakeholder views on the retirement village amendments in the bill based on submissions to the committee and the public hearing. This included strong support for the amendments as well as concerns, primarily from industry groups, about increased operator obligations, compliance costs and certainty about implementation time frames. The committee recommended that the department continue to consult with scheme operators, residents and other stakeholders when drafting the proposed amendment regulation to ensure that financial documents and statements available to operators and residents are clear and appropriate.

The committee report noted concerns raised by stakeholders about the availability of suitably qualified and independent quantity surveyors, especially in regional Queensland. The report also noted that in smaller communities there are quantity surveyors already working for village operators. The committee recommended consideration be given to amending the definition of 'quantity surveyor'. I note the minister's comments as to why this recommendation has not been accepted. I thank her and the government for their considered response. The committee report also acknowledged stakeholder views about the potential for extra costs associated with additional financial reporting requirements to be passed on to village residents, many of whom are under financial stress due to the rising cost of living or have no additional income. The committee recommended the minister consider compliance measures to ensure any extra costs associated with additional financial reporting requirements are not passed on to retirement village residents.

The committee supported the provision in the bill for the chief executive to make and publish guidelines under the Retirement Villages Act 1999 and recommended that the department continue to consult with key stakeholders to ensure that all guidelines are clear and useful for both retirement village scheme operators and residents. Reiterating the importance of consultation, the committee recommended that the department continue to consult with key stakeholders to ensure the proposed transitional arrangements are clear, appropriate and reasonable. The report also noted that stakeholders are seeking clarity and certainty about the timing of the proposed transitional provisions.

I again thank my fellow members of the Community Support and Services Committee for their detailed review of this bill. I am pleased that the minister has indicated the government will fully accept six of the nine recommendations outlined in the report and will partially accept two. Lastly, I thank the individuals and organisations who made submissions and provided evidence to the Community Support and Services Committee through the course of the inquiry. I also thank the minister for her detailed consideration of the report and her ongoing leadership of managing housing in Queensland in terms of the challenges we face. It is very clear that we are making tremendous progress in this area. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Mr BENNETT** (Burnett—LNP) (12.22 pm): This bill proposes to amend the Housing Act 2003 and the Housing Regulation 2015 and to establish a charitable donation deed model in Queensland. The bill also proposes to amend the Retirement Villages Act 1999 and implement certain reforms relating to standardised requirements for retirement village financial reporting, statements and budgets. The stated purpose of the bill is to increase transparency, accountability and consistency of financial reporting in Queensland retirement villages.

The Australian Institute of Quantity Surveyors stated in their submission to the committee that they are aware of the lack of transparency and accountability through complaints they have received about retirement villages—the ones they represent and have been to—particularly those aspects impacting retirement village residents. This is common in virtually all jurisdictions across Australia and it is essential that both retirement village operators and their residents are aware of how the capital replacement fund and the annual maintenance reserve fund are developed and what those funds can and cannot be used for.

There is also a need to provide in plain English the difference between capital items and maintenance. The Australian Institute of Quantity Surveyors proposes to work with the department of communities and housing to establish a guide for those quantity surveyors that will be freely available to retirement village operators and retirement village residents explaining the quantity surveyor's role and providing transparency about how capital replacement funds are developed, what the funds can be used for and the difference between capital items and assets to which maintenance funding should be applied.

The committee heard about some concerns that the effect of the bill will be greater compliance obligations on operators of retirement villages, the cost of which will be borne by residents. These greater obligations take the form of numerous information requirements within the bill which are duplicative and unnecessarily burdensome to operators. This will have a particularly significant effect on smaller operators, who will need to engage external accounting services in order to meet these requirements. Adding more red tape simply transfers more costs in return for more bureaucracy to older Queenslanders—in fact mostly pensioners. Further, it adds another layer of cost to the perfect storm smashing struggling pensioners.

We heard from submissions about the 15 per cent wage increase out of the Fair Work Commission's aged-care industry decision; massive increases in the cost of electricity, gas and fuel; big cost increases in building products and maintenance; record inflation; and devastating cost-of-living increases for basic food, care and transport.


I am concerned about the extra costs being forced upon residents as a result of this bill. To not understand that the minister has not acknowledged the issue and the committee recommendations in full is disappointing. The Retirement Villages Act is in a complete mess, to be fair. It is dysfunctional and not meeting the expectations of residents. I understand the frustration when we hear that the solution is to just trust the department—the same department that has presided over decades of dysfunction. What could go wrong?

The Homes for Homes model is simple. It raises funds from voluntary tax-deductible donations as part of an existing property transaction process that leverages both money raised and existing capacity in the community to increase the supply of social and affordable housing, benefiting those vulnerable Queenslanders desperate for housing solutions. For me, it was interesting to learn that those people standing on street corners handing out those newspapers are part of Homes for Homes. I will certainly be looking at them in a different light and maybe supporting their need to communicate with the community. It is something that I did not realise. I commend them on the work they are doing.

The Homes for Homes submission stated that conservative economic modelling shows that just three per cent of residential properties registered with Homes for Homes by 2050 could realise over \$200 million in donations from Queenslanders. Homes for Homes grants these funds to community housing providers through an open tender process to create new social and affordable housing for the most vulnerable in our community. It is encouraging to see the use of community housing providers being expanded and, finally, the acknowledgement that the private sector has a role to play. I commend the committee's report to anyone with an interest in the issues raised, particularly those nine recommendations referencing stakeholder, community and committee feedback.

While the Housing Legislation Amendment Bill provides an opportunity for not-for-profits to be part of the solution, we need to do so much more in addressing the housing crisis some eight years in the making. As we have been saying for the past eight years, we need to be bold. We need to be innovative in delivering housing solutions and not afraid to work with the private sector utilising the huge state controlled land bank. We need to stop the spin and the denials. The government has a real problem in identifying the problem of its own making.

This bill is not a silver bullet for the housing crisis. We need to do a lot more, as has been talked about. As we know, a lot of effort in this parliament has been directed at housing issues. While this bill goes some way to providing new community housing provider funding, it is time we really unleashed the potential of Queensland's building sector, including both the private sector and the government sector. More importantly, it is about all of us pulling together to make sure this housing crisis is something we can get rid of. It is a monkey on our back. Queenslanders deserve so much more.

 **Ms LUI** (Cook—ALP) (12.28 pm): I rise today to speak on the Housing Legislation Amendment Bill 2022. The bill was introduced to the Legislative Assembly and referred to the committee on 27 October 2022. The committee invited stakeholders and subscribers to make submissions on the bill, with almost 900 submissions received. From the outset I acknowledge the Minister for Housing,

Leeanne Enoch, for her ongoing work to strengthen the housing market in Queensland; the chair of the Community Support and Services Committee, Corrine McMillan; members of the committee; the committee secretariat; and Hansard for their hard work in the examination of the bill. The committee made nine recommendations and recommended that the Housing Legislation Amendment Bill be passed.

According to 2022 figures from the Department of State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning, over 50,000 people moved to Queensland from other states. Largely driven by the COVID pandemic, the mass migration of people to Queensland has put unprecedented pressures on the private rental market and impacted social housing. There is no denying that since the COVID pandemic the housing issue in Queensland has become very complex, factoring in unprecedented population migration, rising house prices, limited land availability, record low rental vacancies, building supply issues, labour shortages and so on.

There is no quick fix to the housing problem we are experiencing in Queensland and I applaud the Palaszczuk government for pulling out all stops to address the housing shortage in this state. The Queensland Housing Strategy 2017-2027 sets a 10-year framework for driving key reforms and targeted investment across the housing continuum to ensure Queenslanders have access to safe and affordable housing. The Housing Strategy aims to ensure confidence in the housing market, consumers are protected and the housing legislation framework is reformed and modernised.


The Housing Legislation Amendment Bill 2022 helps meet the objectives of the Housing Strategy by assisting to boost the supply of social and affordable housing and increase private sector investment into the Queensland economy through enabling the Homes for Homes donation deed model in Queensland and maintaining public confidence in the retirement village industry by increasing consumer protections and reforming the legislative framework for improved transparency, accountability and consistency of financial reporting in retirement villages.

One of the policy objectives of the bill is to amend legislation to support the establishment and operation of the Homes for Homes donation deed model in Queensland. Homes for Homes is an independent not-for-profit company that raises funds to provide social and affordable housing through people making tax deductible donations from the sale of their property. Established by the social enterprise the Big Issue, Homes for Homes is operational in all Australian states and territories. Support for the Homes for Homes initiative is consistent with the Housing Strategy objective of boosting the supply of affordable housing.

The second policy objective of the bill is focused on improving financial reporting in Queensland retirement villages. The policy objectives of the bill in relation to retirement villages are to: address limitations in the Retirement Villages Act's existing provisions and regulation-making power for achieving the policy goal of more transparent, accountable and consistent financial reporting; improve financial transparency of village operations by increasing access to finance documents; and strengthen public confidence in a financially transparent and accountable retirement village industry.

The Retirement Villages Act establishes the regulatory framework for the operation of retirement village schemes in Queensland. The Retirement Villages Act places obligations on scheme operators for keeping village funds for general services, maintenance and capital replacement, fund budgets and related quantity surveyor reports, quarterly financial statements, audited and financial statements and audited reports. Issues about financial transparency and accountability constitute a high volume of village resident complaints made to the Department of Communities, Housing and Digital Economy as well as compliance work with operators and disputes brought under the Retirement Villages Act, including through the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal.

This is a good bill. It brings fairness to residents and resident committees, supporting peace of mind whilst encouraging rights to information, consultation and some decision-making processes. I fully support the amendments in this bill. It is absolutely necessary and aligns with the Queensland Housing Strategy to address the ongoing housing need and demand in this state. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Dr MacMAHON** (South Brisbane—Grn) (12.33 pm): I rise to make my contribution on the Housing Legislation Amendment Bill 2022. This month we learned that around 300,000 Queenslanders are homeless or in housing stress. Home ownership continues to fall and people are increasingly reliant on a largely unregulated private rental market where rents are skyrocketing and vacancy rates are at historic lows.

Working people who tried to escape the rental crisis and took out a mortgage on the promise that interest rates would not rise are now spending more and more of their income on repayments, pushing homeowners into severe housing stress. Far more money is being lent to investors than first homebuyers and unfair tax systems like negative gearing are accelerating inflation.

There are clear solutions in the Better Together report and the Pawson report released by QCOSS this month. The solutions have been presented to this government time and time again by experts and pushed by the Greens: build public housing, control rents, increase renters' rights and tax vacant homes. Stop incentivising a profit-driven housing system that treats housing like a commodity rather than a home.

Instead of any of these solutions, we have this bill. This is not the action on housing that Queenslanders need—not even close. Besides some long overdue changes to residential villages' financial reporting, all this bill does is allow a charity to put an administrative note on the title of a person's property. That note simply reminds the property owner that they promise to donate some money to the charity when they sell that home that they might use to build affordable housing. This is what the government calls action on the housing crisis.

The bill will allow just one charity to receive these funds—Homes for Homes. Homes for Homes asks individuals and developers to commit to donating 0.1 per cent of a property sale to their social and affordable housing fund. To be clear, this charitable scheme is already fully compliant with our existing laws in Queensland.

Homes for Homes has been operating since 2015. Since then, just 1,870 homes have been registered with the charity, but they say that they expect within the coming years they will have 18,000 homes registered. Putting aside the government's seed funding that is going towards this—a poppy seed of seed funding, if you will—0.1 per cent of the sale value of 18,000 properties would be equivalent to a grand total of 18 homes. I do not mean 18 homes for Queensland. That figure is for the entire country. Charitable donations are obviously welcome, but let us be clear: this will not even come close to touching the sides of the housing crisis that Labor and the LNP have created.

From the title of the bill we would think this bill did something a little more than legislate the bureaucratic equivalent of a Facebook poke. It is indeed embarrassing. Having said that, even 18 more homes would be an enormous boost when this government's track record on building new social and public housing is so appalling. The government has built just 4,000 units of social housing since 2014. In the same time, they have sold more than 2,000 public housing properties into the private rental market. Because of this government, there is a shortfall of 31,000 social homes in Queensland. To clarify again, based on—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hart): Members, there are too many interjections. I remind those members who should know they are on a warning that I will not tolerate any interjections from them.

Dr MacMAHON: To clarify again: based on Homes for Homes' own projections, the changes that this bill will facilitate will build just 18 homes. On the government's watch the social housing waiting list has almost doubled since 2018. Some 46,000 people are on the social housing waiting list—a waitlist that is years long and includes single parents and their children, people with disabilities and domestic violence victims. All of them are waiting for housing while languishing in insecure housing or in homelessness.

What is more, this government has deliberately obscured the real size of the crisis by tightening the social housing eligibility criteria and only approving high-needs applicants. They did not like how the housing numbers were looking so instead of addressing the crisis they started to fudge the numbers.

If people want to donate money to help those who have been left behind by this government we welcome that, but the government cannot use these crumbs as a distraction from their failures while record numbers of people suffer. Clearly this government does not understand what 0.1 per cent means if they think Homes for Homes will be anything more than a drop in the ocean. This bill is not even 0.1 per cent of proper housing policy.

Data this week showed that 831 adults and 359 children—107 of whom are under the age of five—sought help from Micah projects last month. That is 831 adults and 359 children who will all be clamouring to get into Homes for Homes 18 dwellings.

It must be incredibly appealing to this Labor government to think that a few wealthy investors and developers could fix Labor's housing crisis with a 0.1 per cent donation. After all, that is who they are listening to when they are writing housing policy. This government does not represent renters, people

who are sleeping rough and people who are struggling to pay their mortgage; it represents landlords and developers. Many of the landlords sitting in this House today are profiting off the housing crisis and soaring rents, siphoning off working people's wages to put money in their pockets.

Right now countless former MPs from both the Labor Party and the LNP sit on the boards of banks and real estate corporations, and they are the same ones who are paying to have fancy lunches with politicians. Anna Bligh, former leader of the Queensland Labor Party, is now the chief—

Ms ENOCH: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. I ask you to rule on that.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hart): Member for South Brisbane, I have allowed a little bit of latitude, as we have for other members, but I would draw you back to the long title of the bill. This bill is about two things specifically, so I would appreciate it if you would talk to those.

Dr MacMAHON: Going back to the long title, the government would like ordinary Queenslanders to believe that this bill, which encourages voluntary donations to a charity, could solve the housing crisis because they do not want Queenslanders to consider that the problem really lies with Labor and the LNP and the property portfolios of wealthy investors and their mates in corporate boardrooms. The government has no desire to genuinely fix a broken system by putting renters and first home buyers first. There is no interest in fixing the broken system they have created, acting in their own interests and the interests of their corporate mates.

The more this government can distract with summits and round tables and nearly useless bills like this, the less time we have to spend looking at the actual causes of the housing crisis and the things that would solve it. We know that Queensland is a really wealthy state. I would like to remind everyone that we have a \$5 billion surplus because the government finally decided to raise coal royalties. Let's just hark back to the last time the government put in a voluntary scheme when they said to mining companies—

Ms KING: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I question the relevance of the member's current contribution and refer to your former ruling.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for South Brisbane, I am listening carefully to what have you to say. You are starting to stray away and I will pull you up.

Dr MacMAHON: I am just drawing parallels between this voluntary scheme and the voluntary scheme the government put in place asking mining companies to tip in a little bit more. In terms of royalties, it raised hardly any money and fell flat on its face. It was not until the government raised royalties—

Mr Berkman interjected.

Dr MacMAHON:—that we started to see more money coming into the Queensland Treasury to invest in the things we need, following, as my colleague has said, Greens policy to raise coal royalties. This begs the question: where are we going? Why are we going to all this effort for a nearly useless bureaucratic change to property titles, which is what this bill does. This bill is being presented by the government as something that will help the housing crisis here in Queensland, but in essence it is a charity. This bill facilitates something that can already happen in Queensland. We do not even need to pass this legislation. As noble as donations to social housing are, the scheme will deliver just a handful of community housing homes nationally when we have a shortfall in Queensland of 31,000.

Why are we wasting our time on this? Why are we not getting to the bottom of who is actually controlling the millions of dollars in the Housing Investment Fund, for example? Given that this bill looks to have emerged from the Housing Summit, I would like to spend a moment reflecting on the Housing Summit. Rental affordability was not touched on at that summit at all, which is reflective of how this government treats renters, because they did not talk about rental affordability at all. From what I can tell, there were just—

Ms McMILLAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. I am the third member who has raised the issue of relevance. This bill is not about rental caps, the price of rents et cetera.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for South Brisbane, I am going to give you some latitude because the minister brought up this subject, but please stick mostly to the bill.

Dr MacMAHON: To clarify, this bill seems to have come out of the Housing Summit. Other key solutions that we would have liked to have seen come out of the Housing Summit are not being talked about at all because there were not any renters in the room. In light of this, I would like to move the following amendment to the second reading—

That the words 'be now read a second time' be deleted and the following words inserted: 'That Queensland introduce a two-year rent freeze, followed by long-term cap on rent increases at two per cent every two years.'

I table this motion. To conclude, this bill is an embarrassment and Queenslanders deserve more.

Tabled paper: Housing Legislation Amendment Bill 2022, amendment to second reading motion moved by Dr Amy MacMahon MP [\[375\]](#).

Ms McMILLAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I seek your guidance and advice. My understanding is that there is a bill before the House that relates to the amendments the member for South Brisbane has proposed. As the chair of this committee, I do recall writing a report about this. I seek your advice as to whether what the member for South Brisbane is doing is appropriate.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will just take some advice on that. Member for South Brisbane, we are going to seek some further advice on that. We will hold proceedings for the moment.

Ms McMILLAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a further point of order. While you are getting some advice, I would also question whether now is the appropriate time for the amendments being proposed by the member for South Brisbane.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member; that is the advice we are seeking.

Deputy Speaker's Ruling, Amendment Out of Order

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for South Brisbane, on advice I am ruling that amendment out of order.

Mr SKELTON (Nicklin—ALP) (12.47 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Palaszczuk government's Housing Legislation Amendment Bill. Obviously it delivers two important reforms. I want to reflect on the previous nauseating contribution that wasted a lot of time in the chamber talking about other issues. The Queensland Housing Strategy 2017-2027, the Palaszczuk government's 10-year framework, aims to ensure access to safe, secure and affordable housing for Queenslanders. The strategy also seeks to ensure confidence in housing markets, consumer protection and modernisation of the housing legislative framework. The Housing Legislation Amendment Bill helps achieve these objectives by enabling the Homes for Homes donation deed model, which aims to boost the supply of social and affordable housing and increase private sector investment in the Queensland economy. Moreover, the bill aims to maintain public confidence in the retirement village industry by increasing consumer protections and reforming the legislative framework for improved transparency, accountability and consistency of financial reporting in retirement villages.

I will talk a little bit about the Homes for Homes program and the organisation responsible, the Big Issue, as the program makes up a major part of these amendments. The *Big Issue* is a street newspaper which has been operating in Australia since June 1996. Since then the *Big Issue* has sold over 13 million copies, earning nearly \$31 million for the enterprise. This has allowed them to employ over 7,000 street vendors over nearly three decades. These vendors are always people who are homeless or come from marginalised or disadvantaged backgrounds. It goes without saying that the *Big Issue* has been life-changing for many disadvantaged Australians, especially our homeless.

Homes for Homes was launched by the Big Issue in 2015. The initiative is simple—it encourages home owners to make donations of 0.1 per cent of their property's price at the time of sale. These donations are tax deductible. Unlike the erroneous claims that were just made by the member for South Brisbane, this does not operate in the state of Queensland—hence this amendment.


Homes for Homes distributes this money to social housing providers to build housing in areas most affected by the current housing shortage. The Homes for Homes initiative operates in other jurisdictions using a permissive caveat on the land title to remind selling property owners to make the voluntary donation under the donation deed and perpetuate the participation of the property in the initiative. However, Queensland's land titling law does not support the use of caveats in the same way. That is why we are amending the bill—just for the advice of the Greens party.

The administrative advice serves as a reminder to the landowner at the time the land is sold that a Homes for Homes donation deed exists and that the owner has agreed to donate a portion of the sale price to Homes for Homes. However, it does not bind successors in title. Overall, the bill seeks to support the initiative in Queensland as part of our Housing Strategy to ensure safe, secure and affordable housing for Queenslanders.

The Retirement Villages Act has been spoken about. It provides the regulatory framework for retirement village schemes in Queensland. The act places obligations on scheme operators. It also requires them to provide residents with regular financial statements, audited annual financial statements and audit reports. The act gives residents the right to access this information and participate in decision-making regarding financial statements and budgets.

However, transparency has been an issue for the industry, and this has been brought to the attention of the department. In late 2019 amendments were made to the housing legislation to improve transparency, accountability and consistency. The department contracted an independent firm, and hence we are making these changes. These reforms aim to provide more transparent and consistent financial statements and budgets to village residents and the department.

I want to thank the committee for their research into the bill. I am a part of that committee. I will add that I am a renter so I am actually in the room when these decisions are being made. I would like to thank our housing minister and her partnerships. I have some social housing in Nambour and I will be able to deliver some community housing in Yandina in June. They will be doing another contract with Coast2Bay thanks to the department. We also have Eco Cottages participating in the prefab homes. These are all just little things that tie into the big issue of housing affordability and homelessness. It is just another step in meeting our commitment under the Palaszczuk government's Housing and Homelessness Action Plan. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Dr ROBINSON** (Oodgeroo—LNP) (12.52 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Housing Legislation Amendment Bill 2022. The government's Queensland Housing Strategy 2017-2027 is a 10-year framework that is supposed to ensure Queenslanders have access to safe, secure and affordable housing. The strategy is supposed to ensure confidence in housing markets, ensure consumers are protected and ensure the housing legislative framework is reformed and modernised. The bill supposedly helps meet the objectives of the Housing Strategy by assisting to boost the supply of social and affordable housing and increase private sector investment into the Queensland economy through enabling the Homes for Homes donation deed model in Queensland and by maintaining public confidence in the retirement village industry. In doing so, the bill amends the Housing Act 2003, the Housing Regulation 2015 and the Retirement Villages Act 1999.

In terms of the issue of boosting social and affordable housing and building new housing, the government needs to invest more funding directly into building new housing stock. There are roughly 50,000 people still on a waiting list, and that number is not getting any smaller in a hurry—contrast that with when the LNP was in government and the housing waiting list that we inherited came down in our time.

More than announcements in parliament is needed. Funding needs to actually deliver, and over the last eight years little has happened. More funding into Redlands Coast housing is needed, but over the last eight years little has happened. The people of Queensland should look at what this government does, not at what it says and not at what it announces. For example, the government promised to build new housing on North Stradbroke Island during the economic transition from mining to a tourism centred economy. The government especially promised that new houses would be built for the Quandamooka people on North Stradbroke Island, Minjerribah, but since 2015-16 nothing has been built according to Quandamooka leaders.

That is why I gave the housing minister a chance to tell us what she has actually been doing, apart from the announcements. I asked the minister a question in a sitting week about a report by the Quandamooka leaders that no new housing stock had been built for them in the last eight years. If I recall correctly, on the day the minister did not answer with a particular number. The number put to her was zero, which was the number local Quandamooka leaders provided. The media approached the minister's office afterwards, and the media reports say that a representative said there might be one. The minister could not refute that it was zero at the time she was asked in the House while on the record, and a spokesperson thought it could be as high as one. So we know it is somewhere between zero and one depending on who you talk to in the government and what day of the week it is.

Clearly, the government are not across their brief or they are just simply withholding bad news. Either way, we can have no confidence in any of the projected figures of this government. The government had a chance to deliver the truth, but the bad news is that they failed to deliver for the Quandamooka people who still wait for their housing. The government have been missing in action in the Redlands when it comes to new housing stock.

Many people find it difficult at this time to make their housing repayments. Some of them find it very difficult to pay the rent. Some of those on North Stradbroke Island had very good, well-paying jobs that were lost when the government shut down the mine before it was expected and did not replace those jobs. At its peak, the mine had 300 workers who came from all over the Redlands and other parts of Brisbane for that work. It also employed a number of local people. At one stage, Sibelco reported that one-third of its workers were First Nations people.

Kate Jones promised 400 ecotourism jobs, but they never happened and partly because there was no housing to put people in. Businesses on Straddie have had to close, some for a time, when they could not get the staff because of the lack of accommodation available on North Stradbroke Island. There is a lack of housing on Straddie and it is regularly reported by businesses, residents, young people and people of all ages. This lack of freehold, social, affordable and specific housing for Aboriginal people is holding the economy back. The government's economic transition has failed on North Stradbroke Island. Some local businesses have closed for good and small and family businesses are struggling because in part they are heavily reliant on the seasonal workforce, especially at Point Lookout, but there is no housing for the workers. The government cannot be trusted to deliver the things they announce and say.

Ms FARMER: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I seek your guidance on relevance.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hart): I am listening closely to what the member is talking about. I think he is talking about a lack of housing in a particular area. I will allow some latitude but draw the member back to the long title of the bill.

Dr ROBINSON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I am very happy to talk about the housing situation on North Stradbroke Island and the Redlands and the bill's relevance to it. Quandamooka leaders are being cut out of consultation about housing, decision-making about housing and implementation. They say that the government cannot be trusted to deliver. Then after years of inaction, the government moved to override Redland City Council—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Pumicestone, member for Pine Rivers and minister, cease your interjections.

Dr ROBINSON: Then the government blame the Redland City Council. They blame the council when it comes to issues around innovative solutions. This bill brings some innovative solutions, but not enough. When the council puts forward innovative solutions, this government knock them back. It is a bit hard to blame the council for the fact that we do not have enough housing supply in the Redlands when this government continually intervene to stop those innovative things.

I want to thank the committee. We travelled to a number of states looking at solutions. A number of states are putting in place lots of very innovative solutions in this space, through not only their direct investment in housing stock but also working with community housing and leveraging off that and working with the private sector to invest in housing, like the Logan Renewal Initiative and those types of innovative solutions. Wouldn't those 3,500 new houses be good to have now? Wouldn't Queenslanders love to have 3,500 new houses right now?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Oodgeroo, do you have much more to contribute?

Dr ROBINSON: In conclusion, we do not oppose the bill, but this government needs to be judged on its record, not only on what it announces.

Debate, on motion of Dr Robinson, adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 pm to 2.00 pm.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance



Mr CRISAFULLI (Broadwater—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.00 pm): Queenslanders have had enough of the crisis and chaos of this government, a government that has lurched from scandal to scandal, from blowout to blowout, from service failure to service failure, a government that believes it is their right to rule, and a government that expects your vote. We are going to earn it. We are going to earn it by listening to Queenslanders across this state. We promised reform and we have delivered it. We promised to hold the government to account and we continue to do so. We promised to chart a different course and we will continue to deliver that.

Because of the chaos of this government, the crises continue to mount. It was on display in the last week when it came to the issue of rental caps, an issue where on Monday the Premier said it was something that was being seriously considered; on Tuesday the Deputy Premier doubled down and even linked it to CPI; by Wednesday, there was the backdown by the Premier and the statement that it was a misunderstanding, that it was everybody else's fault; and now today we have something that does not resemble any of the previous positions: chaos leading to a crisis.

It is in the housing space where Queenslanders are feeling that crisis every day. There has been eight years of an underinvestment in infrastructure to open up new opportunities for young people to get into the market, to be able to rent, partnerships with the community housing sector and targets being met for the social housing sector. Today we heard again about more money—'You should be grateful. Here is more money'—yet, when pressed for answers on what has been delivered, we got zero. The government was questioned about four announcements that were overdue, and they could not point to a single Queenslander housed. The Housing Investment Fund—two years old and not a single new build. Granny flats—zero. Griffith University—zero. The Clayfield retirement home—zero. All of these promises are now overdue, yet the government does not feel the pain of the Queenslanders we are listening to.

Queenslanders are caught up in another crisis and that is the health crisis eight years in the making: ambulance ramping figures nearly three times what this government inherited and more than 10 per cent higher than when the former premier Bligh described them as a basket case; waiting times where innocent Queenslanders are caught between the cracks for vital surgery; maternity wards being closed in cities that provide so much for this state; scandals at Caboolture and Mackay; and the failures of the DNA lab where the opposition and whistleblowers were mocked for wanting to raise it.

Just the other day, we held our 30th town hall meeting in Townsville. When the member for Mudgeeraba and I went there, we promised the people we would take their fight to this chamber today, and what did we get from those opposite? They were whingers. The research shows that they want to try to create some kind of narrative that it is all Queenslanders' fault, that these are things happening elsewhere. Queenslanders who bravely turned up were called whingers. Queenslanders who are falling through the cracks, who are waiting for vital surgery and who did not have an ambo turn up in their hour of need were branded as whingers.

The crime crisis: where the government came into office and one of their first actions was to weaken the laws; where the thin blue line just keeps getting a little bit thinner and the government will not even release those figures to show just how bad it is; where the victims of crime fund continues to ensure that innocent Queenslanders are denied the justice and the financial compensation they deserve; where for two years those opposite told us that breach of bail just would not work and then adopted the LNP's policy word for word. That is only the start. That can only be the start if we are to truly heal the youth crime epidemic gripping this state. It is about consequences for actions, putting the rights of the victim ahead of the rights of the offender. It is about unshackling the judiciary to make sure that detention as a last resort is removed from the Youth Justice Act which is shackling our magistrates in their decision-making. It is about gold standard early intervention so we can turn kids around before they have a knife standing at your door, before they are ramming into yet another police car, and before another Queenslanders falls through the cracks.

Those opposite just expect that this is what will happen, that they can continue to fail Queenslanders and they will continue to have a mandate to do what they continue to do. For 30 of the last 35 years at the time of the next election, those opposite will have been in power where they would have won 11 of the last 12 general elections and they believe that that is their right. The government will be seeking its fourth term and 14 years in office, and they expect your vote. We are going to earn it. We are going to continue to earn it by working harder, by listening better and by getting across this

state and showing Queenslanders what it will be like to have an economy built on the back of small and family business, to have service delivery so an ambo turns up and is not stuck at the end of the ramp, so there are more police and they have the laws to do their job, so young kids can get into the housing market, so our national parks are maintained to the best standard ever, and so our educational institutions continue to provide the best opportunities for our kids and that standards are met that are the best in the nation.

We have reflected this by getting candidates in the field earlier than ever before, candidates that reflect a modern Queensland, who will be fighters for their electorate, and candidates who will be asked to speak up on behalf of their communities. We saw it on the green on Sunday where three brave candidates stood up for their electorates—people like Yolonde Entsch for Cairns, a humanitarian and small business owner who has dedicated her life to vulnerable Queenslanders. She spoke about the issue of crime and homelessness in her community. Natalie Marr for Thuringowa, a former councillor, a long-term chair of Townsville Crime Stoppers and volunteer, told us what it is like in her city because of a generation of repeat young criminals. Rebecca Young, born and bred in Redlands and a chamber of commerce president, spoke about what the lack of investment in health and road infrastructure and places like the hospital has meant for her city.

They are the first of many candidates who will be out in the field earlier than Queenslanders have seen before. We are building a team that will stand up for Queenslanders, against the chaos and the crisis that those opposite have overseen. They will be candidates who will be unashamedly putting their regions and their cities first. They will be part of generational change for this state where Queenslanders will again be treated like customers, where they will matter in the eyes of their government, where the services will be delivered for them and where they will not be accused of being whingers if they want to speak up.


Mr Powell: They will be listened to.

Mr CRISAFULLI: They will be listened to. They will have advocates who will put them first.

This government believes that it is their God-given right to be the government. They just expect it because they feel that is the way it always has been and always will be. The education minister just nods. We see that and the hubris, the arrogance but, in the end, the chaos and the crisis that is besetting those opposite. Queenslanders have woken up to the same old scare campaigns of a government that has been in office for 14 years and wants a fourth term at the next election.

Finally, before I conclude my contribution, we are farewelling a long-serving journalist in this state, one might say a 'silky' smooth operator. We wish Marty Silk all the best in his move. Marty has been a long-term servant of Queensland in what he has done. He is leaving the Gold Coast for Sydney. We can only say to Marty that that is not his finest decision! However, we wish him all the best. We thank him for the way he has conducted himself and send best wishes for his next career move.

Liberal National Party, Performance; Member for Southern Downs

 **Hon. G GRACE** (McConnel—ALP) (Minister for Education, Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Racing) (2.10 pm): There is one thing on which I do agree with the Leader of the Opposition—and it is about the only thing now—and that is that we wish Marty all the very best. Now that New South Wales is led by Labor, I can understand why he is moving from the Gold Coast to New South Wales.

What a victory it was in New South Wales. It shows one thing. It shows that when you have policies on privatisation, when you are talking about public sector entitlement caps and when you are talking about police and teachers, it is more than just rhetoric—you have to deliver. All we heard from the Leader of the Opposition once again today was nothing but rhetoric. There was not one policy idea; not one concrete thing was said in the last five minutes. It is not the people we are calling whingers; it is the LNP we are calling the whingers and the whiners. Let me tell honourable members that is what the people of Queensland are saying to us when we meet them. Even on Sunday night when I was out, people were coming up and saying, 'You guys are doing a great job,' rather than the whingeing and the whining we get from those opposite. The Leader of the Opposition is the biggest whinger and whiner of them all.

When they start talking about candidates more than they talk about their own backbench, I would be worried if I were a member of the opposition.

An honourable member interjected.

Ms GRACE: I do not know what you are pointing—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): When I am on my feet the House will come to order. Member for Burdekin, you are warned for continuing on. The level of interjection is well out of control. I would ask the House to maintain its dignity.

Ms GRACE: They just do not know how to take it. If I was a member of the opposition backbench I would be very worried as well.

When it comes to the government we have plans and we are delivering them. We know that the housing crisis is not just impacting Queensland; it is impacting the whole nation. Those opposite know that. However, they fabricate these crises and chaos thinking that the more they say it, the more it will be true. They have to do more than that about the issues that are confronting Queenslanders. They know who it is who delivers for them and it is the Palaszczuk government.

On another matter, on 28 October last year during consideration in detail on the IR bill the member for Southern Downs made comments reflecting on the QIRC and the Hon. Justice Peter Davis. I found it odd considering he has no background in IR but he certainly had a lot to say. I notice that the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Kawana let him have free reign. We also noticed that the member was up there talking to the Red Union and obviously then puppeteering him and giving him the speech they needed to have delivered.

The comments made by the member for Southern Downs were troubling and called into question the independence of the well-respected Supreme Court justice and the commission. I wrote to the Speaker in November regarding a potential breach of standing orders. On 21 February I was pleased to see that the member apologised unreservedly. As is the usual process, all documents relating to this matter were tabled in the parliament on 22 February, and how enlightening they were. Lo and behold, those documents showed a clear link between the member and the Red Union hub. The most telling of all emails, which they tried to retract, was an email link sent by the member himself—

Honourable members interjected.

Ms GRACE: Just listen.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt. I am trying to pay close attention to the contribution here and I am sure the Acting Clerk is also trying to pay attention to what the minister is contributing. I would like to hear this statement in silence.

Ms GRACE: It showed a clear link between the member for Southern Downs, the Red Union hub and shared legal representation. In fact, one of the ccs was—

'Red Union (Trading Name), NPAA SERVICES PTY LTD (Client)' <jack.mcguire @ redunion.com.au>

The issue there is exactly who was the client in representing the member for Southern Downs? The emails from Emma Watson, an employee of Saines Legal, which cc-ed the Red Union described NPAA Services as the client. If that entity is described as the client we can reasonably conclude that they are the ones who paid for the legal advice for the member for Southern Downs. If they are the client, what is the member for Southern Downs?


The Red Union not only pulled the strings during the debate but were also directly involved in the member's response to the Speaker about the extremely serious matter of a breach of standing orders. I think the member for Southern Downs has some explaining to do. It shows the tangled web over there with the fake unions.

The member for Southern Downs has not declared the benefit. I will be writing to the Clerk of the Parliament in relation to this matter for it to be investigated. He has been exposed.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The House will come to order.

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (2.16 pm): Let me tell honourable members about the member for Southern Downs. He is a member who defends the worker's right to have a choice in the state of Queensland. He is a member who defends a nurse's ability to save \$300 on their union membership and get better services. That is what the member for Southern Downs does. We will not be lectured to by this minister. If she wants to quote the Queensland Industrial Relations Commission, we will see that they had an interesting report last week that showed in the minister's own department her director of workplace health and safety is taking secret phone calls

from the CFMEU and making complaints about it. So she should not lecture us about the CFMEU and the Industrial Relations Commission. That is the same CFMEU that was fined \$179,000 in the Federal Court last week and that funds the Labor Party's campaign. Why does the minister not talk about that? Why does she not expose that in her department? Of course, she will not.

On other matters, I will put every member of our team above the Labor rabble any day of the week with the chaos and dysfunction we see in this government. It can be no clearer than with the Gabba redevelopment and announcement going from a billion dollars to \$2.7 billion, a 170 per cent blowout. I said last week the number was drawn either out of thin air or on the back of an envelope. We have given every opportunity for Premier Palaszczuk to explain the costings, the economic modelling and the business case. Where did all these figures come from? However there has only been crickets—absolutely nothing. I laughed. Last week—are members ready for this—I was at the Legacy Forum that the Premier forgot to mention I attended. The Premier said on the stage, 'I want to share the stage of the Olympics.' Oh my God, there is a stage, but this Premier is not sharing it as far as the Olympics are concerned.

This is the AAA games; they are 'All About Anna': access all areas. That is what the AAA games are, not the 2032 Olympic Games. The Premier says people are whingeing when we ask questions about the Gabba and the blowouts under this government. It is not whingeing. It is the government's responsibility to the people of Queensland whose money they are spending to explain the expenditure and the blowouts. Then I thought it quite bizarre when the Premier said a few weeks ago the Gabba blowout was because of commodities, the Deputy Premier said it was disability access and then the Premier said, 'We didn't start the Ukraine war.' I did not know who accused Premier Palaszczuk of starting the Ukraine war; I missed it. That is how bizarre and chaotic this government has got now.


Now she says to stop whingeing. The Premier is so arrogant that she does not want questions. If you do question those opposite, you are absolutely sidelined. I would have loved to be a fly on the wall after the National Press Club yesterday when the Australian Olympic Committee CEO said that the Gabba needed 'a coat of paint'. Within two hours there was a 'clarifying statement'. Who made the call? Was it the Premier, the Deputy Premier or one of the 30 media spinners in the office?

Mr Purdie: It was the CFMEU—Gary Bullock.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection: the CFMEU's Gary Bullock. Someone made the phone call. I would have hated to be the poor CEO of the Australian Olympic Committee, who was forced to put out a 'clarifying statement' because he dared to challenge the Palaszczuk government. They are so arrogant that they will not be questioned. To them, it is offensive that we dare ask them about this. That is the problem when a person who is controlled by their ego makes it about themselves. Premier Palaszczuk is more interested in building monuments to herself. That is what the Olympics is becoming: what is in it for Anastacia Palaszczuk, not the people of Queensland. The chaos with this government is absolutely disgraceful. I swear, it is like a hurdles race in which every runner hits a hurdle and falls over. That is how chaotic this government is, and who is at the head of it? It is Anastacia Palaszczuk, the Premier of Queensland. These games will forever be known as the AAA games—'All About Anna'. It should not be; it should be about the people of Queensland. All we want is transparency and accountability.

(Time expired)

Training and Skills

 **Hon. DE FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Small Business and Minister for Training and Skills Development) (2.21 pm): Workforce shortages is one of the most critical issues facing our economy. It affects every region and every sector. It is why we have the Queensland Workforce Strategy. It is why we invest over \$1.2 billion in skills and training in Queensland. We have to make sure we have a pipeline of workers with the skills not only to fulfil the promise of our economy but also to provide the services to which every Queenslanders is entitled. The discussion today about housing is a case in point. We know that if we are going to address those critical housing needs we need skilled construction workers in this state. That is why we have over 24,000 construction apprentices going through our system this year—the highest number ever.

Our investment must also include the public provider of VET, because we know that wherever you are in Queensland you need access to that. It is why we invest in public VET infrastructure like our \$100 million upgrade and new facilities program. I seem to be opening a new facility every month. It was Townsville this month, it was Toowoomba last month and it is Hervey Bay next month—and the list goes on. We are over halfway.

If you are talking about skills and training—about the need for construction workers in a critical industry like housing or about nurses, hospitality workers, mechanics, pastry chefs, IT workers or all of the other sorts of workers we need—and then you talk about the LNP, you need to be very afraid. Although labour shortages are one of the critical issues facing us—it is what every employer talks about—the LNP have not mentioned labour shortages once in this chamber—not once. They have never mentioned skills and the training, which is so critical. The only mention they made of skills and training before the last election was the skills task force, the very thing the Newman government set up in order to demolish TAFE.

We know that those opposite are planning on cuts, like they did when they were in government. We know that they are planning that because the member for Chatsworth told us. The Leader of the Opposition told us about their debt reduction strategy. Every single member of the House needs to be very afraid. They sacked staff, they cut \$170 million in funding and they closed campuses in their electorates—in Ridgeway, Ithaca, Maryborough, Tewantin and Ipswich. They were going to cut 11 in Far North Queensland. They were going to cut five in Fraser and the Sunshine Coast. They were going to cut five in the western corridor. They were going to cut three on the Gold Coast. None of their members ever stood up for it. They were going to cut 10 in the Brisbane metro region. They were going to cut SkillsTech campuses from six to two. They are the ones who train our construction workers.

We know what their plans are for infrastructure—every single one of them. Are they going to put up their hand up and say, 'Please save my TAFE. Please make sure I have workers for nursing homes, for schools, for aged care and for disability support workers'? We do not hear any of them saying those things. It is in the LNP's DNA to cut, sack and sell. It will be groundhog day in Queensland if the LNP ever gets back into government, because all they do is cut, sack and sell.

The Leader of the Opposition has outlined some of the list: CopperString—we are training the workers for CopperString; the satellite hospitals—we are training the nurses; the ambulance stations—we are training the paramedics; the transport infrastructure projects—we are training all of those people as well. There is \$10 billion and they have—

Mr Head interjected.

Mr Mickelberg interjected.


Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Order, member for Callide. Order, member for Buderim!

Ms FARMER: We want to make sure that we have the housing to meet the needs of the people who are telling us the terrible stories we are hearing. It is the reason we are having this round table today. We are talking about all of the things we are doing to address this issue in Queensland, and training workers will be a critical part of it. Not one of those opposite has even mentioned workforce. This government knows about workforce. We know what we need to do. We know that we need to train workers. We know that we have to invest in infrastructure.

Mr Nicholls interjected.

Ms FARMER: Those opposite love going to the graduations, but they never want to put their hand up to say, 'I'm saving TAFE. I'm saving those workers. I'm making sure we can meet the needs of our community.' There has not been one single word. We are looking after Queensland.

Kaiser, Mr M

 **Ms SIMPSON** (Maroochydore—LNP) (2.26 pm): When Anastacia Palaszczuk became Premier she said that she would act with integrity and honesty. Her actions show that she has changed. There have been media reports that self-confessed electoral rorter and former Labor MP Mike Kaiser is being considered for appointment to the role of the Premier's director-general. This comes after the Palaszczuk government has already elevated Mike Kaiser to other senior director-general roles. Then premier Peter Beattie displayed higher standards than Premier Palaszczuk after damning evidence and findings were presented at the Shepherdson inquiry into electoral fraud. Peter Beattie said that he did not want people who break the law in the Labor Party. He said—

I don't care whether this goes back to 1917. If people are still alive and they have broken the law in these electoral matters, they should go to jail.

Premier Palaszczuk obviously does not agree with this high standard of integrity in relation to the electoral system. Let's look at what happened, as we should never forget. Integrity mattered then and it matters today.


The Shepherdson inquiry confirmed Mike Kaiser's role as an electoral rorter who at first denied falsifying enrolments but eventually resigned from parliament after evidence presented to the inquiry showed that he had. The inquiry also found a systemically corrupt culture of branch stacking, vote rigging and falsification of electoral enrolments within the Queensland branch of the Labor Party. Inquiry commissioner Tom Shepherdson QC determined that Mike Kaiser's conduct constituted the offence of making a false declaration under section 117 of the Queensland Electoral Act. Because this offence was statute barred and the time limit to prosecute had passed, he could not be prosecuted. Let's be clear: Mike Kaiser was adversely named, as were the practices in which he and other Labor MPs and identities indulged, in using false electoral enrolments. Anyone who downplays this as a minor issue or just a youthful indiscretion is making excuses for the serious business of electoral fraud—electoral fraud—which corrupts the integrity of the voting system.

The Premier and her government try to make out that 'there's nothing to see here and you shouldn't bring up the past of Mike Kaiser'—this damning past of a self-confessed electoral rorter—but those opposite cannot whitewash this history and say that it did not happen. They cannot say, 'Oh, we shouldn't talk about it because the rules of this parliament don't allow us to talk about it.' That is a dodgy interpretation if ever I have heard a dodgy interpretation about a dodgy history which we should be shouting from the rooftops. Peter Coaldrake said 'let the sunshine in' regarding his investigation into the culture of bullying of public servants and cover-ups by this Labor government. Premier Palaszczuk's actions are as good as saying, 'Let the vote rorters in.' When Labor says, 'Don't talk about it,' that shows that it is not sorry, it is not listening and it does not get it.

Integrity matters. It matters because it is about how and why the government makes decisions for Queenslanders, but is it making those decisions for Queenslanders or for itself? We have seen that it has a track record of governing for its mates, governing to keep its own political hide safe and not governing for the safety of Queenslanders. Integrity of government is about governing for Queenslanders first rather than your mates first, and the elevation of self-confessed vote rorter Mike Kaiser tells us more about the Premier than it does about Mike Kaiser. It tells us about her priorities, about how she is more interested in winning the next election than addressing the chaos in the way that her government has let Queenslanders down. This is a chaotic government in turmoil that keeps struggling to deal with Queensland's youth justice crisis, the health crisis and the housing crisis which are all of its making because it failed to act in a timely way and was looking after itself rather than Queenslanders. This government also has an integrity crisis. It is time for the Premier to rule out Mike Kaiser, self-confessed vote rorter, as her next DG. It is time to rule him out because electoral rorting is not an insignificant issue. It matters to Queenslanders.

(Time expired)

Redlands Electorate

 **Ms RICHARDS** (Redlands—ALP) (2.31 pm): What we have just seen in the three contributions from the other side of the House is the LNP's version of doing politics differently. If anybody has just watched those contributions, they would have to truly doubt its genuineness of doing politics differently in this state. I have touched on it already this morning, but the LNP has not changed its behaviour. It has not culturally changed at all. Our LNP mayor was quoted in an article yesterday about the political landscape in the Redlands and the way that people are playing the man and not the ball. We cannot make this stuff up, honestly. The toxicity is outstanding. It is actually quite breathtaking.

We heard what the LNP is espousing in terms of its candidates and its changed vision, particularly for the Redlands. Goodness gracious me, let us talk about roads first, shall we? With regard to Cleveland-Redland Bay Road, a 2015 article is headlined 'Long wait likely for Cleveland-Redland Bay Road upgrade' under the Newman government when the Leader of the Opposition sat at the cabinet table. If those opposite want to talk about roads, their track record is right there. They delivered nothing when they were in government and they delivered nothing in the decade before I was the representative, and every single day that I am in this role I will continue to be that strong voice for my community. That goes without saying—every day. You talk about roads, but that is your track record. If you want to talk about health care, you closed the Wynnum Hospital, putting more pressure on the Redland Hospital. You closed the Barrett centre, you closed the—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Member, the comments will come through the chair.

Ms RICHARDS: You closed the Barrett centre. You closed the Moreton Bay nursing—


Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Direct your comments through the chair.

Ms RICHARDS: Those opposite closed the Moreton Bay nursing home. They sacked nurses. That is their track record in health care. When we talk about young people and opportunity, they tried to close the TAFE. That is their track record. They cut the Skilling Queenslanders for Work program—a program for which I have advocated and fought even though it was hard to be delivered in my island communities in particular. That is their track record. For us on this side to be lectured about what they are going to deliver after looking at their track record, my goodness gracious me! I will sit their previous 10 years side by side on what I have been delivering in the last five years. I will absolutely any day of the week sit that next to the Leader of the Opposition's track record in delivering for the Redlands—that is, nothing, other than cut and sack and sell. They have not changed when we talk about their privatisation and cuts agenda, whether we call it 'pruning' or 'unshackling', as was the word in the last sitting. When we talk about investments in schools, we did not see any of that in years before.

I could not be prouder of what I am delivering for my community because it is a pretty long list, and I will start with the work that we are doing at the Redland Hospital. The car park has been completed. It unlocks the land and will deliver on allowing us to expand the hospital. Stage 1 is underway with ADCO appointed to deliver the ICU, to deliver the 37 beds. Hutchinsons will deliver the extra 25 beds. We are not far off closing off the \$40-plus million satellite hospital in Redland Bay for my growing southern edge. That is my track record and I will sit that any day of the week next to what the LNP offers or says it is going to offer.

When we talk about schools, I have delivered an \$11 million new learning precinct for the Redland District Special School and an \$11 million STEM and hospitality building for the Victoria Point State High School. I have kindly being delivered at Russell Island State School, a really complex community, which is delivering for our families. When it comes to the school space, I will stand my track record against the LNP's track record any day of the week. When it comes to jobs, our regional jobs committee is doing a terrific job in coordinating with industry, local businesses and our educators such as TAFE. All of those groups are on board and we are delivering for our community. When we talk about police, I have doubled police numbers on Macleay Island and Russell Island. We have delivered more in equipment and technology than you can poke a stick at. When it comes to delivering for Redlands, I will fight hard every single day of the week for my community.

TikTok

 **Mr DAMETTO** (Hinchinbrook—KAP) (2.36 pm): Most people in this House would be able to confess that they have a social media addiction and one of the most dangerous social media addictions going on at the moment is a concern across the world. As political tensions rise across the world, the question being asked globally right now is this: where does TikTok play into this?

Mr Brown interjected.

Mr DAMETTO: I take the interjection of a laugh. This is a national security issue that should be the concern of everyone in this House. TikTok is owned by Chinese company ByteDance. TikTok accesses more data on our phones than we think and are aware of. It is not just about watching videos of local MPs dancing or the next fashion craze; there is a sinister side to TikTok that all of us in this House should be aware of.

ByteDance responded to claims in 2020 after TikTok announced that staff in China can access our data. It said that it does not provide any data to the Chinese government, which is an interesting statement to make because China has very different privacy and policy laws. Part of national Chinese security law requires Chinese companies—we learnt this when we went on a delegation to China in 2019—to support and assist the Chinese government to cooperate with national intelligence efforts. We are not just talking about military efforts; we also need to consider that we are a trading partner of China and there are opportunities through this application perhaps to plug into company espionage. The ability for TikTok to access not only our emails but also our data and our keyboard strokes on our smartphones should be a concern to everyone in this House.

TikTok said that it does not collect GPS data or mobile device details, but it does. A deep dive into this application suggests that it is accessing everything from our calendar entries through to our emails. Other social media platforms do not do this. An Australian company, a cybersecurity firm called Internet 2.0, has raised deep concerns. It says—


It's not that TikTok collects more information than other social networks, but governments are concerned about how China might be able to access or use that information.

The risks posed by the app are still unclear ...

When scrutinised, the CEO of TikTok in Australia has been very vague and dismissive of any of the suggestions. A number of countries have moved quite aggressively against the application. TikTok has been banned in India entirely. Canada's government has partially banned it. France's parliament has banned it. The New Zealand parliament has banned it. The Taiwan public sector has banned it. The European parliament has also banned the TikTok app. Pakistan has entirely banned the application and so has Afghanistan. In the US there have been moves for congress to move legislation. They passed the No TikTok on Government Devices Act. In Australia right now it is being considered. A security review requested by home affairs and cybersecurity minister Clare O'Neil has been handed down and is expected to recommend what Australia should do with TikTok moving forward.

Here today the parliament has been warned. I applaud the Queensland Parliamentary Service for making the offer to every MP's office—and I think everyone should heed this—to grab, through their electorate allowance, a separate device to be used for applications of social media, which includes TikTok. In a time when we should be worried about national security, worried about what people across the board may know about our movements as MPs and people who serve government, I urge people to do their best to protect themselves. I know it is enticing to keep your TikTok accounts going—and for certain MPs to continue to engage with their younger voter base; with an election coming up I bet everyone is trying to tap into that market—but the fact is there is a national security risk and people should consider doing what is best for them and this country when it comes to protecting our data and our secrets.

Torres Strait and Northern Peninsula Area Cost-of-Living Summit

 **Ms LUI** (Cook—ALP) (2.41 pm): On 20 March on Thursday Island in the Torres Strait the Palaszczuk government held the Torres Strait and Northern Peninsula Area Cost-of-Living Summit. The cost-of-living summit was a direct result of a government that listens and delivers on the needs of the community. During community cabinet in December 2022 our Premier and cabinet ministers had the opportunity to hear directly from local leaders and the community about the cost-of-living pressures in the region. Prior to leaving the Torres Strait, the Premier announced that her government would hold a cost-of-living summit in the region to better understand the challenges communities face across the Torres Strait and Northern Peninsula Area.


I had the wonderful opportunity to co-chair the summit with Minister Mark Bailey and with the support of the Attorney-General and Ministerial Champion for the Torres Strait, Shannon Fentiman, Minister Leeanne Enoch and Minister Mick de Brenni. We invited the three local governments, the Northern Peninsula Area Regional Council, Torres Strait Island Regional Council and Torres Shire Council, the Commonwealth through the Torres Strait Regional Authority, as well as key stakeholders and local community. The summit attracted huge interest from the local and wider community with close to 100 participants in attendance from different sectors. It was important to have strong cross-sector and local representation to gain a broad view of the cost-of-living challenge at hand, and the summit achieved exactly that.

I acknowledge that cost-of-living pressures affect communities right across Queensland. For my communities cost of living is further exacerbated by remoteness. People on low incomes are worse off in these communities and often it is this cohort that pay the highest price when it comes to health and social wellbeing. There are so many different facets to this problem that is putting immense pressure on people's social and economic wellbeing. As we heard at the cost-of-living summit, people in the region are forced to make hard decisions to make ends meet. People are choosing to feed their family over paying rent. They are choosing to travel in boats and often in severe weather conditions—may I add this option is worse for seniors and people with disability, which ultimately means social isolation with a lack of alternative options.

These are only some examples and there are many more stories around this very complex issue. The government is listening. Last week at the cost-of-living summit we announced an \$80 million marine infrastructure package—a state and federal partnership to improve marine infrastructure in the Torres Strait. We announced \$64 million to subsidise freight costs in remote communities. For the Torres Strait, Cape York and gulf communities we are investing \$10 million to build new houses in the region, \$3 million to help families reduce power usage and \$1 million to upgrade the power network to quadruple solar capacity. The announcements that were made at the cost-of-living summit are a true reflection of a government that is listening. Whether you are in the most remote parts of Queensland or in urban areas, this government is sitting at the table with community, we are listening, we are working in close partnership with community and we are delivering on community needs.

I would like to thank our Premier for her support for the Torres Strait and NPA Cost-of-Living Summit. This issue was brought directly to our Premier and ministers during community cabinet and our Premier wasted no time in acting on this very important issue. I would like to thank Minister Bailey, the Attorney-General and Ministerial Champion for the Torres Strait, Shannon Fentiman, Minister Leeanne Enoch and Minister Mick de Brenni for coming to the Torres Strait to help and support the delivery of the summit. Thank you to the local councils, Torres Shire Council, Torres Strait Regional Council and Northern Peninsula Area Regional Council, and also a massive thank you to the local community for coming on board and showing true community partnership and for working in collaboration with local leaders as well as the state government to achieve the best outcomes for the region.

Police Communications Centres

 **Mr LAST** (Burdekin—LNP) (2.45 pm): In 2016 the Queensland Police Service's Violent Confrontations Review found that 'good communication is still the cornerstone of contemporary policing'. One can imagine the alarm that greeted us and has flowed through our communities to find out that the police communications centres in Gladstone, Mackay and Rockhampton are being earmarked for closure. Let me repeat that: the police communications centres in those three localities are closing. They are closing those three communications centres and moving the comms centre up to Townsville. What does that equate to: 11 operators in Gladstone, 11 in Mackay, 22 in Rockhampton, plus their respective OCs—that is, 47 staff in total.

It begs the question: what happens to those staff who are employed in those communications centres? Are they without a job? Are they being offered a transfer? Do they have to relocate their families to Townsville or to Brisbane—to the nearest communications centre? More importantly, when one thinks about how important those communications centres are, and we are talking life and death, when you are on the end of a radio and you are proceeding code 1 or 2 because someone's life is in imminent danger, you need to know that that communications operator on the other end of the phone knows what they are talking about, that they know the local area and that they are giving you good advice because in those situations time is critical.


A few weeks ago there was a trial of running all the calls for service through the Townsville communications centre. It was a dismal flop. They had to resort to phoning police officers to pass on jobs. It just goes to show the alarm within the community that has come about over these proposed closures and the potential to put the lives of not only police officers but also members of our communities in danger. It also begs the question, if you combine the health crisis at Gladstone and Mackay with the impending closure of the communications centres in those towns, has this government abandoned those communities? What sort of message is this government sending to the communities of Gladstone and Mackay when one looks at the health issues and now the closure of police communications centres in those localities?

It is a recipe for disaster. Those communities have a right to be up in arms. They have a right to be questioning the minister about why these centres are closing and why they are taking that local content out. To run the communications centre from Townsville will increase their area from the Northern Territory border down through Longreach to Birdsville and Blackall and over to Rockhampton. If one pictures that area on a map, over half of Queensland will now be run out of one centre. We do not know whether extra staff are going to be provided in Townsville. We do not know how it will work.

The minister needs to come clean about how that will work. The minister needs to give an assurance, not only to the chamber but also to broader Queensland, about how that will work and whether the systems and the processes are in place to manage it.

I want to talk about police numbers because this minister is very good at dancing around the issue of police numbers. We hear the terminology 'approved' strength and 'actual' strength. I will give a simple example of what we are talking about. If my motor vehicle has an approved carrying capacity of five but my wife and two children are using it then its actual capacity is three. The same principle applies to policing. If a police station has an approved strength of 50 but the number of officers actually on deck and available to do policing duties is 30 then that is the number we need to be working with. You cannot send a police number to do a job; you have to send a police officer—a real person. That is the number that we are interested in because on this side of the House we understand the difference between approved and actual. On this side of the House we understand the difference between division, district and region. Those are the numbers that matter to Queenslanders. This minister needs to come into this place and give an assurance that those are the numbers that he will talk to.

Women in Sport

 **Mr WALKER** (Mundingburra—ALP) (2.50 pm): A huge congratulations goes to the JCU Townsville Fire on their convincing WNBL national championship win. The city is still celebrating. It is the fourth national championship win for the Townsville Fire. They are the most successful women's team in Queensland when it comes to national titles. I acknowledge captain Lauren Nicholson for her leadership and the team's record-setting 16 straight wins this season. That fantastic result by our champion Townsville Fire team has highlighted the growth in women's sport on many levels. It also gives young women the opportunity to have role models and idols that they will follow in their own chosen sport—not just basketball but netball, soccer, AFL, Rugby League, cricket and many more sports.

I know some of those sports are not Olympic sports but they do not have to be. What is important is that today more women than ever before are participating in sport at a very high level. Those sports are now being broadcast on national television networks and pay-to-view sports channels around the world. While that means that more women are now being paid as professional sports stars it does not automatically translate to equal levels of income compared to their male counterparts. No doubt there will be more work done in this space and rightly so.

However, there is still not enough participation by women in sport. In Australia, women are still under-represented in organised sport as participants, coaches, officials, administrators and board members when compared to their male cohort. In 2021, Australia's estimated population was 25,773,344 people and 50.4 per cent or 12,981,134 were women and girls. Around 42 per cent of the female population participated in a sport related activity at least once a week; 33 per cent of Australian women aged 15 and over participated in a sport related activity at least once a week; 37 per cent of Australian girls aged under 14 participated in organised outside-of-school-hours sport related activity at least once a week; and 13 per cent of Australian women aged 15 and over were involved in a non-playing role at least once in 2021.

The reason I speak today about women in sport is because of the importance of women participating in sport and the need for purpose-built world-class facilities and resources to accommodate more women in sport. We need more things like fields, courts and dressing-rooms just to name a few. That leads me to the importance of the 2032 Olympic Games being held right here in Queensland. The 2032 Olympic Games in Queensland will be perfectly timed for our young people and, more so, our young women. With facilities being built across the state for many different sports we have a huge opportunity to have more homegrown Olympians than any other state.

What is just as important is that between now and then we will see more and more young women being involved in sport and becoming professional sports stars due to the new sporting facilities being built now and right up to the 2032 Olympic Games. Those facilities will be multipurpose to cater for sports that are not necessarily Olympic sports such as netball, AFL, cricket and Rugby League, just to name a few. Across the state we will have facilities that will be a legacy for many years and for many different sports well after the 2032 Olympic Games. That is very important for many different reasons but none more important than the participation of women in sport. That is why every Queenslanders should be very proud that they are investing in quality venues across the state so our young people and those with a disability can be more involved in sport.

In closing, I want to congratulate my son Kyle today.

A government member: It's emotional.


Mr WALKER: It is but it is also a fun moment. Today Kyle is graduating for the second time. I wish him a very happy birthday.

HOUSING LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 643, on motion of Ms Enoch—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Mr BROWN** (Capalaba—ALP) (2.55 pm): I take this opportunity to rise straight after the speech of the member for Oodgeroo because I feel I have to address a number of the issues that he raised in his speech in the debate on the Housing Legislation Amendment Bill. I thank the member for Cooper for allowing me to do so.

Today the Minister for Housing made a fantastic announcement for my local area. A retirement village is to be repurposed to provide 26 studio apartments and three three-bedroom houses that will be head leased for the homeless in emergency situations. That is what we are doing in the area. At the end of last year we opened more social housing units in Capalaba, adding to the ones that we have already built in Capalaba and Birkdale, as well as Wellington Point in the electorate of the member for Oodgeroo.

The member for Oodgeroo talks about housing on North Stradbroke Island, Minjerribah. What he fails to mention is that when the government put forward a temporary local planning instrument to open up more freehold land to build more social housing and housing for the traditional owners, he campaigned against it. You cannot complain on the one hand that there is a lack of housing on Minjerribah and then campaign against the actual instrument that would open up freehold land. I find it a complete contradiction that the member would campaign against opening up more freehold land for traditional owners to build housing on and then complain about there not being enough houses. But I will move on to the next part.

The member then defended the mayor of the Redlands. The LNP mayor of the Redlands has not produced a housing strategy for the area. Again, he cannot complain about a lack of housing and the problems with housing and then defend the LNP mayor who has not produced a housing strategy. They say that they do not need to because there is one in place that uses 2006 data. What has changed since 2006? I was pretty young in 2006, but the local LNP mayor thinks that a housing strategy that uses 2006 data will somehow be useful when dealing with the crises that we have now. It is no wonder that the planning minister had to take that over to ensure that that important piece of work happens. He cannot complain about a crisis and then defend an LNP colleague and mayor who does not even have a housing strategy. That is an absolutely ludicrous position to take up.

Let us have a look at the member's council mate, councillor Mitchell. Currently he is campaigning—get this—against a set of units for NDIS housing in Cleveland. That is the LNP's track record: on the one hand they complain about a lack of housing and on the other they campaign against it for the disabled. You cannot make this stuff up. At the local level they are campaigning against housing solutions and at the state level they are campaigning against housing solutions. Let us look at what they are doing at the federal level. Currently, a \$10 billion housing package is before the federal parliament. Can members guess who is holding it up? The LNP! Dutton and his mates are holding up a package that would produce 30,000 social houses. Again, you cannot complain about a lack of housing and then block it. Actually, I genuinely think they are doing it on purpose with the Greens.

They have been nimbies but then complain about the problem. The solutions are there: get on board with the temporary planning instrument, get on board with the social housing investment that we are making at a state and federal level and get on board with the types of measures we are undertaking such as investment in social housing in the local area. Members opposite cannot get to their feet and complain about the housing crisis if they are blocking the solutions. On every single level and on every single measure, that is their record.

Dr Robinson interjected.

Mr BROWN: I take the interjection from the member for Oodgeroo. He has a lot of pressure at the moment. We know that former federal member Andrew Laming is hunting his seat down.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Member for Capalaba, I will bring you back to the bill.


Mr BROWN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I was taking the interjection.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: You may have taken the interjection, but I bring you back to the bill.

Mr BROWN: I know that he is under a lot of pressure. He needs to make sure his own house is in order with his membership—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, I have given you some clear guidance there.

Mr BROWN: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I highlight again that it is this side of the House that is coming up with solutions, be it this bill, the investment we are making in social housing or the planning instruments. We are doing the job of the LNP council down there to come up with a housing strategy. We are getting on with it and we are delivering.

 **Mr POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (3.01 pm): I, too, rise to address the Housing Legislation Amendment Bill 2022. As identified in the committee's report, indeed in the chair's own foreword, Queensland is currently experiencing high demand for housing. That is an understatement. Every member of this House would have constituents contacting them on an almost daily basis because of

the lack of housing availability and affordability across the length and breadth of the state of Queensland. We are told that this bill is part of implementing the Queensland government's Queensland Housing Strategy 2017-2027, a 10-year framework that we are six years into. We are still waiting to see many results, to be blunt.

This bill looks at two aspects. The first is changes to the housing sector to enable people to voluntarily donate to a charity that would in turn make investment in affordable houses—that is, Homes for Homes, a not-for-profit established by the Big Issue. Those of us who spend some time in the city often see the *Big Issue* being sold. We commend the work of the Big Issue and certainly commend their efforts in trying to address affordable housing in the state of Queensland.

The other aspect is around retirement villages. It is designed to strengthen public confidence and enhance financial transparency in the retirement village industry. Anyone in this House who has any dealings with the retirement village industry knows that that sort of move would be welcome to ensure residents of those retirement villages can see what they are getting into and what is changing during their time within a retirement village.

I return to the contribution by the member for Capalaba in terms of what this government is actually delivering when it comes to improving availability and affordability of housing in this state. We hear a lot of words—about a lot of investment and a lot of dollars—but what are we hearing when it comes to putting roofs over the heads of vulnerable Queenslanders? Indeed, it is not just for vulnerable Queenslanders but Queenslanders in general who are desperate to get housing for them and their family.

This morning the opposition asked a number of questions. It started with the Leader of the Opposition asking—given it is nearly two years since the announcement of the Housing Investment Fund, one of those landmark decisions the member for Capalaba referred to—how many Queenslanders have had a roof put over their head through the Queensland Housing Investment Fund? The answer was zero—none. The Leader of the Opposition went on to ask about the statement that Griffith University would be ready within six months to offer crisis accommodation. Six months on, how many people are being accommodated at the Griffith University? Again, the answer is zero.

We then had a question from the member for Everton, the shadow minister for housing—someone whose performance those opposite should be aspiring to in terms of his tenure as housing minister. He was one of the finest, and he went a long way to addressing the waitlist for social housing. His plans would have done even more had they not been torn up by the Palaszczuk Labor government on its election in 2015. The member for Everton asked a question around the Deputy Premier's statements concerning granny flats and making more, cheaper properties available for those needing to enter the rental market, helping thousands of people across the state. How many has it helped? None. We have not heard of any. The Premier certainly could not answer that question, either.

We then heard from the member for Surfers Paradise, the shadow minister for seniors, asking about the purchase of that retirement village in Clayfield. We understand that subsequently villages have been purchased in Toowoomba and just today out in Redlands. How many people have been accommodated through those retirement villages? Again the answer is zero.


Then there was the announcement just yesterday of this rental price cap. First of all, it is not a rental price cap. If we understand what has been put in the media by the Premier, all it does is allow private owners of rented properties to pass on an increase only once per year. The member for Currumbin asked how often in the current environment we see rental agreements increase rent more than once a year. The answer would be that, out of the million people renting, a very small fraction of those who are not on one-year agreements but on six-month agreements would potentially have more than one price increase a year. Again, how will this solve the housing affordability and housing availability crisis that is gripping my electorate of Glass House and the state of Queensland? We hear a lot of words from those opposite. Whilst I do not disagree with the proposals being put forward in this legislation, I fear that yet again all we will hear are words and we will see no real action.

How many Queenslanders are moving into social or affordable housing or having more available housing presented to them as a result of the actions of those opposite? The Deputy Premier announced that there would be a review of the South East Queensland Regional Plan. I asked the Deputy Premier when my constituents in Glass House will have an opportunity to have input into that review. The answer I got was some vague reference to the fact that they have a statutory obligation to put it out for 30 days consultation once the draft is developed and that the draft would not be developed until later this year. Again, that is not going to free up land that can potentially be developed. It will be years before the likes

of my son and my daughter can potentially purchase an affordable house anywhere within the Sunshine Coast-Moreton Bay region, or even for that matter the Gympie Regional Council area, outside of South-East Queensland itself.

All of these ideas might make good sound bites but, when the rubber hits the road, they are not producing the results. They are not helping vulnerable Queenslanders who are coming to us as their local members pleading for social housing and pleading for housing availability in our local area so that they do not have to relocate their children from their schools or move away from the job they have secured. It goes further than that. A lot of the business owners in the electorate of Glass House are pleading with me to open up more housing in the area. They cannot get employees. The local IGA used to have 90 per cent of its workforce located within the Maleny postcode area. That is now 10 per cent. Why? It is because the employees of the IGA have been priced out of the market. The same goes for many of the hospitality businesses in places such as Maleny, Montville and even Woodford and Wamuran. They cannot get staff because people cannot find accommodation within cooee of where they need to work. We need to sort this out.

Again, there is nothing wrong with what is being proposed. My concern is that it is just platitudes and words and it is not going to solve the crisis in the affordability and availability of housing in this state. Queenslanders deserve better. They do not need to be told that they are just whingeing when they bring these concerns to us as members of parliament. They are genuinely trying to find solutions for themselves, their children, their friends and their neighbours. The people of this state deserve better than what they are getting from this Palaszczuk Labor government.

 **Ms BUSH** (Cooper—ALP) (3.09 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution to the Housing Legislation Amendment Bill. I think the point has been well made that the housing demands on all levels of government in every jurisdiction in Australia are extraordinarily high. Just last week, results from suburb trends showed that three of the top five suburbs in Brisbane for housing undersupply are in my electorate so I am certainly alive to the fact that people are feeling pressure at the moment.

Population trends are a major contributor to this. If we look at Australia's housing trends against comparator jurisdictions, Australia's population is growing at twice the rate of the USA and two-thirds the rate of the UK. Many jurisdictions—jurisdictions like Japan, Italy and Germany—are experiencing population decline. Australia is facing extraordinary population pressures and certainly feeling growing pains.

Queensland has particularly felt the brunt of it with over 30,000 people moving to Queensland last financial year alone. Through our strong health response through COVID and securing major international events like the Olympics, everyone wants a piece of Queensland—and who can blame them. It is pretty clear that this has put our state's services, in particular our housing, health and education services, under unprecedented pressure.

Housing is a human right. I am sure all members have felt deeply frustrated and deeply anxious for those who are struggling to find a secure and appropriate home in their budget and in their preferred suburb, or in fact to find a secure home at all. I will refer to the Queensland Housing Strategy 2017-2027 because not only does this strategy aim to adjust those policy levers to respond to housing pressures, but of relevance the bill delivers against this strategy by addressing two key objectives. Those objectives are boosting the supply of social and affordable housing and private sector investment in Queensland through enabling a charitable donation deed model through the Homes for Homes initiative and increasing consumer protections and transparency in financial reporting in retirement villages.

The Queensland Housing Strategy is a whole-of-government response to housing needs. It needs a holistic approach and requires us to think differently about how we respond to Queensland's housing pressures. Queenslanders have different interests and different expectations of government.

In my electorate many of us are sensitive to development applications and yet we all acknowledge the desperate need for safe, appealing and affordable housing. We want to protect our natural assets and retain our green spaces. Simultaneously, we want to manage urban sprawl and ensure that our suburbs retain their character. It is complex work, but those interests do not have to be mutually exclusive. I believe the Labor government, through initiatives like the recent Housing Summit, is the government that can continue to bring all of these stakeholders and all sides of the conversation together to navigate this clear and inclusive path forward.

The bill focuses on two areas within the housing mix: affordable housing, and in particular private investment and the backing of that, and housing security for our retirees. The bill proposes amendments to the Housing Act 2003 and the Housing Regulation to allow the recording of an administrative advice


noting the existence of a voluntary donation deed on the property title. The donation deed signifies the owner intends to donate a portion of the sale price of their property to Homes for Homes—a non-profit organisation established by the Big Issue for the purchase of social and affordable houses in Queensland.

Homes for Homes is an independent, not-for-profit company that raises funds to provide social and affordable housing through people making a tax deductible 0.1 per cent donation from the sale of their property. This initiative generates private sector revenue to invest in social and affordable housing projects by securing voluntary donations from landowners, including developers, upon the sale of a participating property.

The Homes for Homes initiative is consistent with the Housing Strategy objective of boosting the supply of affordable housing. It creates opportunities for multiple investors and helps focus private sector investment into pro-social areas. I am certainly looking forward to seeing how the initiative rolls out and what it can deliver for housing in Queensland.

In relation to the bill's response to retirees, the bill aims to strengthen public confidence and enhance financial transparency in the retirement village industry. Issues about financial transparency and accountability constitute a high volume of village resident complaints made to the Department of Communities, Housing and Digital Economy as well as compliance work with operators, and disputes bought under the Retirement Villages Act, including through the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal.

Reforms to improve the transparency, accountability and consistency of village financial reporting commenced in late 2019, with amendments made in the housing legislation amendment act. These reforms are well researched and have been consulted on extensively. They aim to provide greater security and certainty to our older Queenslanders. Again, I look forward to seeing those outcomes. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr MINNIKIN** (Chatsworth—LNP) (3.14 pm): I rise to make a small contribution to the Housing Legislation Amendment Bill. I would like to thank the committee for their work. As has been pointed out by other speakers on this side of the chamber, the LNP will not be opposing the bill. I would like to take this opportunity to go through a few points.

The bill amends the Housing Act 2003, the Housing Regulation 2015 and the Retirement Villages Act 1999. The bill deals with two issues: first, the establishment of the Homes for Homes donation deed model in Queensland; and, second, changes to the Retirement Villages Act 1999 to strengthen financial reporting requirements. I will first of all address the Homes for Homes scheme.

By the government's own admission, this legislation is in response to the Housing Summit which the government held on 20 October last year. The sector came with an open-minded approach and new ideas and there, from all reports, appeared to be a real willingness to get on with solving the housing crisis in Queensland and the problems associated with the housing crisis.

The reality is that time waits for no-one. I will come back to this point shortly. Time having moved on, the goodwill that would have no doubt been in that room in late October last year seems to be evaporating rather quickly. At the end of the day, as I said, you cannot buy time. This was many months ago. Notwithstanding the Christmas and new year break, here we are now getting towards the back end of March and with the path we are heading down it is very slow to see tangible action.

I have said already that the opposition will not stand in the way of the changes that allow for the Homes for Homes model to operate in Queensland. It has been said—and I completely concur—that it is an organisation trying to do its bit to put a roof over people's heads. It is an independent, not-for-profit company that raises much needed funds to provide social and affordable housing through people making a tax deductible 0.1 per cent donation from the sale of their property. In its purist form, this is a very noble approach.

Established by the social enterprise the Big Issue, Homes for Homes is operational in all Australian states and territories. I believe the previous speaker on this side of the chamber, the member for Glass House, pointed out that when he is in the big smoke of Brisbane he buys himself a copy of the *Big Issue*. I take this opportunity, given it is topical in relation to this particular section of my contribution, to acknowledge all of those fine men and women who get off their behinds and do something about their own lot in life and sell the *Big Issue*. I highly recommend it. It is a great read.

The Community Support and Services Committee's report identified that the organisation has granted over \$1.28 million in funding to 13 projects in Victoria, Queensland, the Northern Territory and the ACT. This obviously gives people the option to voluntarily make this donation and the LNP happily

supports this endeavour. However, if we are to be honest and mature about the scale of donations that we could possibly expect government coffers to receive and subsequent investment, we are likely to see fairly minimal financial returns. We wish it were more, but given that we have cost-of-living pressures impacting pretty much every Queenslander it may well be dawning for a bit of a false hope to think that the coffers will be overflowing with any proceeds from the scheme, no matter how good the intent is.

At the end of the day, skyrocketing interest rates are having a flow-on effect on the housing market. As someone who does not ever claim to be an expert in any one thing, but having studied, in the big building next door at QUT, a masters degree in property economics, some of the items that have been raised, which I will not elaborate on for too long—I will keep to the strict long title of the bill—worry me greatly as to what the unintended consequences could be for public housing in this state and the private housing investment market. I hope I am proven wrong, but we will see what the result will be of any proposed changes in the coming months. I stress that there may well be unintended consequences.

We know that the Homes for Homes model will be a drop in the ocean of what is needed given the sheer enormity of the housing crisis which, sadly, Queensland finds itself in the grips of. The Community Support and Services Committee made three recommendations in relation to the Homes for Homes provisions of the bill which suggest some minor technical changes and clarifications along with ensuring the clear communication of any donation being voluntary. They are valid recommendations which the LNP wholeheartedly endorses.


I would now like to highlight the Housing Summit background and promises. I have said already—and we all know in this House—that there is definitely a housing crisis, and again I go back to my opening comments: you cannot buy time. You cannot rewind the hands on the clock. The state government has been in power now for eight years. When we come to the next state election they will have been in power for a decade. At the end of the day, it is almost tailoresque that what gets measured, gets done. Despite our best efforts during question time to get the minister to have a crack at answering different questions, the sad reality is that there has been very, very little stock—in fact, not enough—to keep up with the pressing housing crisis in this state. We have made it very clear that the first thing the state government owes people is to at least feel safe but also where practicable put a house over people's heads. That is absolutely the second thing they have to look at doing.

The reality is that we are seeing a range of different housing announcements. The LNP does fear that those opposite are overhyping the legislation and that it is something which provides assistance on a very limited scale. We need to start seeing some tangible results in this area of public policy. We are coming up to roughly 130 days since the summit on 20 October last year, and other than the Homes for Homes initiative, as idealistically good as it is, what has the government really got to show for it? Let's go through a couple of things quickly.

There was a promise at the end of last year that QBuild would build 80 prefabricated homes at a facility this financial year. We do not even know if the facility is open. There was a promise to 'urgently' open crisis accommodation at Griffith University. It was meant to be open now—not yesterday, not the day before. It was meant to have been open already well and truly, but that will not be open now until later this year. We do not know exactly when. I will keep going. There was a promise to increase rental supply through the use of granny flats, which was the subject of heated conversation in question time this morning, yet even the Deputy Premier has admitted, 'We haven't seen that yet.' They were talking up a Housing Investment Fund which, nearly two years after being announced, is still yet to deliver a single home. There was a state government land and building audit which nobody knows the results of yet.

I would urge those opposite to stop peddling false hope and get on with delivering what is required by many Queensland families. As with many people in this chamber, I regularly have open mobile offices on the weekend and midweek. It saddens me, because at the most recent one last Saturday morning it was starting to become pretty obvious what the usual issues in my particular local area are. Because of the iconic shop I had my mobile office in front of, people came from near and far. As far as I am concerned, at the end of the day it is not for me as a public MP to turn anyone away. If someone wants to raise something with me, I will hear their point. It was becoming very, very disconcerting that the whole issue of the housing crisis was now starting to affect people from here, there and everywhere. I would urge the government to get on with delivering.

In relation to the amendments to the Retirement Villages Act, this is something that is probably long overdue. When I visit them, my retirement village constituents tell me they are looking for greater transparency when it comes to the financial information they are given, so I do absolutely say that this is a good thing. It may also have some unintended consequences, but the mere fact that people will be provided with more open, transparent and accountable documentation I think will aid their decision-making. We support this bill.

 **Mr KING** (Kurwongbah—ALP) (3.24 pm): I rise today to contribute to this debate on the Housing Legislation Amendment Bill 2022. I want to begin by saying that I am proud to be a part of a state government that is tackling the issue of housing and homelessness head-on. We have a 10-year framework that has been mentioned a number of times: the Queensland Housing Strategy 2017-2027. Since it has launched we have: commenced over 2,400 new social housing homes; invested close to \$140 million in community housing partnerships to deliver over 1,000 more new social and affordable homes; commenced build-to-rent pilot projects in Fortitude Valley, Newstead and Brisbane which will deliver 490 rental homes at a discount rate out of a total of 1,200 new dwellings; constructed crisis shelters for survivors of domestic and family violence in areas of need across the state; and improved legislation to better protect owners of manufactured homes and retirement villages. This bill makes some further changes with regard to transparency and accountability in retirement village finances, which I will come back to. I know that work is also underway on a new regulatory impact statement to address rising costs in manufactured home parks. I look forward to seeing that work come to fruition later this year.

As part of our Housing Strategy we have also: launched the Queensland Housing and Homelessness Action Plan 2021-2025 and subsequently backed it up with a \$1.9 billion commitment; introduced new products and services, including Bond Loan Plus, rent subsidies, no interest loans and headleasing through the department of housing to help people access and sustain tenancies in the private rental market. For those listening at home, if you have not heard of headleasing or the Help to Home initiative and you are thinking of renting out a property or know someone who is, I encourage you to look it up and consider leasing to the department of housing under some quite appealing terms. We have made changes to residential tenancy laws with our first tranche of changes in effect now, and new minimum housing standards will come into effect for new tenancies this September and all tenancies in September 2024.

I want to thank the over 150,000 tenants, property owners and managers who engaged with us during the consultation on these changes, especially those in my electorate who also provided their feedback directly to my office. In October last year, as has been discussed, the Premier convened the Queensland Housing Summit, bringing together a broad range of stakeholders to brainstorm new ways of addressing homelessness, especially in the short term. Since then we have doubled our Housing Investment Fund to \$2 billion, declared new priority development areas and committed \$200 million for critical infrastructure to unlock land for development. We have also boosted funding for a range of region-specific programs. I want to thank Encircle for meeting with me recently to talk about the myriad services they are offering to help people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness across the Moreton Bay region.


This bill furthers our objectives under the Housing Strategy by making it possible for Queensland home owners to donate a percentage of their sale price to the Homes for Homes initiative. Homes for Homes is already operating in other Australian states, and although the percentage donated from each sale is tiny, cumulatively it all adds up to facilitate new housing investment. Currently, our land title laws in Queensland do not support it, which is how Homes for Homes donation deeds are recorded in other states; however, this bill will introduce an administrative advice that can be recorded on a land title to notify anyone dealing with the land in question of the voluntary donation deed. Importantly, an administrative advice is not legally binding and a potential donor is free to opt out at any time. I see that there are some amendments from the minister to further clarify that. This is a great initiative, and I encourage anyone thinking of selling their home soon to please donate if you can afford to. You can claim it on your tax.

I mentioned earlier that this bill takes our protections for residents in retirement villages another step further. We are doing this by creating new regulation-making power to introduce a form for the financial documents of retirement villages to be made public. These include: capital replacement fund budgets; quarterly and annual financial statements; audit reports; and quantity surveyor reports. To increase transparency other financials might also be made to be public, including: shared or apportioned expenses—for example, the relevant staff, administration and utilities costs if a number of villages are owned by one company; comparisons of costs from previous years; and explanations of

surplus or deficits. We are literally spelling out in the Retirement Villages Act our objective to maintain public confidence in the industry through financially transparent and accountable operations. We hope these added consumer protections will drive best practice across the retirement village industry. The Department of Communities, Housing and Digital Economy will provide templates and guidance to assist any necessary transitions.

We recognise that residents in retirement villages have made a significant financial investment in purchasing their homes. At a time in their lives when these Queenslanders should be kicking up their feet and relaxing, they should not have to worry about being ripped off in their ongoing fees. This bill will help them to see where their money is going, providing the peace of mind they deserve.

Our government will continue to step up our game when it comes to housing. We believe every Queenslander deserves a roof over their head. This bill makes sure residents in retirement villages can feel more secure in their homes and introduces a new avenue for ordinary Queensland home owners to make a real difference when it comes to tackling housing shortages. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr LANGBROEK** (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (3.29 pm): I rise to speak on the Housing Legislation Amendment Bill 2022. I want to thank the committee for their report. As we have heard from other members, the purpose of this bill is to address two objectives that arose from the government's Queensland's Housing Strategy 2017-2027 by assisting to increase the supply of social and affordable housing and private sector investment in Queensland. The first objective is to establish the Homes for Homes donation deed model in Queensland.

Homes for Homes is a social enterprise established by the Big Issue and operational in all Australian states and territories. This program gives people the option of voluntarily making a tax deductible 0.1 per cent donation from the sale of their property that goes towards social and affordable housing. As we heard from the shadow minister, the member for Everton, the opposition will not oppose the bill. We support the Homes for Homes program but there are concerns around a voluntary donations program scaling up to help with the housing shortage in Queensland.

Queensland is already feeling the cost-of-living pressures, so how many people are actually going to be able to donate when they are flat out trying to scrape together every last cent to afford a deposit, let alone the ongoing repayments whilst interest rates continue to rise? Whilst not a criticism of the Homes for Homes program, the reality of the world in which we are living means people prioritise necessities, such as groceries, fuel, rent or a mortgage. The Homes for Homes model will be a drop in the ocean compared to what is needed, given the enormity of the housing crisis here in Queensland.

The housing crisis is real. It is upon us. There are homeless people living on the streets in my electorate due to the government's inaction. After eight years in power, not releasing enough land for new homes and failing to plan and forecast how many social homes are needed, the government is now scrambling for solutions. I refer to the article on ABC News dated 21 February 2023 titled 'Could prefab be a quick fix for the housing crisis? Queensland's government thinks so'. The article refers to a pilot program rolling out 52 prefabricated homes in the coming months. The article stated—

Housing advocates welcome the initiative but say the volume is nowhere near enough to tackle the social housing waitlist—which stands at 46,000 people.

I table a copy of that article.

Tabled paper: Article from ABC News online, dated 21 February 2023, titled 'Could prefab be a quick fix for the housing crisis?: Queensland's government thinks so' [\[376\]](#).

The Queensland Council of Social Services CEO, Aimee McVeigh, said that the prefab pilot program was nowhere near enough to meet demand right now. She said—

So far, we haven't seen any commitments that really meet us in the moment.

When you have piecemeal one-off funding announcements with small amounts of houses being delivered without time frames, it's very difficult to see how the government has responded to the crisis in a way that will get us out of this mess.

I am concerned that this issue will continue to increase if immediate action is not taken by the government. As we heard from other members, after the Housing Summit, which was held nearly 130 days ago, and two subsequent round tables, including one today, we had a promise for QBuild to open a facility by the end of 2022 to build 80 prefabricated homes this financial year, but what has happened with that; we had a promise to urgently open crisis accommodation at Griffith University, which was meant to be open now and will not be ready until later this year; and we had a promise to increase rental supply through granny flats.

Let me tell the House about an 88-year-old constituent on the Gold Coast who decided to turn his shed, which I think he had been sleeping in, into a granny flat. Unfortunately, certifiers and local councils are bound by state government regulation. This constituent has had to subsequently decommission his granny flat because it did not have an appropriate plumbing membrane in the bathroom. He had to remove the toilets, taps and vanity basin because he was not prepared to incur the costs of retrofitting a membrane. It was a prohibitive cost for him. I would like to advise the House of how much he spent trying to get his shed converted to a dwelling—and remember this is an 88-year-old pensioner who was trying to do his best to alleviate the housing shortage. He spent \$1,800 on drawings—

Ms Boyd interjected.

Mr LANGBROEK: I hear those opposite whingeing about something. This is an 88-year-old pensioner bound by the rules and laws of the state government, which is making councils and certifiers pass on these costs to this 88-year-old pensioner. The costs that he has incurred include: \$1,800 for drawings, all paid in advance—

Ms Boyd interjected.

Mr LANGBROEK: It is all very well for the member for Pine Rivers to be yelling out from where she is over there. She is staying there; she is not going anywhere else in this place.

Ms Boyd interjected.

Mr LANGBROEK: Well, that is what the Premier said. He paid: \$1,800 for drawings; \$2,450 to the certification company; \$1,950 for a termite certificate; \$370 for a smoke alarm certificate; and now \$330 to remove the taps, vanity basin and toilet. That is nearly \$7,000. He did not have to pay the engineer's final examination certificate because of course it cannot be certified. That is the reality of what the granny flat promise has meant for him and many other Queenslanders.

This is a housing crisis right across the state, and those opposite do not understand the significance of their throwaway words. We have seen this a number of times—whether it is about rental caps or the Olympics. Whatever it is, the effects on the market are extreme, and this 88-year-old pensioner has been at the tail end of copping \$7,000 worth of costs and now he is not able to use his granny flat to alleviate the dwelling shortage.

The housing crisis is being felt by our essential health workers in parts of regional Queensland. I refer to an article on the ABC News dated 8 February 2023 titled 'Queensland housing crisis leaving essential health workers without a place to rent'. In this article, the Queensland Nurses and Midwives' Union secretary, Beth Mohle, said—

It's a critical issue and we really need to actually have government turn their attention to this.

For core workers like nurses, midwives, teachers, police ... they are people who are really needed in regional and rural areas.


We need to make sure they've got the housing stock that will attract them to those areas.

I table a copy of that article.

Tabled paper: Article from ABC News online, dated 8 February 2023, titled 'Queensland housing crisis leaving essential health workers without a place to rent' [\[377\]](#).

This brings me to the second objective of the bill, which is changes to the Retirement Villages Act 1999 to strengthen financial reporting requirements. The amendments will address limitations in the Retirement Villages Act to: firstly, achieve the policy goal of more transparent, accountable and consistent financial reporting; secondly, help improve financial transparency of village operations by increased access to financial documents; and, thirdly, strengthen public confidence in a financially transparent and accountable retirement village industry.

The government hopes these amendments will increase access to particular village financial documents for village residents, the department and the public register for retirement villages. While the intention of the bill is clear in improving transparency and compliance in financial reporting for retirement village operators, the opposition does hold concerns that a consequence of these amendments will be increased obligations and therefore costs for village operators. In my electorate of Surfers Paradise, I have retirement villages operating. I would hate to see smaller operators who may have previously been able to deal with financial reporting requirements internally now having to engage external accounting services to meet the proposed requirements. It should be noted that both the Property Council of Australia and the Urban Development Institute of Australia, the UDIA, have also highlighted these concerns. These amendments would likely lead to increased obligations and costs for retirement village operators, with the flow-on effect of costs being passed on to retirement village residents.

 **Ms KING** (Pumicestone—ALP) (3.38 pm): I rise today in support of the Housing Legislation Amendment Bill 2022 which enables the Homes for Homes scheme, as we have heard, and implements protections regarding retirement villages in order to maintain public confidence and increase transparency. Unlike the member for Surfers Paradise, my priority will always be on those residents of retirement villages and their needs and their ability to assess the value and financial accountability of the villages they are considering retiring in.

There is absolutely no doubt that housing is a key challenge in all of our communities. Queensland may be the place to be, with net interstate migration equivalent to the city of Gladstone moving to Queensland each year, but that does come with a shadow side regarding demand for housing. That is why our Palaszczuk government is working in every possible way we can to ease housing pressures that are impacting people right across Australia. We are building more social and affordable homes, we are unlocking land supply, we are giving Queenslanders the support they need to achieve and maintain a tenancy, and we are delivering rental reform like the Premier's announcement of our plan to limit the number of rent increases to just one a year, in line with other states.

The Palaszczuk Labor government is taking up the challenge of housing with our biggest ever concentrated investment in social housing—\$2 billion in the Housing Investment Fund and almost a further \$2 billion in various support funds and projects. In Pumicestone since 2015, we have seen nearly 100 social homes completed and there are more to come. By 2027, our government will have commenced more than 13,000 social and affordable homes, which is a huge achievement given current constraints surrounding workers, surrounding materials, surrounding land supply and all of the other factors that we are facing.

What more stark contrast could we possibly see than with the LNP, like the member for Glass House, who make lots of complaints, issue lots of motherhood statements and lots of criticisms of all our government are doing but offer not one single solution. Their so-called housing plan is a housing vacuum. They try to capitalise on the current pressures in the housing market in an attempt to win votes but, as the Premier said this morning, their record on housing is really clear: they just wanted to get public housing off their books and off their hands—yet one more expression of their privatisation agenda.


Then we have the Greens party, that bastion of double standards, who talk such a big game on housing, but when it comes to building actual housing or even allowing actual housing to be built, they never ever back it. They are currently blocking the single biggest housing investment in a decade with federal Labor's Housing Future Fund that will see 30,000 social and affordable houses built over the next five years because they say it does not go far enough. That is a story that on our side of the House we have all recalled hearing before with their ETS playbook that delivered 10 years of climate inaction. Today we have had the member for South Brisbane again talking down action on housing that is contained in this bill, but it is absolutely par for the course for her and her federal and state colleagues.

In the spirit of doing absolutely everything possible to support Queenslanders with housing, the bill that we are debating today amends the Housing Act 2003 to support the Homes for Homes donation deed model. Homes for Homes' independent, not-for-profit social enterprise model has so far raised \$1.3 million for 13 different social and affordable housing initiatives across Australia, but there is a much greater potential, and our government believes that we must use every single lever that we have at our disposal in order to get more Queenslanders into housing and hence the legislation before the chamber today. The model creates that pathway for developers to make a tax deductible 0.1 per cent donation of the sale price which then goes forward to increase the provision of social and affordable housing.

Contrary to the member for Everton's meanderings, our government does not claim for a moment that Homes for Homes is a silver bullet for all the current pressures on housing markets across Australia. Because housing is so tough right now, our government will continue to use every lever at our disposal, and supporting Homes for Homes is one small but important part of our strategy to increase the supply of social and affordable housing throughout our state.

The legislation also amends the Retirement Villages Act 1999. With the highest proportion of people over 65 in any electorate in Queensland, these changes are particularly important to my communities in Pumicestone and very good news for older people who are looking to move into a retirement village. Currently, resident committees are engaged with the budget process and residents do have rights in relation to setting the total general services charge that they pay, but some reporting obligations are not easy to understand or enforce, leaving room for ambiguity, confusion and inadvertent breaches. These changes are imperative to protect older Queenslanders who have a large financial investment in their retirement village.

The amendments in this bill are just one small part of our response to supporting Queenslanders with housing, but they are important measures that enhance fairness, enhance transparency and enhance innovation, as every Queenslander deserves. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr PERRETT** (Gympie—LNP) (3.43 pm): I rise to speak on the Housing Legislation Amendment Bill 2022. This bill aims to boost the supply of social and affordable housing and increase private sector investment deals with a Homes for Homes donation deed model. It also makes changes to the Retirement Villages Act to strengthen financial reporting requirements. These measures are part of the government's response to the Housing Summit which was held six months ago in October. Despite the deteriorating housing crisis, it has taken six months before we can debate measures. It is a clear demonstration that the government is quick to embrace the theatre of politics but very slow to get its act together.

The Housing Summit was forced on the government by the LNP. The government was forced to do something because of the sheer magnitude of blowback it was receiving from the public, from advocates and in the media. A tokenistic housing summit designed to milk the goodwill in the room and clear the air cannot be the only action taken. The goodwill will evaporate quickly if tangible actions are not seen. This is the path we are heading down.

The LNP will support the changes which allow for the Homes for Homes model to operate in Queensland. Homes for Homes is already operational across all other states and territories, but let us put its efforts into perspective. Homes for Homes is an independent, not-for-profit company that raises funds to provide social and affordable housing through people making a tax deductible 0.1 per cent donation from the sale or rent of their property. They raise funds from these donations to provide grants for housing projects. According to the committee's report, it has granted over \$1.28 million in funding to 13 projects in Victoria, Queensland, the Northern Territory and the Australian Capital Territory. The minister said in her second reading speech—

In September last year the Premier convened a housing summit ... to tackle one of the biggest challenges facing our state ... The summit resulted in a number of significant outcomes ...

Among those outcomes was to provide \$500,000 seed funding to Homes for Homes. Donating to the organisation is commendable, but it will not meet the housing demand across the state. Let's put that in perspective. We are talking about a project which has realised \$1.28 million across every other state and jurisdiction. It is a drop in the ocean.

This initiative is listed as a 'key action' from the Housing Summit. This bill is a response to that summit. The summit was held 159 days ago, more than half a year ago, and one month after the government held a housing round table. It is hard not to be cynical about the government's approach. Three housing forums, media events and press releases do not solve the issues.

During the second reading speech, the minister said these amendments will help address the extraordinary market conditions 'which are causing unprecedented pressures on the housing market'. The pressures did not appear overnight. They have built up for years. Much of the housing crisis can be laid at the feet of the government. It has been in power for eight years. It has not released enough land for new homes. It has never planned or forecasted how many social homes were needed. It continually neglects the community housing sector, a sector which is embraced in every other jurisdiction in Australia.

Failed timber policies spanning years of successive Labor governments have directly resulted in increased housing and renovation costs. As we face a housing crisis, the government is unable to understand the contribution of its anti-forestry and anti-timber agenda. The result is that Queenslanders continue to pay more for housing, rent and renovations.

The amendments to the Retirement Villages Act aim to improve transparency and compliance in financial reporting for retirement village operators. The government had previously made changes to the Retirement Villages Act and then found its amendments were unworkable. Two years ago we debated amendments which provided an exemption for freehold resident-operated retirement villages from existing statutory buyback requirements. The changes were part of yet another housing strategy, the Queensland Housing Strategy 2017-2027. Warnings in 2017 and 2019 about the adverse impact of its provisions took until two years ago for the government to walk back from its proposals. It sent small-time operators into liquidation and threatened the viability of regional villages. In my own electorate, the Cooloola Waters Retirement Village in Tin Can Bay went into liquidation as a direct result of the state legislation. It was a small community of 44 units.

It is therefore with some reservations that I do not oppose these latest amendments to the Retirement Villages Act. I am concerned these changes could increase obligations and therefore cost village operators and ultimately residents. Small operators who have been able to internally deal with financial reporting obligations may now be forced to use external accounting services.

When cost-of-living increases are becoming harder to carry, the government must do everything possible to not increase the cost for village operators. Changes must be practical and implemented with common sense. The government has treated the housing crisis as a political problem, a media problem. However, you cannot put a roof over someone's head with a media release.

Last year's budget promise to build 1,200 new social and affordable homes was an exercise in cynical and cruel trickery; it was already announced in the budget the year before. The promise in 2021 was unfunded and delivered nothing. The promise was then repeated a year later in a cynical, contemptible abuse of the public's trust.

During the second reading speech the minister also said this bill supports the government's commitment to ensure vulnerable Queenslanders have access to safe and secure housing. Whether you call it social housing or crisis housing, there is next to nothing available across the Gympie region. The pressure on the private rental market puts pressure on the social housing list. People struggle to access safe and secure housing. My office fields calls from distressed residents trying to find crisis accommodation. Too often we are told there are no available vacancies. Private renters contact me distressed that it is harder and harder to find somewhere to live. Of course, last year's floods exacerbated the crisis. Many renters and home owners were forced out of homes and then competed for somewhere to live, but the difficulties were there before the floods.


A healthy vacancy rate is between 2.6 per cent and 3.5 per cent. In November the *Courier-Mail* reported that the Real Estate Institute of Queensland's latest quarterly rental report showed Gympie vacancies were at 0.4 per cent. It was Gympie's ninth quarter of below 0.5 per cent. The REIQ chief executive officer said it was unlikely renters will see any relief from the tight market in the foreseeable future.

While Gympie locals struggled to find accommodation, the Treasurer last year declared that a unit block would not be appropriate for residents who are living rough in tents and cars. The comments were disrespectful to those struggling to find somewhere to live. During the last sitting the housing minister said in a ministerial statement—

In December our government reached the milestone of 5,000 social home commencements since we came to government in 2015. Based on our commitments, we are projected to start 13,000 social and affordable homes by 2027.

The government commenced 5,000 dwellings in the last eight years and then is projecting 13,000 in the next four years. The minister repeated this claim again this morning. Gympie's share of those 5,000 commencements over the last years has been miserable. In February I asked the minister about the number of social houses that the government had invested in the Gympie and Fraser Coast local government areas. The response was shocking. The government delivered only four dwellings and 13 bedrooms between 2016 and 2022 in the Gympie area. It contrasts with 41 dwellings and 80 bedrooms in the Fraser Coast area. In fact, there was absolutely nothing in the Gympie local government area from 2016 until 2021.

We are paying the price because housing has been treated as a political issue. When people are living in their cars, in tents or couch surfing and when families are being split and forced to live apart, the last thing they need is platitudes and trickeries. I support the bill.

 **Mrs MULLEN** (Jordan—ALP) (3.52 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Housing Legislation Amendment Bill 2022. It is undeniable that across Australia and indeed the world we are in the midst of a significant housing shortage. The truth is that the market will simply not provide enough affordable and social housing without a suite of legislative and financial policy mechanisms from all levels of government. The bill before us provides the mechanism for one particular measure that has found success in other states and is worthy of implementation in Queensland.

It was misleading and, frankly, mischievous of the member for South Brisbane to say that this bill is the government's solution to housing in our state. I do not know how you forget \$3.9 billion, but the member for South Brisbane has, so I will remind her. It is \$3.9 billion, the largest concentrated investment in social and affordable housing in Queensland's history. Perhaps it is easy to forget \$3.9 billion when it does not fit your narrative. The Greens cannot have it both ways. They are anti development but they want more housing. They want governments to do more, but will not support the federal government's legislation to establish the \$10 billion Housing Australia Future Fund. Give me a

break! The high moral ground is of no use to those who need affordable housing in our communities. We cannot all encourage illegal squatting like a certain Brisbane city councillor does. We must also be open to all solutions to address our housing shortages in the state. This is just one measure.

Amendments to the Housing Act 2003 and Housing Regulation 2015 will allow the recording of an administrative advice noting the existence of a voluntary donation deed on the property title. This will signify the owner intends to donate a portion of the sale price of their property to Homes for Homes, a not-for-profit organisation established by the Big Issue for the purchase of social and affordable housing in Queensland. Most people in our communities would be aware of the Big Issue. It is one of Australia's largest and most successful social enterprises, providing marginalised people with a means to work and earn. They have now turned their minds to this vital area of housing. Over the next 30 years, Homes for Homes aims to raise more than \$1 billion for social and affordable housing. The program works generally through the signing of a donation deed, after which a caveat is lodged on the property title. On settlement, the donation is made to Homes for Homes as part of the disbursement process.


In preparation for this bill, I read an opinion piece by University of Queensland researchers Professor Cameron Parsell and Dr Ella Kuskoff. In the article, they outline that many people want to help those struggling with affordable housing, but there are currently very few means to provide people with the help to access the affordable housing they require. Innovative finance and development models are needed to empower communities to fulfil their desire to help by contributing to the development and delivery of new affordable housing stock.

Our government is committed to looking at all available models and working with communities, industry and the housing sector. Our build-to-rent program is a very exciting model and I was very pleased to see the Treasurer's announcement this morning of new and significant tax incentives to increase affordable housing stock through this program. We already have a number of pilots underway and I am confident we will see more of this type of development.

Prior to entering parliament I sat on the board of a Queensland superannuation fund and I was also on the fund's investment committee. It was a little perplexing to me at the time that our fund was investing members' money in social homes in the United Kingdom. When I questioned why we were not investing the funds into Australian or Queensland social housing, we were advised that there was no mechanism nationally or at any state level for this to happen. So I am particularly excited by what we will be able to achieve with our government's Housing Investment Fund. I see that the opposition clearly do not support the fund; they are already whingeing and whining about it. I am sure they have got their garden shears out ready to prune.

The \$2 billion Housing Investment Fund will provide an ongoing and sustainable pool of funding, estimated at around \$130 million every year for subsidies, one-off capital grants and other supports to encourage developers, builders, community housing providers, tenancy managers, institutional investors and superannuation funds to partner and develop, finance and operate social and affordable housing across our state. It is a genuine market-led process and we are already seeing significant interest in participation in the scheme, which is being led by Queensland Treasury. In fact, there were over 300 attendees at the most recent industry briefing. The first major agreement through the Housing Investment Fund has been inked, which will see up to 1,200 new social and affordable homes via a partnership between the housing provider Brisbane Housing Company, the Queensland Investment Corporation and Australian Retirement Trust.

Our government recognises that homelessness or the risk of homelessness can take its toll on mental and physical health, education and employment prospects, resulting in greater dependence on welfare. On this side of the House we will do absolutely everything we can to ensure people in our communities have a safe and secure place they can call home. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Ms SIMPSON** (Maroochydore—LNP) (3.57 pm): I feel like we are living in a parallel universe. We hear Labor members sprout that they are holding round tables and they have a plan to address the housing crisis, yet what we have not seen is anyone in charge in this government. There are multiple ministers who do have legislative and moral responsibility, but we do not see anyone who is actually in charge and driving the program.

Let's have a little look just at the Land Supply and Development Monitoring Report, which is supposed to monitor the South-East Queensland region's land supply and development activity. This was supposed to be just one indicator to help monitor and drive the timely release and provide appropriate information to the market. I understand the latest monitoring report for December 2022 has

still not been released. This is indicative of this government. I am sure they have the information, but they are not sharing it with all of the market. The market is also saying that the way the government is interacting with it is broken.

I believe in good planning. I believe in having the right infrastructure in place to deliver the appropriate types of accommodation in our communities, but this government has completely dropped the ball. I believe its concept of build to rent is recognition of and an admission that it has totally blown the systemic reform that is required to help encourage more investment in the private rental market.

I am sure there will be some nice projects that will help some, but they will be commercial-in-confidence. You will not know the deals that have been done. Why shouldn't there be an open book on this? If we really want to see investment in the private sector, with the government encouraging people in, have systemic reform. We do need private investment in this sector. Roughly 70 per cent of homes are occupied by owner-occupiers and 30 per cent are occupied by renters. It varies a little bit in some markets. In recent times a tremendous number of people have decided to enter the home owner market and have bought their own home for the first time. Many of the rented homes that have been sold have not come back into the rental pool. There is a shortfall in supply.

I want to quote some figures from the Sunshine Coast, where I am. We have seen a record number of people who are homeless or the working poor—people who never expected to be homeless. This experience has been reflected throughout Queensland. Between 2016 and 2021, the average population increase was about 8,500 per year. This was before the COVID disruption. What did we see in regard to new home approvals? We saw about 2,800 new home approvals per year. Currently, we are sitting with a vacancy rate in the rental market of about 0.8 per cent. To cut a long story short, there is a lack of supply. This is being reflected everywhere.

If we want to see more supply in the market, we will have to do a whole lot better than what we have seen to date. Some of the programs are nice, but it is tinkering around the edges. I will still have people coming into my office who are sleeping in tents or sleeping in cars. When I talk to some of the social agencies and people who are out there trying to help these folks, they say that it has changed from when a family living in a car would be found emergency accommodation. Now the question is, 'How old is your family living in the car? If the kids are old enough, okay. If they are little kids, we'll get you into emergency accommodation.' I kid you not: that is one of the conversations that has been relayed to me by somebody who is on the front line of trying to help the most vulnerable.

For goodness sake, we need more urgency and more practical solutions than round tables, which are more about media spin than about driving the wheels to release more supply. Not enough is being done, there is no minister who is responsible and still there are incredibly stupid decisions being made by some of the ministers of this government such as Minister de Brenni—what he has done with public works, what he has done with the National Construction Code and what he has done in ignoring the concerns of the building industry, who are saying, 'We are facing genuine situations where more will go broke.' He is not listening to them.

I believe that you can bring about appropriate reforms to the National Construction Code, but you would not do it the way this man is doing it. They are talking about an average increase of \$50,000 for an average house build in some areas. A whole raft of display homes will no longer be of use. In some places, the price for a slab-on-ground house has increased by about 20 per cent, while the price for houses on sloping sites has increased by around 30 per cent. When I talk to people in Far North Queensland and North Queensland about some of the proposed changes that are coming and the way this National Construction Code will be implemented, they say that it is a whole lot more than about \$50,000 per home. Other builders are saying that the uncertainty and the way it has been done, with this chaotic government, means they are going to get out of the industry.


We have to listen to these people, but I do not believe that this government is listening. We need the builders to build the homes to house the people who are currently living in the bushes, in tents—trying to head wherever they can to get shelter or living in their cars. You are still mucking around at the margins of this issue. It is time we had a minister who is responsible. It is time to release the data rather than hiding it—the land supply monitoring reports and all the other reports. This government has wall-to-wall data but it is not listening to industry. I have spoken to many people, not only in the building industry, who want to see the timely release of new housing stock into the market. This is about supply. What we have seen in the last eight years is a falling pipeline of supply relative to population increase. COVID on top of that has been disruptive, but the trend was already there.

It is pretty ridiculous when it can take eight to 10 years for a housing master plan to be released to the market but there is a lack of recognition from government that they need to do more. It is indicative when we have a transport minister presiding over a department that realises when it goes to expand the roads, 'Oops, there is a housing development.' Those home owners were never notified that their houses would be potentially affected by realignment for expanded roads. That is a government's bread and butter. A good government should ensure planning is done in such a way that it does not have to bulldoze brand new homes in a time of housing crisis.

This is a government that cannot plan, cannot deliver and will not listen to the people who have the solutions. Who pays the price ultimately? It is some of the most vulnerable people in Queensland. I have never seen so many coming through my electorate office door in Maroochydhore. I know that my colleagues in this House and others across the parliament have seen the same in their electorates—people who are desperate. We need better from this government than round tables of hot air and talking. It is time for action. It is time to put a minister in charge with clear, transparent deliverable KPIs. Deliver housing and incentivise the private sector, rather than just your mates with a few commercial-in-confidence deals. Reform the system because it is broken currently. The announcements to date are only verifying that fact.

As I said, I am sure there will be some nice projects built, but it will not be enough unless we start to see a real reform of the system. I want to see people afforded the dignity of a roof over their heads, not in the terrible situation where they do not have that pipeline of supply. They are moving out of the area or, increasingly, moving into desperation and distress.

I heard some members laughing or cackling when my colleague the member for Surfers Paradise was talking about a gentleman who was looking to bring a shed into compliance as a dwelling. I thought, 'How ignorant they are.' There are people who are living in a whole lot worse than sheds. I know that there are people who are literally living in the bushes, in parks, in cars, under bridges, on couches and in vulnerable situations. That should never be the case. It is time we saw action from a government that delivers rather than what we have seen to date: a crisis of their chaos, which is now hurting the most vulnerable. It is time they woke up, stopped blaming other people and took action.

 **Hon. DE FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Small Business and Minister for Training and Skills Development) (4.06 pm): Will you get a lend of those people? Will you get a lend of the way they are carrying on? Here we are in one of the most distressing crises we have seen in Australia. Every single day we are hearing stories of homelessness, of absolute crisis and need. If you are not a person who is experiencing difficulty in getting a roof over your head then you, as a good human being—as we all are—are distressed that it has come to this. This crew over here, when they were in government, wrote letters to little old ladies in social housing saying, 'If you go on a holiday to visit your daughter, we're going to take your house off you'. They wrote letters to vulnerable people to say that—they might have been living in the house for years and raised their family there—they had to take strangers into their house.


At the end of their three years in government, not only had they cut 90 per cent of construction of social housing; we were almost 450 houses behind on the social housing register. The absolute cheek of them! Has any single one of them picked up the phone to Peter Dutton in the last month and said, 'Mate, how about you support the \$10 billion Housing Australia Future Fund so that 30,000 people can get homes?' I bet not one single one of them has picked up the phone and said, 'This is terrible.' We see all of this carrying on and fake concern. I say to them: you do something about it. They had zero commencements in Logan, Gold Coast, Sunshine Coast and Ipswich. They cut funding to the tenancy advisory and advocacy service. They put up the rent of low-income social housing tenants, for goodness sake.

The Housing Legislation Amendment Bill is one of many things that this government is doing to address this issue, yet there is no one single fix to this issue. This bill is one of many things. Let me list some of the things that we have done in this government. We have doubled the Housing Investment Fund by \$1 billion to \$2 billion. We have delivered up to 1,200 new social and affordable homes from the Housing Investment Fund. We have exceeded our first-year target by commencing 832 social homes. We have delivered changes to enable better use of secondary dwellings. We have delivered specialist homelessness services through a \$166.3 million investment. Many may think that this bill is modest, but it makes a difference. Everything makes a difference.

We are going to look at the Homes for Homes donation, which was established by the *Big Issue* magazine. I want to really praise the *Big Issue* and the people who support that and have made it part of their lives. Those people are an important part of my local community. Clearly in Queensland we do

not have the system in place which allows that donation to happen easily, but I am grateful that this is yet another way that we can contribute to the development of social housing. The Queensland government has made a contribution towards that to start that off. It is fantastic because in my community people just want to help. As I said, if you are not a person who is experiencing rental stress or homelessness or any challenge in terms of having a roof over your head, you just want to help and this is a really practical way to do it. I personally am going to be encouraging people in my local area to do it.

We will be addressing the issue of retirement villages so there is increased transparency, accountability and consistency. That is an incredibly stressful time for people to choose where they are going to live in their later years and knowing that there is proper scrutiny and transparency in that phase of their lives is absolutely critical. I really want to praise Azure Blue in Cannon Hill, Arcare Aged Care in Seven Hills and Regis Bulimba for the wonderful service that they provide. There is so much to say. The round table is going to deliver more results today. I want to thank the Community Support and Services Committee for its great work on this bill.


 **Mr KNUTH** (Hill—KAP) (4.12 pm): I rise to give my contribution to the Housing Legislation Amendment Bill 2022. The policy objective of the bill is to meet the Queensland Housing Strategy 2017-2027 10-year framework to ensure Queenslanders have access to safe, secure and affordable housing, along with other strategies. This is a mighty grand statement. However, it is too little too late and should have been introduced 10 years ago. Just like youth crime, the government has been very slow to take up any form of action. Instead of using foresight and forward planning, the government is now scrambling to fix an issue it should have known was coming a decade ago.

As has already been mentioned, families are living in cars, living in sheds, living on the streets and living in tents. Farmers have even told us that families will pull up with kids in the car and ask them if they could rent out their sheds or barns at the back of their farms, so this is a massively serious issue and we are sick and tired of hearing the blame game passed on to everywhere else, including the previous federal and state governments. The ducking, weaving and hiding on taking responsibility for delivering the basic right for every Queenslander to have a roof over their head is absolutely astonishing. Every electorate office has been pounded with the housing issue. I would say that this has been the biggest issue in my office and I would suggest that it is probably the biggest issue in electorate offices right across Queensland, coupled with the youth crime issue. The public has had a gutful. The government must take responsibility and move heaven and earth to fix the housing crisis.

The state government has committed almost \$4 billion in total to social and affordable housing and at the Queensland Housing Summit in October the Housing Investment Fund was boosted to \$2 billion to support a revised target of 5,600 social and affordable homes commencing across Queensland by 30 July 2027, with annual funding of \$130 million available. That is a significant investment. However, with a second housing summit today, what has been delivered? Exactly how many new dwellings have been delivered? How many have been and will be constructed in North Queensland?

When asked this week how many new affordable houses have been delivered, the Premier could not provide an answer except to advise that \$10 million has been given to the NGOs, 'so you'll have to ask them'. How about the government tells that to the mother—and this is in my electorate—of Naryma Lawson from Tully, whose family has been living in a shed for six months despite a combined income of \$1,600 a week? She does not want to hear excuses or shifting the blame. Naryma wants to see action and the details on exactly what is being delivered from this supposed expenditure.

It is not only affordability that is the problem; it is also the availability of housing that is at a critical point. I had met with the government and put forward options to fund and build affordable housing in North Queensland, including dome homes and the affordable homes development at Tully, almost a year ago. These are locally designed and built to withstand the tough weather conditions in the north and can be delivered at a fraction of the cost of standard housing. This was recommended over a year ago, yet nothing has been done. However, of course, funding was provided to the Gold Coast's ModnPods last year while North Queensland has again been completely and absolutely ignored. Queenslanders do not want more summits. They do not want more media spin. They do not want more blame game. They want action now. I wanted to bring all of those issues to the attention of the House.

 **Mr McCALLUM** (Bundamba—ALP) (4.16 pm): More housing and getting more Queenslanders into housing sooner is a core Labor value. It is the foundation on which the Queensland Housing Strategy is built and it is delivering more homes to more people sooner. One of the signature parts of


our Queensland Housing Strategy is our \$2 billion Housing Investment Fund. This is part of a \$3.9 billion investment to increase social and affordable housing supply and is the largest concentrated investment in housing in Queensland's history, with 5,000 homes commenced and on track to be increased to 13,000 by 2027. That is doing the heavy lifting when it comes to responding to the extraordinarily high demand in our housing market at the moment. It is happening in our local community in Bundamba. Over the last 18 months alone we have delivered over five new social housing complexes—three have been constructed in Redbank, another in Bellbird Park and there is a fifth that is in its final stages of construction in Goodna, and there is more to come.

Our QuickStarts Qld program is seeing 166 new social homes commenced more broadly in Ipswich by 30 June 2025 and that is going to go through to a planned investment of \$43.7 million which is going to support more than 138 full-time jobs. Already under QuickStarts Qld there have been moves towards contracts being awarded for another 156 new homes in the Ipswich region, and this is in addition to the 253 new social homes that are already commenced under our Housing Strategy.

As well as social and affordable homes, we are facilitating more housing stock coming on. This morning we heard the Deputy Premier talk about a \$40 million funding commitment for the Catalyst Infrastructure Fund, \$5.91 million of which is going towards the construction of Barrams Road in Providence in South Ripley which will unlock another 5,600 lots.

It is clearly evident that under the Palaszczuk Labor government there is a range of initiatives that are responding to the housing needs of Queenslanders at every level. We will keep doing that. We will keep on delivering. It does stand in stark contrast, however, to the LNP and its record when it was last in government. When it comes to social housing construction we are building and we will continue to build. The LNP cut social housing construction by 90 per cent. There was a 90 per cent cut to social housing construction. In Ipswich there was zero commencements of social housing in 2013-14—that is absolutely shameful—as well as in Logan, on the Gold Coast and on the Sunshine Coast. In fact, when the Palaszczuk government was elected in 2015 there were 428 less dwellings under the LNP. It is absolutely despicable.

We have heard how the former LNP wrote to tenants in social housing asking them to justify staying in their housing in case they went away on holiday or to maintain their place on the register and they defunded the tenants advisory and advocacy service. One of the cruellest things that occurred under the LNP's watch was that it put up the rent of vulnerable and low-income social housing tenants. It sought to take 25 per cent of payments of carers allowance, mobility allowance, pension supplements, utilities allowance and pharmaceutical allowance. It was extraordinary meanness. This bill will go a long way towards putting more Queenslanders into social homes sooner. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (4.21 pm): If members want an example of delusion, it is what we have just heard from not only the member for Bundamba, but also the Minister for Employment and Small Business and Minister for Training and Skills Development, the member for Bulimba. It shows complete delusion while reading straight from the talking points of Labor. Where is the little bit in the talking points for Labor that says, 'Hang on a minute, you've been in government for eight years. What have you done? Why is this another crisis?' We know all about the health crisis, we know all about the tax crisis, we know all about all of the other crises, this is just another crisis stemming from this chaotic Palaszczuk government.

There is no better example of delusion than the member for Bundamba when he stood there and said in his opening lines, 'The core Labor strategy is to build more homes'. Where are those homes? They certainly are not scattered across the state. That is why people are living in their cars, why they are living under bridges, why they are living in tents. The member for Pine Rivers does not believe someone living in a shed is bad enough. The member for Pine Rivers might like to get out of her little patch in Brisbane and head out towards Proston and have a look at how people live without decent running water and without connectivity. They are doing everything they can to survive.

The Palaszczuk government is so ignorant and so out of touch it simply does not understand how the other side live. After eight years those opposite are so delusional they do not worry about talking to anyone, they do not worry about listening to anyone, they just come in here and lecture us on the fact that the core strategy is to build homes. It is unbelievable.

Let us talk about the Leader of the Opposition's first question in the House today about the Housing Investment Fund. Two years ago the Housing Investment Fund was set up. Those opposite laugh and think it is hilarious that they cannot do anything in two years. This is the problem with the Palaszczuk government. It comes out with an announcement, it says it is going to set something up

and two years later there is zero outcome. What happened with the Griffith University plan? That is right, zero houses have come out of that. What about the Clayfield retirement home? There has been zero out of that.

Mr Stevens: Granny flats!

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: What about the granny flat announcement? I take the interjection from the member for Mermaid Beach. All that was about was a media release, another big announcement, to say 'we are going to do this'. It is a bit like the member for Bundamba talking about \$2 billion. I wonder if the poor people of Bundamba actually question where the money is going. It is their money. They are the taxpayers. It is not the 'AAA' money—'All About Anna'—it is taxpayers money and they deserve to have it spent properly. It is the money of mums and dads. When we have a government that is so interested in themselves and not the people of Queensland it is no wonder we have a housing crisis. It should not be about talkfests and announcements, it should be about the people of Queensland who, after eight years of this incompetent Palaszczuk government, just want a roof over their heads. It is about the lack of social housing in this state.

We know that the record of the Labor government in relation to social housing is abysmal. In the last five years the number of social housing bedrooms has increased by less than one per cent and the waiting list has grown by 70 per cent. The government is trying to blame Peter Dutton, the federal opposition leader, the former LNP government, probably the Lord Mayor, the Ukraine war—who knows—but the problem rests with an incompetent government that has honestly stopped listening to the people of Queensland. It is unbelievable that the number of social housing bedrooms has increased by less than one per cent while the waiting list has grown by 70 per cent.

In 2021 I asked the housing minister for data in relation to social housing in my electorate. Back then the figures were terrible, but the figures now are even worse. The data shows there are 121 approved applicants waiting for a home within the Nanango electorate and 118 of those people have been categorised as a very high need. That is not last year's figures but this year's figures and yet somehow the Labor government still tries to blame the LNP. It is gobsmacking. The applicants include older people over the age of 55, young families, disabled people, Indigenous people and people who are already homeless. In fact, one of these people has been on that waiting list for the whole time the Palaszczuk government has been in power. More than a third of the people on that waitlist have been on the list waiting for more than 35 months. The majority of people on the waitlist for social housing in my electorate have been waiting for more than three years, yet somehow the Palaszczuk government is so incompetent at its job it is still trying to blame the former LNP government. It is simply unbelievable.

It has been confirmed that only \$40 million of the government's promised \$1 billion fund for social housing will be spent each year, which means it will be nearly 2050 before the commitment is even close to being delivered. It is certainly not going to fix the housing crisis. When the Productivity Commission speaks we should listen. The Productivity Commission found the Palaszczuk Labor government is the worst government in the country, spending the least on social housing compared to every other state or territory. Even though the Productivity Commission has said that about the incompetent Palaszczuk government when it comes to social housing, it is somehow all the LNP's fault, or maybe Peter Dutton's fault, maybe the Lord Mayor's—

Ms Leahy interjected.


Mrs FRECKLINGTON: It is probably all the fault of the local council. I take the interjection from the member for Warrego. I will continue to advocate for our regions and highlight that state government assets are still being under-utilised. The residence of former Nanango Hospital medical superintendent, Dr John Robinson, has remained vacant for two and a half years. We have a housing crisis in this state and yet a state government owned home, a four-bedroom, beautiful home in Nanango, has remained vacant since June 2020.

The house is owned by the department of communities and housing. I have asked the minister why it has remained empty for so long when we have families that are desperate. The minister claims that there is no demand for government employee housing in my electorate and says they are still deciding what to do with that home. It seems incredible to me that it has taken nearly three years to make a decision about a four-bedroom home that is owned by the government—that is, taxpayers' money. It should have been made available sooner.

It begs the question: how many other state government owned homes are there like that one? I know the member for Burnett was talking about the same issue in his area. There are beautiful vacant homes so how about the government look outside of the box and think about what the heavens they

can do with those homes? They could take someone who is living in her car in the centre of Kingaroy and put her in a vacant house. Gee, that would make sense, but no! They put someone who is living in her car in the centre of Kingaroy on the waitlist for social housing for—what was it? Thirty-five months or nearly three years! It beggars belief.

This government lurches from chaos to crisis. Like always, there will be another announcement saying that this is what they are going to do with taxpayers' money but no outcomes will be seen. The ministers will continue to give talking points to the poor backbenchers who the Premier has said will never get anywhere. Goodness help the people who are living in their tents, who are living in sheds or who are living under bridges because the Palaszczuk government does not have their back and they are not planning to help them. That is why in October 2024 we will need an LNP government.

 **Ms BOYD** (Pine Rivers—ALP) (4.31 pm): We in Labor believe that everyone deserves to have a roof over their heads. We believe that housing should be safe, secure and affordable. I want to clarify that in fact, unlike members of the opposition, I do not believe that sheds are an appropriate place for Queenslanders to live. The contributions from the member for Surfers Paradise and others on the opposition benches today, talking about sheds as an acceptable place for people in our community to live, were absolutely abhorrent. While those speakers did take interjections from me, I place on record really clearly that I do not support that and it is not something that I think is appropriate in this day and age in Queensland.


Frankly, I think the conflated and inflated contributions that we have heard from those opposite were really offensive when we look at their record and the contribution that they made during their very short tenure on the government benches. Through that short three-year period when they were in government in Queensland the only thing that I can see that they cut was the number of people able to get on the waiting list. I think we should have this debate in a respectful way. The points raised by opposition members through this debate have been, quite frankly—and this is probably being complimentary—juvenile at very best. We should stick to the facts and I would like to make a contribution in that respect.

In terms of the legacy of the Labor government, we have developed the Queensland Housing Strategy 2017-2027, which outlines a commitment to deliver a better housing future by working with communities, industry and the housing sector. Having a roof over your head is a critical basic need. When governments can help the community to meet that need we know that there will be overwhelming economic and social benefits, in addition to the really positive impacts that it can have on the resident. Homes values are booming right across the south-east corner as well as on most of the eastern coast. While this is good news for home owners, it is locking many first homebuyers and people on low to moderate incomes out of home ownership altogether.

One of the elements of the plan that we have put together, which I am really excited to see roll out, is advanced in this bill and it is the Homes for Homes initiative. It will dramatically boost the supply of social and affordable housing and will also see a boost to investment by the private sector. Homes for Homes is a model established by the Big Issue, which collects, through a voluntary donation deed, a tax-deductible portion, which is 0.1 per cent, of the sale price of properties in Queensland. Those donations then go back into the purchase of more social and affordable homes in Queensland.

The Homes for Homes donation deed is a voluntary caveat lodged on the property title and can be withdrawn into the future. Property owners can choose to retain the donation at 0.1 per cent, increase it to a higher percentage, or make a nominal donation or no donation at all. This model is operating successfully around the country and, to date, has delivered some 13 projects from the \$1.2 million it has raised. A Queensland advisory group will advise on priority housing needs and assess future applications. The Palaszczuk government is focused on opening up new opportunities to improve housing outcomes across all communities in Queensland.

Our Queensland housing plan is all about partnerships. We know that we alone cannot do all of the heavy lifting. Working with the charitable and non-government sector will help make major inroads into our ambitious and necessary goals. Since the launch of our Housing Strategy we have partnered with the community housing sector to unlock existing investment and drive the growth of the sector. We will continue to support community housing providers to grow their capacity through innovative funding opportunities and partnerships across government and private industry. This legislation is good, essential reform for the future of safe, secure and affordable housing in Queensland. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mrs GERBER** (Currumbin—LNP) (4.35 pm): Housing is one of the most pressing issues facing my constituents in Currumbin. While I note the contents of this bill, I question whether any of these amendments will make a real difference to the housing crisis we are currently facing. On the face of it, it appears that the bill will not actually meaningfully increase the accessibility or affordability of homes in this state. The reality is that housing pressures across our state are putting enormous stress on families, businesses and communities, which has been compounded by the skyrocketing cost of living.

From the conversations I have had with locals in my electorate of Currumbin it is very clear that the lack of rental vacancies and housing opportunities on the southern Gold Coast is creating significant hardships right across our community. Much has been made of the acute rental stress on the Gold Coast. Poor planning from the state government has meant that infrastructure has not kept up with the increase in population. For example, across the state residential building approvals decreased by close to 40 per cent between 2014-15 and 2019-20.

For the December quarter of 2022, the Gold Coast rental vacancy rate was a startling 0.7 per cent. A healthy rental market has a vacancy rate of between 2.6 per cent and 3.5 per cent. That is compounded by huge rental prices. According to SQM Research, for properties on the Gold Coast the average weekly rent has passed \$900, which is higher than Brisbane, higher than Sydney and higher than Melbourne. This time two years ago, for the southern Gold Coast and Gold Coast the average rental price was sitting at around \$554. I ask members to imagine a family of four where both parents work and, over the past two years, their rent has increased by over \$400 a week.

Mr Boothman: They're working for the rent.

Mrs GERBER: Yes. The latest census data shows that the Gold Coast is one of the most expensive places to rent in Australia. It is scary to think that our beautiful region is becoming unaffordable for the next generation. Why has this happened? It has not happened overnight. It is eight years in the making; eight years of failed policy and failed planning by this state government, which has resulted in a housing crisis that is genuinely affecting my electorate of Currumbin. Hardworking locals are desperately looking for an affordable place to live in the place that they call home. They are not asking for handouts. They are not asking for anything to be free. They just want it to be fair. However, over the course of eight years this state government has failed them. It has failed to plan and it has failed to deliver housing solutions. To curb the housing crisis, right now the absolute focus must be on boosting housing supply in the short, medium and long term.

Let me share a story from my electorate of Currumbin, where the state government's failure to plan and failure to deliver is painstakingly clear. Not too long ago, a concerned resident contacted me. They are part of a long-term local family, and they are being pushed out of the community because of the housing crisis. This family's rent went up and they could not afford the property they were in. They have been searching for a rental property since early 2021. They are now fearful they will have to move out of the area. They have been living house to house and have not had a permanent home since 2021. They are trying to find somewhere to live, but they do not want to uproot their children from the local school. They do not want to leave behind their family and friends. Why should they have to, because of this state government's failure to plan and failure to deliver? This constituent said to me, 'I'm going to contact Labor and see if I can make a difference. Something needs to be done. People are suffering and if we don't speak up nothing will change.'

The rental market right across Queensland is so tight. It is being compounded by poor planning and a lack of foresight by the Palaszczuk Labor government. Social housing on the Gold Coast is not really an option, either. In the Currumbin electorate the number of people waiting for social housing has dramatically increased, by 84.3 per cent since 2018, yet the number of social housing dwellings has risen by just 63 since 2017. The Productivity Commissioner found that the Palaszczuk Labor government is the worst government in the country when it comes to housing, spending the least on social housing compared to every other state. The Auditor-General found that social housing promised by this state government is not meeting surging demand and that there are no forecasts or targets for how much social housing stock is needed in Queensland.

Mr Boothman: This legislation won't help.

Mrs GERBER: I take that interjection. This legislation does nothing to deal with those targets. The figures are staggering, and they reflect a government in chaos. They reflect a government with an inability to plan and an inability to deliver. This housing crisis has not just happened overnight; it has been eight years in the making—eight years of failure to plan and failure to deliver.

The southern Gold Coast is such a uniquely beautiful part of our state with magnificent beaches, beautiful hinterland and our village community feel, but small and family businesses in my electorate of Currumbin are finding it difficult to even attract staff, because those staff have nowhere to live because the rental market is so tight. This state government has failed to deliver housing supply.

In Coolangatta we have Southern Cross University—an amazing university and the university I got my degree from. It provides hundreds of students with the opportunity to learn in a beautiful part of the world. Those students then go on to get jobs in our local small and family businesses and go on to support our region, but in order for those students to be able to stay we need a healthy rental market. Those students need somewhere to live. Right now they do not have that, because this state government has failed to deliver housing supply.

Further, the lack of housing has made it incredibly challenging for families to stay together. I know from my own experience as a mum that I want my children to grow up and be able to afford to live in the area they love, where they are supported by their family and friends. Many in my community feel the same. I know that in too many cases people just cannot find a place to live because this state government has failed to plan, failed to deliver and failed to provide housing stock.

The LNP will not stand in the way of any measure that will assist Queenslanders to get into homes, but the Palaszczuk Labor government does not seem to grasp the full extent of this crisis. It is full of talkfests but no meaningful action to deliver homes for Queenslanders. This bill will not address the broader issue of housing affordability or supply across our state, especially in my electorate of Currumbin.

The Gold Coast needs a government that is going to provide real solutions on this issue—not just talkfests and platitudes. We have solutions on the table. They include more adequate land supply, partnering with the community sector to deliver affordable and social housing, and building projects on time and on budget.


Government members interjected.

Mrs GERBER: They do not like it, because they have failed to do it themselves. In fact, I will not be surprised if they pinch our policy. I will not be surprised if I hear them talking about partnering with the private sector in order to deliver social housing.

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hart): Pause the clock. There is way too much noise. We are getting out of control. We have been very good.

Mrs GERBER: We will also ensure that we deliver projects on time and on budget. That is another aspect in which this state government has abysmally failed. It has a trickle-down effect. On this side of the House, we are determined to drive change. We are determined to drive change so that every single Queenslanders can have a roof over their head. That is what Queenslanders expect of a good government. Under this Palaszczuk Labor government, people are failing to have a basic need met—that is, a roof over their head. It is really not good enough. Queenslanders deserve so much better than what they are getting. This housing crisis lies directly at the feet of this state government.

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (4.45 pm): It is not hard to tell why the member for Currumbin had swings against her at both the last by-election and the last general election.

Mrs Gerber: Why don't you play the ball and not the person, Minister?

Mr BAILEY: That one landed!

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hart): Order, members. I realise there is a bit of provocation there, member for Currumbin. There is really no need for the loud interjections.

Mr BAILEY: Ten minutes of nothing other than rhetoric. That is all we heard. We have to ask the question: why are interest rates—

Government members interjected.

Mrs Gerber interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members. Member for Currumbin.

Mr BAILEY: We have to ask ourselves: why are interest rates escalating? It is because of the record inflation left by the LNP in this nation. We know that is the truth. They did not trim the stimulus. They messed up the economy. It is the Albanese government and the Palaszczuk government—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Members, I cannot hear what the member for Miller is saying—honestly! Member for Miller, I do not remember interest rates being mentioned in the bill. I call you back to the long title of the bill. We have had a wideranging debate so I will not pull you up too much. Just mention the bill every now and then.

Mr BAILEY: Indeed. Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I totally accept your guidance. We are talking about housing and the need for people to have decent housing. That is what this bill is about. In response to the previous speakers—

Mrs Gerber interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Currumbin, that is the third time. You now are warned under the standing orders.

Mr BAILEY: We know that, despite what the opposition say in opposition, when in government they always cut housing funding. We know that. In fact, the current shadow housing minister was the housing minister in the Newman government who cut social housing. We have to look at the signals being put out. The Leader of the Opposition, who was a member of the Newman cabinet, has appointed the Newman government housing minister as his shadow housing minister. What does that tell us? Two plus two equals four. The housing minister under Newman will be doing exactly the same thing. Let us not hear the rhetorical nonsense of the members for Nanango and Currumbin. We know that if they ever get back into power housing will be first thing on the chopping block.

I will speak to the bill, as opposed to those opposite. One of the main objects of the bill is to amend the Retirement Villages Act 1999 to promote consumer participation and fair trading practices in operating retirement villages and to encourage the growth and viability of our retirement village industry. That is important in terms of my electorate, where I have a range of retirement villages and facilities. Those people deserve to be well managed.


The bill inserts a new object into the act which is to maintain public confidence in the retirement village industry by enhancing the financial transparency of the operation of villages and the accountability of scheme operators. This strengthens the act's purposes when it comes to consumer protection and fair trading. It makes clear the Palaszczuk government's commitment to having a financially transparent and accountable retirement village industry, while enabling its growth and viability.

This new object also supports other objectives in the act such as to encourage the adoption of industry best practice standards and facilitating participation by residents in the affairs of the village. The new object will assist with the statutory interpretation and decision-making that best achieves the purposes of public confidence, financial transparency and accountability.

I am proud of our government's role in improving the transparency and standard, particularly when people are in the latter part of their life. It is very important that their rights be respected. This government wants to see older Queenslanders live their best possible life in the best possible facilities. This bill aims to ensure that the Queensland public has confidence in the industry. These changes make clear the government's commitment to continuing growth.

The bill shines a light on the finances of retirement villages to ensure its residents receive the best possible care while knowing exactly how their money is being spent. These proposed changes will support senior Queenslanders in the electorate of Miller in retirement villages like Regis in Chelmer, the Village Yeronga and TriCare Annerley. Residents have had severe impacts with the recent floods. I worked with them on that. I was very glad to join them at their annual market day.

Queenslanders who are in retirement villages will be given the opportunity to have a direct input into the affairs of their village due to these reforms. These changes will ensure that my constituents are given a voice in how where they live is run. It ensures greater transparency. Not only will these changes improve the accountability of retirement villages, they will also protect the Queenslanders who live in them. I endorse the bill. I certainly encourage all members to talk to the bill as opposed to some of the speeches I have heard in the last 20 minutes. I endorse the bill and every decent member should vote for it.

 **Ms LEAHY** (Warrego—LNP) (4.51 pm): I rise to contribute to the Housing Legislation Amendment Bill. The bill deals with two issues, the first being the establishment of the Homes for Homes donation deed model in Queensland and the second being changes to the Retirement Villages Act 1999 to strengthen the financial reporting requirements. As mentioned earlier by the shadow minister, the LNP will not be opposing this bill.

By the government's own admission, this legislation is in response to the Housing Summit which the government was backed into convening on 20 October last year. The Labor government has dropped the ball in the last eight years and they had to have the Housing Summit because there is a critical shortage of housing right across this state, not just in the metropolitan areas but also in the regions.

Local governments have been doing a lot of heavy lifting to address the housing shortage. In fact, they have been doing a lot of the work that the state government should do to quantify the issues and responses to the needs, particularly in the regions. Six Western Queensland alliance councils—Murweh, Paroo, Flinders, Boulia, Carpentaria and Blackall Tambo regional councils—have developed their local housing action plans. They are action plans. They have a clear path forward and what they are looking for is action from the state government in the housing space. They have done the work and they deserve to have some reward for that effort. They have done a lot of the state government's work in doing those action plans.

I asked a question of the Labor government in relation to how many additional public housing dwellings would be available for accommodation in the Warrego electorate by 30 June 2022 as a result of the capital expenditure in the 2021-22 financial year. The answer from the government was that no additional social housing dwellings would be made available in my electorate by June 2022 as result of capital expenditure in the 2021-22 financial year.

Mrs Frecklington: So none at all?


Ms LEAHY: Zero; absolutely none. That was the answer to a question on notice. This is despite the average wait on the social housing waiting list at 30 June 2022 was 19 months—more than a year and a half was the average waiting time. It is not good enough. The number of people waiting is 285 and 275 of those waiting are categorised as very high need. These are statistics straight off the government website. The government does not care about social housing in my electorate.

I doubt the Homes for Homes donation deed model being implemented in this legislation will address the number of people waiting on the social housing waiting list in my electorate. However, we have a housing crisis in this state so anything that will deliver more housing is better than nothing.

We know there is a housing crisis when we see the housing chaos of the last few days. Last Monday we had the Premier announcing caps on rental prices which were described in a major newspaper of this state, the *Courier-Mail*, as a 'thought bubble' under the headline 'Dunce's cap'. It was resoundingly trumped by stakeholders as a policy that would make the housing crisis worse. This was followed by the Deputy Premier trying to hose down the rent cap push amid fears of a property bloodbath. Then we had the Premier saying she was misunderstood. This week we have the proposal to have rental hikes capped—all before the housing forum being held today. This is chaotic. When the government is in crisis, these chaotic responses cause them to give up on service delivery.

We are now coming up to 130 days since the summit and other than the Homes for Homes initiative, what has the government got to show for it? Is it the promise for QBuild to build and open a facility by the end of 2022 to build 80 prefabricated homes this financial year? We do not even know when that facility is to be open. Is it the promise to urgently open the crisis accommodation at Griffith University which was meant to be open by now, but will not be ready until later this year? Is it the promise to increase rental supply through granny flats? Even the Deputy Premier has admitted, 'We haven't seen that yet.' I have granny flats in my electorate and people would love to rent those out, but they are still waiting to do that.

We have the talking up of the Housing Investment Fund, which, nearly two years after being announced, is still yet to deliver a single home. There is a state government land and building audit which nobody knows the results of yet. Those opposite should stop peddling false hope and get on with delivering because people who are living in cars and tents and couch surfing need a roof over their heads. These people deserve better from the Palaszczuk Labor government.

 **Ms HOWARD** (Ipswich—ALP) (4.56 pm): For the first time in many decades, Queensland is facing an extremely high demand for housing, coupled with a severe housing shortage. It is hitting people on low incomes the hardest and it is happening right across Australia. There are a number of Queenslanders, including in my electorate of Ipswich, who, for the first time in their lives, are at risk of homelessness due to the shortage in rental properties and the prohibitive cost of purchasing homes. The Palaszczuk government has committed to a clear objective of making sure every Queenslanders has access to a safe, secure and affordable home. We acknowledge that it is extremely tough out there for rental applicants trying to secure an affordable home to live in. We are also now hearing of people struggling with ever increasing interest rates.

This government continues to work hard every day to build more social and affordable housing and to work with non-government partners in supporting those at risk of homelessness. We have shown that we are serious about taking more action by increasing our investment in social and affordable housing to a record \$4 billion. Across Ipswich around 240 social homes have been built under the Queensland Housing Strategy since 2017 and 166 new homes will commence construction in Ipswich by June 2025 under the QuickStarts Qld program.

We are also clearing the way to boost delivery of housing supply in priority development areas by unlocking new land for housing and supporting critical infrastructure. We have invested \$150 million into the Catalyst Infrastructure Fund to accelerate housing delivery in priority development areas like in Ripley in my electorate. We have invested \$50 million into the Growth Acceleration Fund to support the delivery of infrastructure in growth areas. The Housing Summit we held last October produced a number of actions that we will deliver on to help accelerate housing supply and improve support services for people at risk of homelessness. Today we have proposed to limit rent increases to once a year rather than one every six months. In addition, we have announced that we will provide more emergency funding to support people who are vulnerable in our communities.

Our government has been reaching out to non-profits and the private sector to support innovative ways to deliver more social and affordable housing. Homes for Homes Ltd is one of those innovative solutions. It is a unique social enterprise established by the Big Issue and they have one simple goal: to raise more than a billion dollars over the next 30 years to end homelessness in Australia. Their innovative ideas rely on property owners, developers or home owners making a promise to donate a portion of their property sale prices to Homes for Homes. Non-profit organisations like Homes for Homes play a pivotal role in fixing our current crisis.

Government investment is just one part of the solution, but we can achieve far more when we bring together the community sector, private housing sector, finance, industry and all three levels of government to work out how we can best work together to boost housing supply. We saw this happen at the Housing Summit last October, where over 200 attendees came together to work on the shared goal of addressing our state's urgent housing needs. I was proud to be one of those people, and it really was a very productive conversation. There was a great bunch of people in the room.

Our government is continuously working to clear any legislative or regulatory barriers that prevent the growth of social and affordable housing, and that includes amending the Housing Act so that schemes like the Homes for Homes initiative can work here in Queensland. Currently, the Homes for Homes initiative works effectively in other jurisdictions in Australia as it uses a permissive caveat on land titles to remind selling property owners to make a voluntary donation under the donation deed and to perpetuate the participation of the property in the initiative. We can achieve the same outcome by using an administrative advice recorded on a land title to indicate the property is subject to a voluntary Homes for Homes donation deed—a very neat solution. Queenslanders will benefit, with the donated proceeds being used to provide, assist or increase the supply of affordable housing in Queensland only.


Almost 40 per cent of people living in Ipswich are renters and just over 36 per cent of low income renters in Ipswich are living in rental stress, meaning they pay more than 30 per cent of their income on rent. Vulnerable Queenslanders who are finding it tough to secure a property in the current rental market would certainly benefit from having Homes for Homes operate in our state, as it will contribute to the supply and range of housing available to them. Amending the Housing Act to allow for the effective operation of Homes for Homes in Queensland will mean that our state can enjoy those benefits too.

I now turn to the part of the bill that amends the Retirement Villages Act to improve financial reporting in Queensland's retirement villages. Queenslanders who live in retirement villages deserve to know that the fees and charges they pay for services, maintenance and upgrades are being used properly. This bill will put a new objective in the Retirement Villages Act; that is, to maintain public confidence in the retirement village industry by enhancing the financial transparency of retirement village operations and accountability of scheme operators. Retirement village residents will also be given increased access to financial documents. The Department of Communities, Housing and Digital Economy and the public register will also be given this increased access. Disclosure requirements in exit entitlement statements for former residents will be further clarified so residents can know how the exit entitlement was worked out by the scheme operator. Further, the bill will amend penalty provisions for budget and financial statements to rectify inconsistencies and incorporate existing requirements in the act and regulations.

As our population ages, the retirement village sector will experience more growth as more and more people seek out accommodation that provides a sense of community, collocated health and recreational facilities, and safety and security. Retirement village residents invest a significant amount of their money upon moving into a village, and they pay ongoing fees and charges during the time they live there. Financial transparency and accountability is of the utmost importance to them so they can have peace of mind that their money is being well invested. Instilling confidence in our state's retirement village industry is a vital component of the Retirement Villages Act to ensure the sector's continued growth and visibility, and this growth is crucial to keep up with our growing population of older people in Queensland. People of all ages are being swept up in the housing shortage crisis, and just as we need to increase more affordable accommodation for young people and families on low incomes, we also need to increase affordable accommodation options for older people who have specific needs, especially older people with disabilities and older single women.

In my electorate I have several retirement villages and they are filled with residents who have rich, fulfilling social lives filled with activities, friends and support networks. This government conducted an inquiry into inclusion and social cohesion, and we know that these types of villages fit the bill for people who would otherwise be lonely and isolated. I am very pleased that we have introduced these really important changes. I do want to take a moment to thank those community organisations in Ipswich that support people who are experiencing housing difficulties at the moment: inCommunity does an amazing job; Beddown is working in the community; and organisations like Ipswich Assist are lending a hand to support people who are suffering. I work with these people; I call them every day to see how things are going and to hear what is happening in their sector. I am really pleased to support this bill. I commend it to the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hart): Under the provisions of the business program agreed to by the House and the time limit for this stage of the bill having expired, I call the minister to reply to the second reading debate.

 **Hon. LM ENOCH** (Alger—ALP) (Minister for Communities and Housing, Minister for Digital Economy and Minister for the Arts) (5.05 pm), in reply: First of all, I thank all honourable members for their participation in the debate on the Housing Legislation Amendment Bill 2022. All members are of course aware of the extraordinary pressures on Queensland's housing market. Housing affordability is one of the biggest challenges across the state and, as we all very well know, across the country. The amendments in the bill to enable the Homes for Homes charitable donation deed model to operate in Queensland deliver on a commitment we made at the Queensland Housing Summit and are a small step forward in addressing these extraordinary market conditions.

I note that in their contributions to this debate a number of members have attempted to characterise this bill as the government's entire response to the housing challenges facing our state. This is entirely untrue and quite frankly yet another example of the incredible level of immaturity on display by the opposition. At no time have I or any member of the government said that this bill is the silver bullet. In fact, in my second reading speech I said that these amendments are another step towards addressing the extraordinary market conditions we are facing nationwide. The housing affordability challenges we face are complex and wideranging, and we need strategies that attack the problem from all fronts. This is yet another one. The fact of the matter is, as those opposite chose to ignore, that the Homes for Homes amendments in this bill sit alongside our existing work in delivering more social housing, providing more support for vulnerable renters and increasing funding for homelessness services providers.

I would like to take a moment to respond to comments made by members during the debate. The member for Everton is quite frankly having a bet each way on this bill, as the LNP so often does. They are not opposing the bill; but they are not happy about it either. The member complained loudly about the government's housing record, so let me remind those opposite again about our record when it comes to social and affordable housing delivery. Under our QuickStarts program, every single day since July 2021 when it began we have completed more than one new social housing home every single day. Every single day for the last 21 months more vulnerable Queenslanders are being housed, and this represents over \$1 billion in investment from this government. More broadly, since 2015 the Palaszczuk government has commenced 5,299 social housing dwellings across Queensland, and we are on track to meet our target of 13,000 commencements by 2027. Since the Housing Summit we have distributed \$5.1 million in extra funding to help vulnerable renters keep a roof over their head, and \$25.5 million has been allocated to specialist homelessness services across Queensland under the Immediate Housing Response Package for families, which already supports more than 4,000 families.

In relation to the purchase of a property in Clayfield to help house Queenslanders in need, I can inform the House that works to upgrade that facility are currently underway and are expected to be completed by the end of April. The department has informed me that once they are completed a procurement process will be undertaken to enlist a property manager—a normal process—and I am advised by the department that this should be completed by late May. Following that process we expect residents should be able to move in by early June this year. That is a quick turnaround for potentially around 30 new dwellings to support Queenslanders in need.

I would also like to reflect on the member for Everton's comment that when it comes to Homes for Homes we should be 'honest and mature about the scale of donations that we can expect'. I think a bit of honesty and maturity from the LNP in the housing debate would be a welcome change. Instead of ignoring the fact that there are fewer households on the housing register now than there were in June 2021, instead of ignoring the largest concentrated investment in social and affordable housing in Queensland's history, and instead of ignoring rental reforms that are helping Queensland renters, maybe the member for Everton will start being honest with Queenslanders about their cut, sack and sell approach to social housing.

The member for South Brisbane's contribution was full of so many inaccuracies that it was hard to keep up. My biggest question out of that contribution was: what does the member for South Brisbane have against the Big Issue? In what can only be described as a thinly veiled sneer, the member was less than enthusiastic about the work that this organisation does through Homes for Homes. Given the number of people in her electorate she claims to be advocating for, I would have thought she would be more supportive of the Big Issue and the work they do. The member for South Brisbane asserted that Homes for Homes is already operating in Queensland and sought to minimise the contribution they will be able to make to our state. I would refer the member to the transcript of the parliamentary committee's public inquiry on 28 November 2022, in which Ms Tracy Longo from Homes for Homes advised the committee that—

In Queensland, obviously we are not operating but, based on the models we have done to date, we anticipate there will be about \$200 million of new funding contributed.

What Homes for Homes currently does in Queensland is simply receive and distribute donations. This bill will allow for an administrative advice to record the existence of a donation deed on a land title so that the seller is reminded of the promise to donate at the time of sale and to support the donation deed to pass voluntarily from one owner to the next when a property is sold. The longer the donation deed remains attached to the property, the more money that will be raised over time from successive donations at the point of sale.

The member also said that the Housing Summit last year did not talk about rental affordability. Well, I am happy to remind the member that the *Queensland Housing Summit: outcomes report* is available online. She can google it if she gets back from the park in time to do her job. In the report, members can see that four workshops were held in order to get direct feedback from summit attendees and one of them was called 'housing and rental affordability and opportunities to remove barriers to supply'. Also listed in the outcomes report is the \$10 million the government invested as a result of the summit in expanding private rental assistance products and services for people experiencing severe rental stress. So we did talk about rental affordability at the summit.

She then went on to refer to the bill as nearly useless. The member for South Brisbane likes to talk about how many renters she knows. I wonder whether she knows anyone who lives in a retirement village, because in response to that incredibly ignorant comment I would like to inform the member that these reforms to the Retirement Villages Act are significant for people who live in these places. Retirement village residents have been advocating for greater financial transparency in the operations of retirement villages and the accountability of operators for many years. The amendments to the Retirement Villages Act will improve financial reporting in retirement villages to increase resident confidence in consumer protections and enhance compliance with the legislation.

Returning to social housing supply, the member for Nanango shouted quite loudly that she did not know where the new social homes were being built. I am happy to inform the member that 52 of them are in Nanango. That is right. Since 2015-16 our government has completed 52 new social and affordable housing homes in her electorate—some of them construction projects and some acquisitions. In this current financial year alone, we have commenced five more. If the member wants to know where our new social and affordable homes are being built, maybe she should just look in her own backyard.

I will now turn to respond to some of the other matters that were discussed by members during the debate. The Homes for Homes initiative will make a small but significant contribution to boosting the supply of social and affordable housing in Queensland. It will engage the private sector in addressing an important community problem in recognition that a whole-of-community approach is needed to address the current housing crisis. We are supporting the Homes for Homes model to take further steps to operate in Queensland as it does in other states, by allowing a donation deed with Homes for Homes to be noted in an administrative advice recorded on a land title. As Homes for Homes establishes their presence in Queensland and the model achieves sustainability, the funds available for investment in social and affordable housing projects will accumulate over time. In delivering on a commitment we made at the Queensland Housing Summit, we will be providing \$500,000 seed funding to Homes for Homes to help maximise the donations made under the scheme.

In relation to the amendments to the Retirement Villages Act, some members made comments regarding unintended cost implications. While there may be establishment costs for accountants and auditors to address gaps for some operators, I am advised that these costs will likely be offset going forward through the standardisation and efficiencies that are created. It is also important to note that many operators already collect additional income and expenditure breakdowns and information for budgets and financial statements but currently have no obligation to disclose or report them to residents. There are also potential cost savings to residents by having more accountable budgets and financial statements, as incorrect allocation of costs or even instances of fraud should be more easily identifiable. In addition, disputes and complaints about financial matters are expected to decrease with more transparent and accountable reporting, and this will mean a time and cost saving and less stress for both residents and operators.

Ongoing consultation with key stakeholders aims to ensure that the detailed regulation requirements are workable and efficient across different village types and sizes. The department will take a capacity-building approach to implementation, supported by financial guidance material. This will particularly assist smaller, standalone and regional villages. To provide some further detail, I can inform the House that changes to the capital replacement fund ensure that operators accumulate the required funds for replacement of village assets, that the trust fund operates properly, and that the budgets have regard to the quantity surveyor's report so that residents' financial interests in the village are protected.

In relation to concerns about increased administrative and compliance costs for smaller operators, including that they may have to engage external accounting services, it is important to remember the amendments in this bill do not set different financial reporting requirements based on the size of the village or the operator. It is important that all operators are accountable for the proper management and reporting of funds. Residents who live in smaller villages or have smaller standalone operators should not be afforded any less consumer protection than residents of larger villages and operators.

A new requirement for a quantity surveyor to hold membership of the Australian Institute of Quantity Surveyors ensures that professional standards and the industry code of conduct apply in the preparation of reports for a retirement village. The new regulation-making power for financial documents will allow for prescription of requirements about accounting or auditing standards, types and presentation of information, disclosure notes and explanations to assist residents. All of these changes commence on assent of the bill, immediately providing better consumer protection through improved financial accountability and transparency. In addition, we will continue to work with stakeholders to develop an amendment regulation and financial guidance material that supports the objectives of the bill. This further consultation will also seek views on commencement time frames for new requirements in the proposed amendment regulation to ensure they are fair and workable for all residents and village operators.

Homes for Homes will assist in boosting the supply of social and affordable housing and increase private sector investment in the Queensland economy. As a result, more vulnerable Queenslanders will have a safe, secure and affordable place to call home. The amendments to the Retirement Villages Act will improve compliance by operators, result in fewer resident complaints, provide for earlier resolution of complaints that do arise, and increase the likelihood that issues are dealt with at a village level. The increase in financial transparency and accountability will benefit Queensland retirement village residents, prospective residents and their families. Village operators will also benefit by having clearer regulatory requirements, and the department will be better able to monitor and enforce compliance.

I thank all our village residents, community members and industry stakeholders for their contributions to the development of this bill. I know many in this House have had one-on-one conversations with village residents in particular with regard to this bill, so I want to specifically thank them. I also applaud Homes for Homes and wish them well in their work supporting our community housing providers who work every day to help vulnerable Queenslanders have access to a safe, secure and affordable home. These are the same community housing providers we have been partnering with for many years, and we continue to partner with them through our various programs.

I thank the Community Support and Services Committee and in particular the chair, the member for Mansfield, for her and the committee's careful consideration of the bill. I thank all of those who took the time to make submissions and assist the committee's consideration.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the efforts of my staff and the dedicated officers in the department of communities and housing for their work on this bill, some of whom have been working in this space for many years, looking for this resolution. I commend the bill to the House.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1 to 3, as read, agreed to.

Clause 4—



Ms ENOCH (5.20 pm): I move the following amendments—

1 Clause 4 (Insertion of new pt 8, div 2C)

Page 5, line 13, after 'service'—

insert—

in the State

2 Clause 4 (Insertion of new pt 8, div 2C)

Page 7, line 7, after 'deed'—

insert—

, or the registered owner of the lot,

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

Tabled paper: Housing Legislation Amendment Bill 2022, explanatory notes to Hon. Leeanne Enoch's amendments [\[378\]](#).

Tabled paper: Housing Legislation Amendment Bill 2022, statement of compatibility with human rights contained in Hon. Leeanne Enoch's amendments [\[379\]](#).

To speak to these very quickly, amendment 1 amends clause 4 section 941(b)(ii)(A) to insert the words 'in the State' at page 5, line 13, after 'service'. The purpose of this amendment is to achieve consistency with the wording in subsection (b) of the definition of 'charitable donation deed' to further clarify the requirement that funds raised in Queensland must be spent on social and affordable housing in Queensland. This is achieved by adding the words 'in the State' to subsection (b)(ii)(A) of the new section 941 which defines a 'charitable donation deed'.


Amendment 2 amends clause 4 section 94K(1)(b) to insert the words 'or a registered owner of the lot' at page 7, line 7 after 'deed'. The purpose of this amendment is to ensure that a registered owner of a property can remove an administrative advice whether or not they are a party to the donation deed. This is achieved by specifying that either a party to the deed or a registered owner of the lot may request that the registrar of titles remove the record of the existence of the charitable donation deed recorded in the administrative advice from the freehold land register.

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 4, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 5 to 28, as read, agreed to.

Third Reading

 **Hon. LM ENOCH** (Alger—ALP) (Minister for Communities and Housing, Minister for Digital Economy and Minister for the Arts) (5.23 pm): I move—


That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title

 **Hon. LM ENOCH** (Alger—ALP) (Minister for Communities and Housing, Minister for Digital Economy and Minister for the Arts) (5.23 pm): I move—

That the long title of the bill be agreed to.


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

Motion agreed to.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 12 October 2022 (see p. 2610).

Second Reading

 **Hon. MAJ SCANLON** (Gaven—ALP) (Minister for the Environment and the Great Barrier Reef and Minister for Science and Youth Affairs) (5.23 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I would like to thank the Health and Environment Committee for its report tabled regarding the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2022. I would also like to thank those who made submissions to the committee about the bill and those who appeared as witnesses as part of the committee's inquiry.

The committee report for the bill was tabled on 25 November 2022 with a recommendation that the bill be passed. I thank the committee for that recommendation. The report also included a second recommendation that I respond to concerns raised about the executive officer liability and the adequacy of defences in section 493 of the Environmental Protection Act 1994. I will address this recommendation shortly. I was pleased to table the government's response to the committee's report on 13 February 2023, which accepted the committee's recommendations.

This bill will support improved environmental protections while also streamlining and clarifying processes to assist interpretation of the legislation, and to improve understanding of obligations owed under the act. This bill ensures the independent environmental regulator has the tools it needs to do its job effectively and also to protect the safety of our environmental officers as they go about their important work. By doing so, this allows for strong timely action against illegal activities, to make sure Queensland's unique environment is protected for future generations.

The bill amends the Environmental Protection Act while also making minor amendments to the Waste Reduction and Recycling Act 2011 and the Wet Tropics World Heritage Protection and Management Act 1993. These amendments will benefit all Queenslanders by modernising the legislation under the environment portfolio.

In response to recommendation 2 of the committee's report, I note that the committee supports the policy intent of ensuring corporate executive officers are held accountable for serious environmental harm. The bill amends the executive officer liability provisions of the Environmental Protection Act to ensure executive officers of a corporation can be held liable if they were in office at the time of an act or omission that eventually results in the commission of an offence against the Environmental Protection Act.

It is worth remembering why we are making this important change to the law. This amendment was brought about as a result of the Linc Energy case. Linc Energy, the company, was successfully prosecuted and found guilty of wilfully causing serious environmental harm. However, executive officers, who were alleged to be responsible, were unable to be held accountable because of the way the legislation was interpreted by the courts. This was Queensland's largest and most complex investigation and greatest ever occurrence of environmental harm, which continues to cause serious and ongoing concern for the community at large, concern that we are still responding to. Yet despite this, no individual was ever able to be brought to justice for their acts or omissions. This amendment clarifies the existing legislative provision to ensure that individuals who, through their acts or omissions, are actually responsible for an offence can be held liable and cannot leave office to avoid liability. The existing provisions were never intended to be limited only to executive officers in office at the time an offence occurs. This amendment will give effect to the original intent by ensuring that the relevant provision recognises both when an offence occurs and when an act leading to the offence happened.

Existing defences for executive officers will continue to apply to former executive officers in addition to executive officers in office at the time of the commission of the offence. This provides former executive officers with a defence against liability if they were not in a position to influence the acts or omissions that led to the commission of the offence, or where the officer was in a position to influence but took all reasonable steps to ensure the corporation complied with the Environmental Protection Act. In circumstances where the former executive officer can successfully demonstrate that they did not know or could not have known that acts or omissions would lead to an offence against the legislation, then this existing defence would apply.

It is important to note that section 493 of the Environmental Protection Act, which requires executive officers to ensure their corporation complies with the act, was always intended to capture the scenario we are addressing through these amendments. Therefore, the existing defences are considered reasonable and, I am advised, do not need to be amended. This change is about reflecting very clear community expectations that those ultimately responsible for environmental harm, and who have failed to take all reasonable steps to ensure a corporation complies with the Environmental Protection Act, can be held accountable. We do not want to see company directors avoid liability for environmental offences simply because they leave office. By addressing the current loopholes in the legislation, we will ensure the original intent of these provisions is met.

The bill also includes amendments to the Environmental Protection Act to mandate public notification for all major amendment applications to environmental authorities for resource activities. This will enhance transparency and community input in decision-making processes. This is particularly important because of the potential for significant changes to resource activities to impact on the community, either directly or indirectly, so we are making sure the community is notified of such changes and has the opportunity to take part in the process.

Industry has previously stated that the existing legislation is uncertain. They tell us they do not know when they need to notify and when they do not. The amendment will make it very clear about when they need to notify, and I would say to all proponents that they ought to always err on the side of transparency and should welcome the involvement of the community in any approvals processes.

The bill supports operators of non-resource activities to trial new and innovative approaches by relaxing the application requirement for short-term environmental authorities for these activities. The relaxation in application requirements does not result in reduced environmental regulation for trial activities. The amendment will support the undertaking of trial activities with the potential that the trial could lead to better environmental standards that can be adopted throughout a particular industry. The department will use existing powers to appropriately condition the trial activities, which could include things such as increased monitoring requirements to limit risks of environmental harm.

Building further on the importance of public transparency in making some of the most important environmental decisions, this bill introduces measures to further enhance the effectiveness of the environmental impact statement process. This process is critical to informing the development of appropriate authorities for projects in order to strike the right balance between protecting our unique environment and enabling the sustainable environment that creates the jobs of the future in Queensland.

This bill includes amendments so that an environmental impact statement assessment report lapses three years after it is given to the project proponent, ensuring that outdated information is not relied upon in assessing environmental authority applications for significant resource projects. Three

years provides a significant amount of time to prepare an environmental authority application. Where there is a valid reason why an environmental authority application would not be made in three years, the bill provides discretion for the chief executive to extend the time frame. The intent here is to ensure that the environmental impact statement assessment report is current and reflects contemporary environmental legislation, policies and standards.

This bill also includes amendments that allow the chief executive additional powers to stop a project from continuing to proceed in the environmental impact statement process. It is important to note that there is an existing power in the Environmental Protection Act that enables the chief executive to decide whether to approve or refuse the environmental impact statement from progressing. This bill amends these existing provisions rather than introducing an entirely new power. One of the amendments enables a refusal to be made earlier in the environmental impact statement process where the proposed project is clearly unacceptable. The amendment provides additional certainty for industry earlier in the process and creates efficiencies by not expending unnecessary resources continuing a process for a project that is clearly unacceptable.


Other amendments provide additional clarity by stating circumstances where the chief executive will refuse an environmental impact statement. These circumstances are where it is unlikely the project could proceed under another law and where a regulatory requirement requires refusal, creating additional transparency. This bill will also remove powers currently in the Environmental Protection Act that allow for a minister to review decisions of the chief executive where an environmental impact statement has been refused to proceed to the notification stage or has been refused to proceed to an assessment report. Proponents in community will be afforded greater transparency because now the existing review and appeal rights already in legislation will be utilised at these points.

I am proposing to move three amendments during the consideration in detail stage of the bill. Two amendments will address minor drafting issues in the bill and the third amendment to one provision of the bill—clause 2, which modifies the commencement section to provide that sections 102, 121 and 125 (2) to the extent it inserts a definition of a body worn camera—will commence on a day to be fixed by proclamation. This is to allow sufficient time for any unintended consequences of these sections to be resolved prior to their commencement.

I acknowledge that several stakeholders have expressed views about the consultation process undertaken for the bill, particularly regarding time frames and confidentiality. Provisions contained in this bill have been consulted on over a very long period, with the department initiating conversations in August 2021 followed by a consultation paper circulated to targeted stakeholders in October 2021. The department also responded to feedback on the initial process for consultation on the exposure draft of the bill, providing a subsequent round of consultation that made it easier for peak groups to share the bill with their members. All targeted stakeholders have been provided the opportunity to comment on the bill at various stages in its development through targeted briefings and presentations, the release of the consultation paper, the rounds of consultation on drafts of the bill and the Health and Environment Committee's inquiry into the bill. The Palaszczuk government is committed to comprehensive and meaningful consultation with all stakeholders. As I noted in my explanatory speech, the government appreciates the feedback that was provided on the drafts of the bill and a number of changes were, in fact, made as a result prior to the bill's introduction.

I do not accept the criticism that has been levelled about the consultation process leading up to the introduction of this bill. I want to acknowledge in particular AgForce Chief Executive, Mike Guerin, who said that the department's approach was appropriate because 'the whole area is one of the most sensitive but also most important to have in a rational and calm way'. Moreover, I think it is a convenient excuse for those who would rather not put their real position on the substance of the bill forward—that they do not support stronger, more transparent environmental regulation—to criticise the process and not the policy. I look forward keenly to the contributions of those opposite on the important substantive amendments contained in this legislation, but I suspect I will be left waiting.

In conclusion, this bill will support the Palaszczuk government's commitment to protect and enhance the environment enjoyed by Queenslanders through a range of amendments. This includes amendments to strengthen end-of-life provisions for resource projects, enhanced investigation powers for authorised officers and the streamlining of statutory processes. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr O'CONNOR** (Bonney—LNP) (5.36 pm): As shadow environment minister, I will start my contribution by confirming that the Liberal National Party will not be opposing the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill as a whole, but we will be opposing one particular

clause in the consideration in detail stage. Before I get to the substance of the bill, the process that this legislation has gone through must be called out. I do not think the minister could have botched this more if she had tried.

As I have spoken to stakeholders and read their submissions, practically every single one raised how much of a mess the consultation around this bill was. The minister tried to pass this off in her introductory speech as 'ridiculous and fanciful comments that were made in relation to the consultation process around this bill'. We heard a similar continuation of that dismissal there. However, every stakeholder I have spoken to has given the same feedback: the consultation process on this bill was completely mismanaged, the turnaround times were impossible, they were given the wrong expectations of what the legislation covered and they had been left questioning the motives of the minister, the government and the department.

This started in August 2021 when stakeholders were initially told this would be a fairly administrative bill with no major policy changes. Then in April last year they were given a copy of the draft bill a few days before Easter. This was under a strict confidentiality deed so peak bodies could not even share it with any members and they had just days to come up with their response. When they looked at the contents, it was not the bland administrative bill they were promised; it contained much more far-reaching changes. This confidentiality deed was unprecedented to most of these stakeholders, particularly for peak bodies who work hand in hand with their members. They seek feedback from the people on the ground they represent and for them to be restricted in sharing this draft was highly problematic.

Following the quick turnaround it was only after strong lobbying by stakeholders that a second round of consultation was undertaken. At this point some of the more extreme measures were taken out of the bill. However, concerns were still raised. By August we saw media stories appear containing information about the bills contents that were leaked. This happens often with this government, but it should not take something making it into the media for action to be taken. That is a chaotic way to run things.

In the submissions to the committee we saw the repeated feedback about how badly the minister managed the consultation. These are some of the key players in the environmental space, so I want to highlight a few of their comments. The minister, of course, highlighted just one stakeholder, but I think there are a few more we should get on the record of this debate. The Australian Prawn Farmers Association said—

Given the extremely short period of time for industry to digest this information and understand its practical implications, and the amount of detailed commentary on the amendments, there is some real confusion about the nature and extent of some of the changes that are proposed and how they will operate in practice.

...

The APFA is a significant stakeholder in this Bill on behalf of our Queensland members and the adhoc and restrictive nature of consultation taken with the Exposure Draft (which is different to the Bill tabled) by the Department and now the time between the introduction of the Bill on the 12th October 2022 and the closing date for submissions on the 26th October 2022 also being extremely short, the timing does not allow a measured and considered response developed through consultation with our members.

The Waste Recycling Industry Association of Queensland said—

Unfortunately, the short consultation period on such a complex but important piece of proposed legislation has reduced our ability to provide detailed responses or levels of evidence to support those responses; nor have we been able to facilitate detailed feedback from our members.

The Queensland Resources Council said—

It is critical for industry confidence in an open, transparent, consultative government that such arrangements do not become the standard modus operandi for government processes. As a minimum there should be a reasoned explanation of why such a process is occurring, beyond simply stating that it is an exposure bill and thus not finalised government policy. For example, what content is particularly sensitive and why? If the changes are considered so minor that they did not justify a RIS, what is the rationale for the stringent confidentiality requirements?

The Association of Mining and Exploration Companies said—

AMEC also considers the manner in which consultation has been undertaken, combined with consistently short timeframes for responses to various iterations of documents, necessarily means the policy development behind the Bill will suffer from a lower quality and smaller breadth of responses that would otherwise likely be provided.

AMEC would be very concerned if the Department, or indeed the Queensland Government more broadly, were to adopt such practices more broadly moving forward.

I repeat these submissions because for the minister to stand up in this place and use her introductory speech and subsequent contribution to pretend that there were no issues and that this was all drummed up by the LNP or the media is incredibly misleading. The minister should be listening to these stakeholders, not misrepresenting the actions of the department she administers. The behaviour of this government in managing the introduction of this bill has eroded confidence, and it is causing stakeholders to question the sections of the bill before us in terms of their intent and how they will be enacted.

The final bill we have before us is closer to the administrative bill that the government initially discussed. The department's written submission to the committee stated—

Consultation was undertaken across a range of possible amendments to the EP Act. While many amendments to the EP Act are minor, technical or operational in nature, some are more significant and were not supported by industry representatives.

As a result of feedback received during consultation, some of these proposed amendments were amended and some were not included in the final Bill.

The fact that it was so substantially scaled back is why we will not be opposing the bill as a whole, but these comments from stakeholders are telling in terms of the process this bill has gone through over the last couple of years. It is clear there were major issues with what was proposed and the minister had to backtrack on her initial plans.

Turning to the substance of the bill, the objective before us is now to improve administrative efficiency and ensure the regulatory frameworks within the environment portfolio remain contemporary, effective and responsive by amending the Environmental Protection Act, the Waste Reduction and Recycling Act and the Wet Tropics World Heritage Protection and Management Act. The most feedback was received on amendments to the Environmental Protection Act. While I cannot cover all the issues, I will cover some of the elements which have been raised with me.

Changes to the environmental impact statements process generated much discussion, particularly around the early refusal of an EIS for an unacceptable project. The amendment enables the chief executive to decide that the draft terms of reference for an EIS cannot proceed to public notification under section 43. This early refusal is designed to be more efficient for both the department and the proponent. Where it is plain that a project should not proceed, an early refusal will free up the system for others and give clarity to the proponent.

This measure was supported by a number of conservation and environmental stakeholders, with some suggesting additional safeguards are needed around the integrity of information of environmental impacts from the proponent. Concerns were raised by a number of industry bodies that this removes due process and that there was potential for a subjective refusal based on the particular departmental officer who was undertaking the assessment. This is where the consultation mismanagement really matters, because you can understand some of the concerns raised after what the stakeholders were put through in the process of developing this legislation.

Where it appeared in earlier drafts that the government was trying to get through more radical changes, there is a concern from stakeholders that this watered down version of the original legislation still could contain the intent of original versions. A number of these stakeholders were not opposed to the early refusal; they just wanted to ensure there are clear, reasonable and rational criteria to ensure a fair and objective decision being made by the relevant authority.

The removal of ministerial review of the chief executive's decision to refuse to allow an EIS to proceed was not supported by the LGAQ, AgForce, the Queensland Water Directorate, APPEA, APFA and ABFA, who raised that it removed procedural fairness and they had not seen any evidence of why it should be changed from current legislative processes. While I understand their perspective and I agree that there needs to be oversight of those decisions, I also acknowledge the department's response that the ministerial review powers have never been used.

Similar concerns were raised in respect of the changes to contaminated land and environmental investigations, with the additional power given to the administering authority and concern, once again, that there could be subjective decisions made by particular officers. The amendment to section 230 provides that all amendments to an environmental authority deemed 'major amendments' require public notification. This is a change to the discretion that is allowed in the current form of the act. Healthy Land and Water and the EDO were in favour of this change and the increased transparency it could provide to the community. APPEA, the QRC, AMEC and Cement Concrete & Aggregates were opposed to the change, arguing that the lack of clarity in the act and the associated guidelines between major and minor will lead to an excessive number of applications being deemed major, therefore requiring public notification.

I note as well that the department has committed to undertaking a review of its guideline major and minor amendments to support consistent and transparent assessment level decisions on EA amendment applications. I ask the minister in her reply to detail when this review can be expected to be finalised and released and when stakeholders will see any changes it contains put in place. I question why this was not done prior to the introduction of the bill so that all stakeholders could be well aware of the parameters around minor and major amendments.

There was a really good example given in the submission by the QRC whereby a nine-kilometre extension to a 100-kilometre pipe would be considered minor while a 10-metre extension to a 100-metre pipe would be considered major, with the nine-kilometre pipe not requiring public notification but the 10-metre pipe requiring public notification. That is a clear demonstration of the need for clarity. If we are genuinely trying to ensure that substantial changes which could impact the environment are subject to community notification, there needs to be some common sense when it comes to which amendments are classified as major. I ask the minister again to answer in her reply whether the government has considered delaying the enactment of this provision to allow for the review to take place.

Clause 54 of the bill supports the implementation of the Industrial Chemicals Environmental Management (Register) Act 2021 of the Commonwealth. This bill clarifies that a person does not comply with the general environmental duty if they do not comply with any risk measurement measures for a chemical scheduled on the register, even if any other reasonable and practicable measures may have been undertaken. The waste and recycling industry spoke strongly against this amendment. They understand the need to add chemicals to that register. It is the changes to this legislation that they are fearful of. Section 319 provides that a person is taken not to have complied with the general environmental duty unless the person complies with any risk management measures for the chemical under the Industrial Chemicals Environmental Management (Register) Act 2021.

The government must work with stakeholders like these to support those impacted by these changes to comply with them. There must be reasonable and achievable expectations put forward on businesses with an understanding of the impact of the change, allowing them to have the necessary time to implement the structures that they need. You would not want a landfill to suddenly have to make a massive change to their infrastructure and procedures without an adequate transition period to manage the on-flow of a chemical which is now on the ICAM register.

WRIQ also raised the need to amend new section 316GC to include localised disaster situations for the waste and recycling industry. We heard the CEO of WRIQ detail to the committee how much waste has had to be dealt with through the February 2022 floods, with 125,000 tonnes taken in by their SEQ members and another 111,000 tonnes from northern New South Wales. They are doing the hard work of recovering what they can, but it takes time and we need realistic legislation in place which supports these necessary and important efforts.

Clause 105 of the bill amends section 493 of the Environmental Protection Act to make clear that executive officers can be held liable if they were in office at the time an act or omission happened that resulted, even at a later time, in the commission of an offence. All Queenslanders can appreciate the need to hold executives liable where they have been negligent or have acted deliberately and reasonably knew the harm that would come to the environment, but this is not the right framework to achieve a deterrent to that environmental harm. Many stakeholders did not support this clause, with the Queensland Law Society in particular raising issues with the current defences and the extension of this liability going too far without also amending those defences further. The proposed amendment does not require a former executive to have known that the act or omission would result in the corporation being liable.

If an executive officer made the decision on the best available evidence at the time, they could also be liable. The department itself acknowledged this and said that under the current provision there is no explicit requirement for the executive officer to have known or ought reasonably to have known that the act or omission would result in the corporation failing to comply with the EP Act. Given the extension of the liability for an indefinite time, I believe it is necessary for these defences to be better clarified to get the balance right and to make sure that those who do the wrong thing are punished.

This is an attempt to address the issues related to the prosecution of executives around the Linc Energy site and their disgraceful conduct there, but we need to get the framework to hold executives accountable right. We need to ensure it gets the right balance and does not capture the wrong people. For those who have acted or failed to act when they should have and whose actions have clearly led to environmental harm, they should be held accountable. However, we cannot have a case where an

executive at any time of a company which caused harm is liable indefinitely. It does not achieve any environmental outcomes and it deters good people from taking on these roles. That is why the committee included the good recommendation for further clarification, but ultimately we do not believe those concerns have been adequately addressed and so the LNP will be voting against this clause in its current form.

I want to finish my contribution by sharing my experience with some of the submitters to this bill from the aquaculture industry—that is, some prawn farmers. I had the pleasure of visiting Australian Prawn Farms in Ilbilbie south of Mackay last month and I was shown around by Matt, who is a marine biologist with 22 years experience working on that farm. He leads a team of about 60 people and he wants to do everything he can to expand that operation and provide more jobs in that region. I should disclose for the full awareness of this House that I am not a fan of prawns. You will not see me at seafood night on a Wednesday.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr O'CONNOR: No, that is all right; it does not disqualify me from speaking. I checked the Constitution. I am not a fan of prawns, but despite not eating them I can appreciate the opportunity that our state has to embrace and grow this industry, and the operation that I saw there was seriously impressive. Australian Prawn Farms was originally set up because of the environmental benefits of farming in this way of aquaculture—of taking less wild catch out of the ocean—and the work it does treating the water and its commitment to ensure it does not have an impact on its surroundings is backed by clear evidence. It monitors the chemicals continuously and it actually releases less chemicals than what comes in from its inlet. There are no pesticides or herbicides released and the microalgae that flows out helps other organisms by providing a source of food. There is always going to be some nitrogen released and business would like that to be what is assessed, not the settlement levels in its ponds. It even uses the canefarming by-product bagasse as a probiotic for the prawns.

That farm produces 750 tonnes of prawns a year or around 30 million prawns—again, 30 million prawns not taken out of the wild. Each pond is about a hectare and it produces 10 tonnes a year. This type of farming has the highest yield of protein per hectare of any type and it produces all of that from a few hundred prawns that it takes out of the wild as the breeding stock. It does have the ability to expand, but it found the department's processes limiting and it even found that the department seems to have a negative view of the industry. That is the view that it has had from its experience. It says that the regulations it has to comply with are outdated and not based on evidence and it is concerned that it will continue to be disadvantaged. Again the message it had is that some nitrogen is environmentally acceptable if it is organic and it wants its regulation to be based on discharge, not on the current settlement system it has to comply with.

I would like the minister to do something really simple—that is, just go and visit that business or another aquaculture farm to meet with this industry that her department regulates. That particular business is south of Mackay, so she could even go to the Pioneer-Burdekin pumped hydro scheme and meet with those residents while she is there—that is what I did as well on that trip—to hear their environmental concerns about that massive project and turn it into one big Mackay trip. If the minister really does care about the environment, she should give that business time and see how the industry could add to the future of aquaculture in Queensland. It told me that it might even have a bucket of prawns to share with her if she enjoys eating them more than I do. These prawn farmers are prime examples of exactly what we want to see: they are providing a sustainable food source—again, it is the highest yield protein per hectare of any farming; they are drought resistant; they are flood resistant; and they are looking further at renewable energy to see how they can be even more sustainable. They just want fair and evidence-based regulation based on science and the ability to expand the sustainable operation they have. We have a massive opportunity to support aquaculture in our state and legislation such as this should be aiding that goal.

To wrap up, for what it has ended up achieving, this bill has created an enormous amount of angst among so many stakeholders. Whilst the legislative changes it includes are relatively minor and administrative, the damage done to relationships with some of these stakeholders is major. We need a government that is open and transparent. We need a government that explains its reasoning and works to build stakeholder confidence, not treat them with contempt. We need a government that can look at the evidence and take genuine action based on that evidence to protect and enhance our environment. This third-term Labor government is failing on those measures.



Mr HARPER (Thuringowa—ALP) (5.56 pm): I rise to support the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2022. Following the remarks of the member for Bonney and in drawing the attention of the House to the member for Broadwater and Leader of the Opposition's earlier comments in his contribution to the matters of public interest debate, the member for Bonney talked about consultation. I can assure the member for Bonney that there was zero consultation when those opposite sacked staff under the Newman government when the Leader of the Opposition sat around the cabinet table. Those opposite should not come into this place and pretend to talk about protecting the environment when they sacked staff under the Newman-Crisafulli government. The hypocrisy is breathtakingly amazing coming out of the mouth of the member for Bonney in pretending to care for the environment. You cannot lie straight in bed when your government sacked staff. That is disgraceful.

The main objective of the bill is to improve administrative efficiency and ensure regulatory frameworks within the environment portfolio remain contemporary, effective and responsive by amending the Environmental Protection Act 1994 to support industry, streamline and clarify regulatory processes, better protect the environment—that is what Labor governments do—and improve community input and transparency. The bill will also amend the Waste Reduction and Recycling Act 2011 to make minor technical refinements related to administrative processes and interpretation, and it will amend the Wet Tropics World Heritage Protection and Management Act 1993 and the Land Title Act 1994 to better protect the Wet Tropics of Queensland World Heritage area, improve user understanding, align with other legislation and contemporise drafting.

The Health and Environment Committee received 29 submissions to its inquiry. The committee's report on the bill was tabled on 25 November 2022 with a recommendation that the bill be passed. The committee did make a second recommendation that the minister respond to concerns raised by submitters about executive officer liability and adequacy of defences in section 493 of the Environmental Protection Act 1994. The government's response to the committee's report was tabled on 13 February this year and the government accepted the committee's recommendations. I note the minister's earlier contribution where she responded to the concerns raised about the executive officer liability provisions.

I would like to thank my colleagues on the committee for their work in contributing to the committee's report. I would also like to thank and acknowledge all those who made submissions and attended the committee's public hearings, including department representatives. These contributions help the committee do its work. Many valuable points were raised by all who participated. I would like to particularly thank our committee secretariat for their hard work.

This bill will support industry, it will better protect the environment and it will improve community input and transparency. Finally, it will provide for a stronger, more effective environmental regulator. The bill will ensure the state's environmental legislation remains up to date. Some submitters supported proposed amendments to the environmental impact statement process, which include to refuse an EIS process from proceeding if it is a clearly unacceptable project and for an EIS assessment report to lapse after three years. Conversely, some submitters opposed aspects of the proposed changes. Amendments to require public notification of major amendment applications for environmental authorities for resource activities received strong support. Some issues were raised about most other proposed amendments and particularly in relation to changes to environmental authority, transitional environmental program and contaminated land provisions and the provisions to support the implementation of the Commonwealth Industrial Chemicals Environmental Management (Register) Act 2021 in Queensland.

The provisions in this bill will support industry by allowing a regulator to issue temporary authorities in an emergency situation, save time and money when going through an EIS process by ensuring there is power for obviously flawed EISs to be rejected at an early stage and provide for operators of non-resource activities to obtain a short-term environmental authority to trial new and innovative methods. The bill also provides for court orders to prohibit persistent offenders carrying out an activity and will allow criminal history reports to be sought, if required, to help protect the safety of the environmental regulator's staff when interacting with potential offenders.


In relation to consultation, it was incredibly disappointing to read that the opposition members on the committee used virtually their entire statement of reservation to the committee's report to whinge about the consultation process that happened before the bill even made it into this House. Whingeing and whining is the modus operandi of the LNP. Clearly the LNP did not want to talk about the substance of the bill. They do not believe in protecting the environment or, indeed, about toughening environmental laws so that offenders can be held accountable.

I draw to the attention of the House the Leader of the Opposition who today in his MPI contribution talked about protecting national parks. The blatant hypocrisy of the Leader of the Opposition has to be called out. The member for Broadwater was a government minister who sat at the cabinet table of the former LNP Newman government that sacked many parks and wildlife and department of environment staff. Those opposite come in here and talk about process rather than substance. It is such a lazy opposition. Not one environmental bill, member for Bonney, has been tabled in this House since you have been the shadow minister. I call that out. He is being paid extra to do the job, but what does he do with his time?

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Lui): Member for Thuringowa, can I please bring you back to the long title of the bill.

Mr HARPER: According to AgForce—that great peak organisation representing Queensland rural producers—CEO Michael Guerin, the approach taken by the Department of Environment and Science to consultation was appropriate because of the highly complex nature of this law. Mr Guerin said, ‘The whole area’s one of the most sensitive but also most important to have in a rational and calm way’. The industry body said consultation was needed and it was entirely rational. Consultation started in August 2021. There was a discussion paper released in October 2021. A draft bill was released in early 2022. Changes were made to the bill in response to feedback from stakeholders. Then, of course, there was our parliamentary committee process where the whole community had a chance to have its say.

It is clear that there are elements of this bill that some stakeholders do not want. What is sad, however, is that rather than make their position clear, they instead attacked the process, a process that was extensive and went on for well over 12 months, member for Bonney, before the bill was finalised. Of course, the lazy LNP do not want to do any work themselves. They were just happy to jump on the bandwagon of some stakeholders and exploit the situation for their own political means, and they know how to do that very well. This bill will improve our environmental laws and lead to better and improved environmental outcomes. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Ms PEASE** (Lytton—ALP) (6.05 pm): I rise to speak to the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2022. This bill will amend the Environmental Protection Act 1994 to provide for a stronger, more effective environmental regulator. It will support the Department of Environment and Science in achieving its objective of environmental protection. It is important that its officers have the appropriate powers to investigate and take appropriate action against wrongdoing. The courts also need sufficient powers to punish and deter offenders. Some improvements have been identified to support investigation and enforcement under the legislation. This bill will address a loophole in the current executive officer liability provisions of the Environmental Protection Act. I know that the member for Warrego is interested in this, in particular in relation to Linc and the environmental damage that they have done out her way. Unfortunately, because of that loophole only Linc as an organisation could be fined, not the executive officers. Perhaps the member for Warrego should have a chat to the member for Bonney about his position of not supporting this particular provision to close that loophole so that the executive officers can be held responsible. As a consequence of this amendment, anyone who decides that they are going to be environmental plunderers can be held accountable.

Most people go about their everyday business not wanting to do harm. We want to live and tread on this planet softly and make sure that it is a better place for future generations. We do not want to be the ones responsible for the plundering of our planet. I am sure the member for Bonney would agree with me on that. Those opposite always have to go for the gotcha moment. There always has to be complaints about the process because they do not really care about the environment. What they care about is big business: their mates who support them and make big donations to their party.

Let us be very frank about this: the LNP has stated they will support it ‘but’. Are those opposite going to support it completely or are they going to leave the member for Warrego out in the wilderness? At the moment only the company itself can be fined, not the executive officers. This amendment will close that loophole so that people who make those bad decisions will be held accountable. If they do the right thing they have nothing to worry about. The point to remember is that we should all be responsible and accountable for our actions.

The bill amends existing provisions that put beyond doubt that executive officers can be held liable if they were responsible for acts or omissions that cause illegal environmental harm that only crystallises after they leave office. It is important to take that into account. I am sure most people would not want to be the person responsible for leaving such a mark on the world.

It is expected that the executive officer liability provisions will continue to be used reasonably and only where an executive officer has clearly done something wrong. The existing defence provisions will apply to these amendments, meaning an executive officer can defend themselves against a charge if they took reasonable steps to prevent the environmental harm or if they were not in a position to influence the decisions that led to the harm. There are protections in there.

Importantly, the bill includes a number of amendments to add to the power of authorised persons to support the safety of authorised persons. This includes an amendment to allow authorised persons to take drones into places when exercising entry powers and to use body worn cameras. There is also a new power to allow authorised persons to require a corporation to nominate an executive officer to answer questions on behalf of a corporation.


At this point I would like to acknowledge all of the great workers within the department of environment and the Parks and Wildlife Service. I am very fortunate in my electorate to have some incredibly hardworking officers who go out each and every day to protect our beautiful environment.

Mr Harper: We had to employ more after they sacked them.

Ms PEASE: That was going to be my next point; I take the interjection from the member for Thuringowa and thank him for it. We had to rebuild after the Newman government—sorry, the ‘they who shall not be named’ government. When we got back into government we had to rebuild that very important workforce. We had to undertake a lot of training and development of officers to make sure that our beautiful environment is protected and that there is something here for my grandchildren and my grandchildren’s grandchildren.

I am delighted to see the amount of great work that we have done in the environment space. The Containers for Change scheme is one small example of that. We have done an amazing amount of work in this space and I am incredibly proud to be part of a government that has delivered that. My own community groups are really thrilled to benefit from the Containers for Change scheme. As a government we like to look after everyone: we look after big business and also our community groups, our charity groups and our environment. I am very proud to be part of a government that does that.

I acknowledge the member for Thuringowa, the chair of the committee, and my parliamentary colleagues the members for Pumicestone, Bonney, Southport and Mirani. I acknowledge the contributions of the 29 submitters and thank them for their efforts and for taking the time to make those contributions. I acknowledge the department—not only the great departmental staff who work in the field but also the departmental officers who undertake all of the great work that goes into writing these bills and making sure that our environment is protected. I also thank the witnesses who took the time to appear before the committee. Finally, I thank the committee staff for their tireless work in supporting the great work of the Health and Environment Committee. I believe that we have a very big responsibility in taking care of not only the environment but also the health of all Queenslanders.

 **Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (6.12 pm): I rise to address the parliament on the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2022. Throughout this debate I have listened to the contributions of members. In particular, I refer to the member for Thuringowa who made what I would say were some gratuitous attacks on the shadow minister for environment. I think that those comments were very misplaced. I would say to the member for Thuringowa that the LNP candidate, Natalie Marr, is coming for you. She is absolutely coming for you in North Queensland.

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

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Lui): Member, I bring you back to the long title of the bill.

Dr ROWAN: I was the Liberal National Party shadow minister for the environment and heritage protection during the 55th Queensland parliament and I have constantly supported genuine and balanced measures that both conserve and protect our environment. Indeed, the Queensland Liberal National Party is committed to seeing genuine efforts further implemented and delivered across our state for the environment. The LNP continues to work constructively to achieve such goals.

Before further expanding on various aspects in relation not only to the content of the legislation but also the associated legislative and consultative processes undertaken by the Palaszczuk Labor government, I note that the stated objective of the bill is to improve administrative efficiency and ensure the regulatory frameworks within the environment portfolio remain contemporary, effective and responsive. As outlined in the explanatory notes, the legislation seeks to make amendments to the

Environmental Protection Act 1994, the Waste Reduction and Recycling Act 2011, the Wet Tropics World Heritage Protection and Management Act 1994 and the Land Title Act 1994. Much has been made of the fact that this legislation ultimately remains mostly administrative in nature. That being said, in relation to this legislation the Liberal National Party cannot ignore the disastrous way in which Labor's Minister for the Environment and the Great Barrier Reef has discharged her responsibilities in failing to meaningfully and openly consult with key stakeholders throughout this entire process.

Again in relation to some comments from the member for Thuringowa who talked about LNP members reading the report, we have referred to the comments of stakeholders throughout this process as has been articulated previously. They are contained within the parliamentary committee's own report. It is not what the LNP members put together; it was what stakeholders said in their testimony before and submissions to the committee. That is why we say that this government has given up on listening to Queenslanders. Today we have heard contributions from various ministers who are not listening to Queenslanders and what they are saying in relation to other matters in Queensland. We are talking about what the submitters themselves said in the contributions that they made to the committee process and that are contained within the committee report. That is what LNP members of the committee were highlighting to the parliament, as is their responsibility when it comes to democracy in Queensland. It is our responsibility to listen to Queenslanders and stakeholders and to reflect their views not only in the report but also here in the Queensland parliament.

Not surprisingly, as has been articulated already by the Liberal National Party shadow minister for the environment and the Great Barrier Reef, at the end of this whole process stakeholders were left with nothing more than distrust and scepticism with respect to this Labor state government. In any democracy it is absolutely crucial that the government of the day, irrespective of jurisdictional level, works openly and transparently with respect to decisions for all Queenslanders. Unfortunately, the management of this bill has been another prime example of the opposite, revealing once again a state Labor government that is out of touch with the needs and concerns of those who have genuinely raised matters and a government that has failed to fully consider and respond to the consequences of its proposed actions.

Whilst this legislation will offer improvements in environmental protections, it is impossible to ignore the way it has been managed. It is important to acknowledge that there will be improvements with respect to environmental protections. However, the way the bill has been managed is of great concern, particularly with respect to some of the stakeholders who have provided input into the consultation process. As has been widely stated, this bill was first presented to stakeholders as being minor and administrative in nature. However, it was later revealed that the first draft contained more significant amendments than were expected, leading to alarm and concern amongst key stakeholder and environmental groups. This lack of consultation and communication with key stakeholders by the Labor state government, whilst typical of this government, is unacceptable and it is a breach of its most fundamental obligations to the community. What is more, it is also disappointing that such a problematic and inept process of legislative consultation could jeopardise genuine improvements to environmental protections.

So problematic was the Labor state government's consultation on the legislation that it warranted inclusion and comment by the Health and Environment Committee in its tabled report. As the committee stated—

Submitters were critical of the department's consultation process in the development of the Bill, emphasising concerns that consultation on the draft Bill involved engagement with selected stakeholders only, and only on specific parts or versions of the draft legislation, and was conducted under strict confidentiality arrangements, including requiring representatives of identified organisations to sign confidentiality deeds which prevented circulation of draft materials to members for feedback.


Submitters complained of short timeframes for responses to versions of documents restricting their capacity to respond fully. Submitters expressed concern about the possibility that the department, or departments more broadly, might adopt this approach for the future.

Given these damning findings and stakeholder feedback, it is not surprising that the Queensland parliament's Health and Environment Committee had to issue its own comment, including that 'the committee encourages open consultation with stakeholders and the general public, over timeframes that facilitate an effective legislative process.' This is aimed squarely at the Palaszczuk state Labor government, and it is incumbent on them to ensure future legislative processes and stakeholders are not treated in such a disrespectful manner.

Before concluding my contribution today I must say that I firmly believe that as elected representatives of our communities in the Queensland parliament we have a responsibility to support genuine efforts to conserve and enhance our environment, both locally and for our state. That is why I have always been proud to support genuine and meaningful efforts to protect and improve our environment, including ensuring bipartisan support such as I gave with respect to the removal of plastic bags in Queensland and the implementation of Queensland's container deposit or refund scheme when the current Deputy Premier was the minister for the environment.

I am also a strong supporter of broader efforts to ensure that clean, affordable and reliable energy is delivered to Queenslanders, with renewable energy forming an important part of our energy mix. Environmental protection and conservation is everyone's responsibility. We have all an important role to play. Certainly, that is why I continue to work with my local environmental and conservation groups throughout the Moggill electorate and, more broadly, the western suburbs of Brisbane.

Finally, for the benefit of the record, I remind Labor members opposite with respect to Linc Energy that it was the former Beattie and Bligh governments that supported underground coal gasification in Queensland. Again, the implementation or the fostering of that form of technology in Queensland occurred under former Labor governments. Environmental degradation is squarely at the feet of the Labor government with respect to the fostering of that technology in Queensland and the circumstances that we saw of Linc Energy. Whilst those opposite always try to point to others and other governments with respect to potential failings or errors that may have been made, it is the responsibility of the current Labor government to acknowledge that in Queensland. That is a consequence of its poor decision-making and of its poor evaluation of particular technologies. That rests squarely at the feet of not only this Labor government but also former Labor governments in Queensland. The LNP will always stand up and support our environment. We have always done that and we will continue to do so.

 **Ms KING** (Pumicestone—ALP) (6.21 pm): I reflect, as I have been called to reflect previously in this place, that being the LNP's environment spokesperson must truly be the second-worst job in the world. We need five whole minutes of filibustering and behaving like prawns, because you are not allowed to talk about climate change, anything that might upset property developers or anything that might upset the National Party. In fact, the only role that would be worse than being the environment spokesperson for the LNP—

Mr O'Connor interjected.

Ms KING: We will see that about that, member for Bonney. I take that interjection. I cannot wait to see who the LNP preselects against me in Pumicestone.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Lui): Member, I ask the member to come back to the long title of the bill.

Ms KING: Certainly. I do reflect that the one thing worse than being the LNP's environment spokesperson would be being its actual environment minister. Then you really would have your foot on either side of the barbed wire fence!

The Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill takes important steps to ensure Queensland's environmental framework is contemporary and fit for purpose. It supports better environmental protection, it enhances community transparency and input and it supports industry with streamlined administrative processes. Essentially, it also lays the foundation for a stronger and more effective environmental regulator. We have seen through past events how incredibly important that is.

Many of the changes in this bill were in fact proposed by the conservation sector or raised by the regulator over many years of conducting investigations. Contrary to the comments of the member for Bonney, as a member of the Health and Environment Committee I congratulate the minister and the department on this bill and on the incredibly thorough consultation process undertaken. Contrary to the claims by the member for Bonney, in fact many of the stakeholders described the approach taken by DES and the minister as collaborative and positive. We heard those comments about the attitude reflected by AgForce in its submission, as noted by the member for Thuringowa. It was certainly a thorough—

Mr O'Connor interjected.

Ms KING: I remind the member for Bonney that he may not want to critique AgForce too thoroughly.

It was certainly a thorough and detailed consultation process. In October 2021 a consultation paper was released to key stakeholders including the LGAQ, the Queensland Resources Council, AgForce and the Environmental Defenders Office, among others. Those stakeholders received an initial draft of the bill in April/May 2022 and an updated exposure draft of the bill in June 2022 for a period of three weeks, subject to confidentiality. While a couple of stakeholders objected to signing confidentiality deeds prior to the release of those exposure drafts—presumably because they were not able to activate their campaign against measures in the bill by leaking them directly to the *Courier-Mail*—this was necessary because the proposals at that point had not gone through cabinet processes. The department took on a range of feedback about the need for peak bodies to discuss the bill with their member organisations and businesses. The availability of those exposure drafts was extended accordingly. The feedback received was carefully considered in the drafting of the bill before the House, with amendments made to some proposals to address initial stakeholder concerns.


The proposed amendments to the Environmental Protection Act in this bill are designed to protect the environment via contemporary, effective and efficient environmental regulation. A key measure in the bill that will lead to better environmental outcomes is enabling the chief executive to refuse an EIS from proceeding if it is unlikely the proposal could legally proceed. We heard positive reflections on those measures from a number of stakeholders who, while they may never like being told no if their proposals lack merit and are not going to be able to proceed, welcome knowing that at an earlier stage.

The bill also requires public notification for all major amendment applications for environmental authorities for resource activities, improving the availability of community input. Some of the measures in the bill that will support industry include resolving issues with progressive rehabilitation and closure planning frameworks. Our government rightly expects that industry should act to rehabilitate and rectify sites following resource activities. Ensuring that industry has clarity and can plan for those obligations is essential.

Most importantly, though, measures in the bill support the strength and effectiveness of the environmental regulator by strengthening executive officer liability provisions, ensuring that corporate executive officers remain accountable for serious environmental harm that has been caused by their decision-making, even after they sever their relationship with the organisation in question. The community absolutely expects that company directors who make decisions resulting in serious environmental harm are not only held to account but continue to be held to account into the future and cannot sidestep those obligations by changing their employment.

We heard really significant support for those measures from a range of conservation and community groups such as Healthy Land and Water, who said that if an executive officer made a decision that resulted in harm to a person they would be held accountable into the future and they should be accordingly if the harm is environmental in nature. Representatives of the Queensland Law Society stated that they were in furious agreement that former executive officers should be responsible for egregious environmental harm that they may have caused.

I acknowledge my committee colleagues, the secretariat, the minister and the department. I note that this bill will improve environmental outcomes, something that the LNP continue not to understand. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr JANETZKI** (Toowoomba South—LNP) (6.27 pm): I want to make a contribution on one particular aspect of the bill—that is, the amendments to section 493 relating to the director liability provisions. We have heard a lot from the other side of the House in relation to the AgForce submission and other submissions, but there is one glaring omission from the submissions they are referring to—that is, the Queensland Law Society. Although it is only four or five lines of this bill, it is an important provision that we need to analyse with a forensic eye, because it is not as straightforward as those opposite would have us believe.

We want to throw the book at anyone who is responsible for environmental damage. That is without doubt. The laws that were there could have addressed the Linc disaster. Let's never forget: that the Linc disaster was all about Peter Beattie and Bond. They went to America, took an unknown technology and created untold damage. The Labor government was responsible and was in government during the prosecution. Now we have this provision in the bill. I will go through certain aspects of the amendments to section 493. Basically, it now proposes that if a person was an executive officer at the time of an act or omission that eventually caused an offence but has left the company before the offence arises they may still be liable. That raises the possibility of liability for a project that

was approved while an executive officer was at a company but no longer is. Let us say the project was proposed and that person then leaves the company. The project is then constructed and after a time damage is done. They may still have liability attracted to them.

That is something that I want to explore, because the Queensland Law Society has spoken at length about this. This House ought to be a house of considered contemplation of the laws we are seeking to introduce into this state. I do not believe this debate and the review by the committee of this particular law went as deeply into the issues as it ought to have. Let us look at what the Queensland Law Society said. It stated—

The difficulty with that approach—

that is the one adopted by the government in this bill—

is that there is no requirement that the former executive officer, knew or ought reasonably to have known that the act or omission would result in the corporation failing to comply with the Act.

It bells the cat a little in the explanatory notes because it refers to executive officers who leave office to avoid liability. In the explanatory notes it appears that it is a deliberate act to leave, but that is not in fact how the legislation was drafted. The Queensland Law Society goes on to say—

If despite these efforts, environmental harm results, liability would be imposed in circumstances where the executive officer could not reasonably have known that the acts or omissions following that decision would cause an offence to be committed.

That is an extraordinary extension of the law. We have seen the provisions that are there. This is an extension of the law that we are speaking about that the Queensland Law Society has said has just not been addressed appropriately.

I want to reflect a little on directors' obligations. My experience of advising directors, executive officers and officers of companies is that they take their obligations extraordinarily seriously. There are normally three kinds of director obligations—direct, accessorial or deemed liability. There are various means by which liability may be attracted to directors. My reading of the Queensland Law Society's submission on this bill is that they think this goes further. This is an extension beyond what has been seen previously, certainly in these acts but also generally speaking.

I think it is worth talking about directors' obligations and liabilities generally. I look back to the last Liberal National Party government. That government introduced the Directors' Liability Reform Amendment Act. It sought to undertake an audit of 80 different acts and over 3,800 obligations which related to directors and officers within those acts. That act in 2013 streamlined a whole bunch of directors' obligations. In that same term of government, the Liberal National Party government went through and undertook a review of all obligations contained in Queensland law. At the time there were about 265,000 obligations and requirements contained in Queensland law that companies and individuals were obliged to comply with. There is a heavy compliance obligation across the board. I do not think we can ever take that for granted.

We often get lectured to by the Labor government. Let us have a look at their record when it comes to fundamental legislative principles and what they have done again here in ignoring the advice of the Queensland Law Society. Let us not forget that back in 2016 they wanted to introduce reverse onus of proof. They wanted to do away with mistake of fact as a defence. They wanted to go to retrospectivity in legislation. We get lectures from those opposite, but the truth is that they offend fundamental legislative principles regularly and with impunity. We have seen over time piece after piece of legislation that has had this leaning from this Labor government.

I will go back briefly to the Queensland Law Society submission. They say with these amendments—

- there may be a significant time gap between the act or omission happening and the offence being committed;
- during this time gap, intervening events might have occurred to exacerbate the situation, over which the former executive officer could have no influence;


This provision is extending the law to issues that the executive may have had no bearing on or influence over. There is no proximate cause defence. The defence that the Queensland Law Society has spoken about has not been expanded. There is no approximate cause defence. There is no thinking through the particular issues that may face executive officers.

It is worth remembering the executive officer definition has been expanded widely. The Queensland Law Society says the definition of executive officer—

... includes a large number of potential employees, including those employees who may have no decision making power, but are responsible for implementing the management decisions of the corporation.

My takeaway on this from the Queensland Law Society—and we have heard the Linc comment again—is that they may not have even caught Linc with these provisions because they are so unworkable. The Queensland Law Society raises the prospect of what would happen if a whistleblower wanted to blow the whistle on poor environmental conduct and then sought to resign. What would happen to them under this law? What would it mean for insurance for these companies that are trying to undertake lawful activities in the state of Queensland? It is the practical operation of these provisions that needs consideration. Will a potential whistleblower who wants to resign from a company to draw attention to environmental harm that is being done be able to get insurance?


I believe that Australia has some of the toughest and heaviest—it has been proven—corporate regulations for directors and officers and the liability that they may attract. We have seen it again with the ASIC prosecutions that have been launched against Star that there is no tolerance of poor corporate misconduct. That must always be the way. The Queensland Law Society has said that these provisions are unworkable. In many instances they may not even lead to potential prosecutions. The minister said tonight that she had been advised on this. I would love to see the content of the minister's legal advice. Clearly, the government has not taken any notice of the submission from the Queensland Law Society, and corporate Australia needs more certainty than that.

 **Hon. SJ STEWART** (Townsville—ALP) (Minister for Resources) (6.37 pm): I rise to speak on the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. Our government has long held the position that we support resource projects so long as they stack up environmentally, financially and socially, and our position has not changed. All industries, regardless of whether they are resources, manufacturing or agriculture, must act in a way that is environmentally sustainable while also supporting good jobs and economic growth. That is what this bill is all about: supporting the environment while continuing to support the good jobs a sustainable resource industry generates.

It is important that we continue to work with all stakeholders. This bill provides greater certainty for the community and industry. I have been engaged with Minister Scanlon throughout the process and the development of this bill and I welcome the extensive consultation they did on the initial drafts.

It is important that all stakeholders' views are taken into consideration, and that is how good governments operate. As the Minister for Resources, I met with a number of industry stakeholders to listen to their feedback on the drafts, including Ian Macfarlane from the Queensland Resources Council. When I spoke to Minister Scanlon about a number of the concerns that they raised with me, she was more than happy to meet and listen to that feedback. In fact, we met on several occasions and we will continue to do so on a range of issues. Working together across government and with stakeholders is what will benefit all Queenslanders.

The other part of the bill I would like to talk about is the amendments which will allow the administering authority to issue temporary authorities during an emergency situation. This is important, as it will help support operators do what is needed in an emergency situation without needing to go through the full environmental authority application process. This includes during flood situations which at times are unprecedented such as what we have seen in the North West Minerals Province particularly. It is important that we have this option. As I said before, it comes back to working together as this will benefit all of us. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr ANDREW** (Mirani—PHON) (6.39 pm): I rise to speak on the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2022, which amends the Environmental Protection Act 1994 and other legislation. The bill has a number of significant implications for those industries and organisations that hold environmental authorities as well as the general community more broadly.

Proposed amendments include extended investigative powers, expanded executive officer liability, significant changes to transitional environment programs, and changes to the contaminated land and EIS frameworks. The bill also makes changes to the submission process and a new decision point for the administering authority for an environmental impact statement prepared under the EP Act. Along with the draft terms of reference, a proponent for an EIS will now be required to submit a summary of potential negative environmental impacts and the measures undertaken to avoid or minimise these.

The chief executive may determine that the EIS cannot proceed if satisfied that the project would: contravene the law; give rise to an unacceptable risk of serious material or environmental harm; have an unacceptable adverse impact on a matter of state environmental significance or a matter of national environment significance; have an unacceptable adverse impact on an area of cultural heritage significance; or there is a regulatory requirement requiring the chief executive to refuse the draft terms of reference proceeding. This would mean there is a significant onus on the proponent to demonstrate at a very early stage that the project does not fall within these narrow grounds for rejection. Notably, 'cultural heritage significance' is given a broad definition and includes 'an area or place of Indigenous cultural significance or aesthetic, architectural, historical, scientific, social or technological significance to the present generation or past or future generations'. How exactly will the department determine what an area of technological significance actually is or an area of aesthetic significance?

I know that the Eungella range is. I have asked Minister Scanlon to come up to Eungella to have a look at these areas, the Yuwibara and the Iron and the people who live there, to give us some understanding about the Pioneer hydro they have suggested up there.

The extreme ambiguity around the grounds on which an early refusal may be made is a clear breach of section 4(3)(a) of the Legislative Standards Act 1992, which allows parliament to 'make rights and liberties, or obligations, dependent on administrative power only if the power is sufficiently defined'. The power is not sufficiently defined and will leave the door wide open for government to impose additional grounds for early refusal by regulation. The early refusal of projects is not just some minor technical matter that may be delegated to subordinate legislation. These are major amendments with hugely significant consequences for both industry and submitters. The whole bill is riddled with the use of vague and ambiguous terms, including the term 'unacceptable risk' in relation to serious or material environmental harms. The problems of ambiguity and subjectivity in a number of the statutory criteria for what constitutes a major application have been raised in submissions, particularly by the QRC.

The government's consultation process has been strongly criticised in a number of submissions to the bill. The bill was introduced on 12 October 2022 with submissions called for by 9 am on 26 October 2022—a mere 10 working days later. Such a rushed process is disrespectful to other stakeholders and does not accord with the principles outlined in the *Queensland Cabinet Handbook*, which states that consultation is an essential element of the legislative and cabinet process. It further states that consultation with persons or organisations external to the government is a routine part of policy development and cabinet submissions, and that when developing legislative proposals the Queensland government is committed to consulting effectively with affected stakeholders at all stages of the regulatory cycle.

The Queensland public deserves a full and transparent explanation as to why the government considered it necessary for stakeholders to execute a confidentiality deed before a copy of the first draft exposure bill was released to them. This is something that is hard to fathom, given that the explanatory notes state that one of the primary objectives of the bill is to improve community input and transparency.

The bill also substantially changes areas of legislation that are currently the subject of an independent review into the adequacy of existing powers and penalties under the Environmental Protection Act 1994. The review into the EP Act was headed by retired judge Richard Jones. Several components of the draft EPOLA Bill propose changes to enforcement provisions of the EP Act and will be considered as part of the ongoing independent review of the EP Act, including: environmental investigations; environmental protection orders; offences related to environmental requirements; and powers of authorised persons for vehicles and places. Changes to enforcement provisions of the EP Act should not be progressed prior to the completion of the independent review.

I have significant concerns around the amendments to executive officer liability in section 493 of the bill. Amended section 493 substantially extends liability to historical acts or omissions without regard to the knowledge a former executive officer may have had at the time of the decision as well as potential intervening events beyond the influence of the former executive officer. Any enforcement regime must be fair and balanced as well as clear and unambiguous in its application. These new executive liability provisions are not consistent with these principles. According to the submission of the Queensland Law Society, if this amendment passes in its current form an executive officer will remain indefinitely liable for historical acts or omissions, and this could render such officers uninsurable. Such a far-reaching liability provision is likely to have a chilling effect on the willingness of qualified and capable people to accept senior positions in corporations affected by these extended liability provisions.

With regard to the amendment of section 326BA—when environmental investigation is required; contamination of land—it would appear that the intent of this proposed legislative change is to empower the department with broader regulatory powers to require environmental evaluations in wide circumstances. However, the proposed broadened power as drafted has the potential for an environment evaluation to be required without proper consideration of the effect on the environmental values having regard to concentration levels of identified and measured contaminants. It would be possible for the department to require an environment evaluation based on mere supposition and speculation, albeit a reasonably held opinion.

At least two submitters, the Australian Prawn Farmers Association and the Australian Barramundi Farmers Association, expressed a certain amount of nervousness about the policy direction the government appears to be taking with this bill. While some of the provisions that were in the first exposure draft of the bill were ultimately removed, specifically the explicit prescription of intensity or yield limits, their original inclusion has raised a red flag for the state's food producers. Even with the changes, their concern is that the bill may still provide opportunities for further on-farm regulation, including the removal of a transparent and fair process of appeal. The concern relates primarily to agriculture producers operating under an environmental authority who may need to report a breach, possibly due to a big rainfall event.

With this bill the department may arbitrarily determine this to be a material change and compel operators to comprehensively modify their EA, introducing new conditions as a result and without any transparent appeals process beyond a court appeal. According to the testimony of Ms Ruscoe of the Australian Barramundi Farmers Association, the first exposure draft was extremely concerning. Ms Ruscoe told the committee that the draft—

... talked about control of yields. That is akin to telling a banana farmer how much they can produce as a crop ... We have significant concerns about the direction that this bill takes the policy framework.

Ms Hooper expressed similar concerns, stating—


The changes that are being looked at here—giving that discretionary power to the department—will ... they can, at their discretion, change the licence conditions, as my colleague Jo has said. For example, if there was a flood event and it was deemed a breach, those licence conditions can then be amended. Then we come down to the ability of the department to put that on yield or intensity. It should not matter what happens on-farm; it is about what comes out of farm. That is where the jurisdiction should be and not on whether we have five ponds or whether we have 500 ponds.

...

If we want to talk about the response from the department that aquaculture is not subject to an environmental impact statement, I point out that for new agricultural projects a very similar, if not identical, process to the EIS is undertaken in order to get the authority environmental authority. As I have mentioned, the bill indicates a policy shift within DES that concerns us with regard to the overreach, subjective decision-making and the removal of the minister's review of refusal.

With the opportunity for retrospective changes and no transparent appeals process this bill invokes, business confidence is certainly reduced.

I tend to agree with Ms Ruscoe's comment on the bill. It clearly contains a number of serious and unexpected shifts in policy by the Queensland government. This is a shift that clearly raises concern for the future of the industry and food production of this state.

 **Ms LEAHY** (Warrego—LNP) (6.49 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. At the outset I want to remind Labor members opposite that it was the Beattie and Bligh Labor governments which allowed the trial of the underground coal gasification at the Linc Energy site near Chinchilla. This Labor government should try to not walk away from this fact. It was the LNP when in government in April 2014 which laid charges against Linc Energy for causing serious environmental harm. I say to those opposite when talking about Linc Energy to just remember which side of politics sought that questionable technology at the Linc site, at Cougar Energy near Kingaroy and at Carbon Energy near Chinchilla. We did not hear the cries about the environment from Labor back then.

The bill aims to improve administrative efficiency and ensure the regulatory frameworks within the environment portfolio remain contemporary, effective and responsive. Specifically, the bill amends: the Environmental Protection Act to support industry, streamline and clarify regulatory processes, better protect the environment and improve community input and transparency; the Waste Reduction and Recycling Act to make minor and technical refinements related to administrative processes and interpretation; and the Wet Tropics World Heritage Protection and Management Act and the Land Title Act in response to a review of the Wet Tropics Management Plan 1998.

I would like to thank the committee for their consideration of the bill. I would also like to thank all of the stakeholders who were consulted and made submissions to the content of the bill. Stakeholders have described the consultation process to me as bizarre and unprecedented. The first exposure draft was only given to stakeholders who signed a very tight confidentiality deed, meaning peak bodies could not share its contents even with their members, which was coupled with a very tight turnaround for responses just before Easter. I have heard from stakeholders who have expressed concern about the short time frame in which they were asked to comment on 125 pages of amendments. Further, they said the format of how the bill was presented to stakeholders made it difficult to determine the extent and impact of the amendments.

It is disappointing that the government comes into this House and is critical of members and media who spoke out about the contents which were kept secret during the consultation. Given that the minister has removed the following provisions—such as the proposal to require environmental investigation every 10 years and the proposal that the Director-General could change the conditions on every environmental authority every 10 years without notice—I would say that those stakeholders with those concerns have had a victory because the minister has backed down. However, her mismanagement has created a lot of distrust.

Good governments work openly and transparently and respect the people they represent. The management of this bill through the consultation process has shown this is a third-term government which are clearly out of touch. The government only gave the second exposure draft after hard lobbying from stakeholders. This experience has clearly impacted stakeholders and their trust in the Labor government. Many commented on the process and the quick consultation period once the bill was tabled. Here are some of their comments. The Australian Prawn Farmers Association said—

Given the extremely short period of time for industry to digest this information and understand its practical implications, and the amount of detailed commentary on the amendments, there is some real confusion about the nature and extent of some of the changes that are proposed and how they will operate in practice.

The Prawn Farmers Association also said—

The APFA is a significant stakeholder in this Bill on behalf of our Queensland members and the adhoc and restrictive nature of consultation taken with the Exposure Draft (which is different to the Bill tabled) by the Department and now the time between the introduction of the Bill on the 12th October 2022 and the closing date for submissions on the 26th October 2022 also being extremely short, the timing does not allow a measured and considered response developed through consultation with our members.

The Waste Recycling Industry Association Queensland said—

Unfortunately, the short consultation period on such a complex but important piece of proposed legislation has reduced our ability to provide detailed responses or levels of evidence to support those responses; nor have we been able to facilitate detailed feedback from our members.

The Queensland Resources Council said—

It is critical for industry confidence in an open, transparent, consultative government that such arrangements do not become the standard modus operandi for government processes. As a minimum there should be a reasoned explanation of why such a process is occurring, beyond simply stating that it is an exposure bill and thus not finalised government policy. For example, what content is particularly sensitive and why? If the changes are considered so minor that they did not justify a RIS, what is the rationale for the stringent confidentiality requirements?


The Environment Institute of Australia and New Zealand said—

The following feedback is provided on a number of proposed amendments to the Environmental Protection Act 1994 noting again that in the limited time available more constructive consideration of all provisions has not been possible.

It was abundantly clear from many submissions that there was damage done in relationships with stakeholders. On the bill before us, most of the amendments are a result of the back-peddalling the government needed to do.

A number of concerns were raised by stakeholders. One of the most concerning changes is that the mandatory notification of environmental authorities which are to be amended makes it very difficult for resource security in the resources industry. The omission of the ministerial review of decisions made by the department was also an issue for some stakeholders. While we understand this had not been used before, there is concern given the power to refuse an environmental impact statement early.

In the end, this bill is mostly administrative and should not have caused the level of angst and anxiety it did for stakeholders. Had the minister managed this better, there would not have been the fallout we have seen around this legislation. Queenslanders deserve better.


 **Mr SKELTON** (Nicklin—ALP) (6.56 pm): I rise in support of the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2022 which aims to amend the Environmental Protection Act 1994 to better protect the environment while also supporting industry, particularly through streamlining and clarifying regulatory processes. The Palaszczuk government is committed to ensuring that the legislation delivers the government's priorities while meeting operational industry needs. Many of the amendments have been initiated in response to industry feedback.

The bill inserts a process for changing an application for an estimated rehabilitation cost decision. This will support industry by providing a clear process for them to change their application before it is decided. An estimated rehabilitation cost decision is required for particular environmental authority holders for a resource activity, and it is critical that a smooth process is in place to enable these holders to obtain that decision.

The bill also inserts new transitional provisions to clarify how environmental authority holders transition into the progressive rehabilitation and closure framework. It also provides for temporary authorities in emergency situations, and it relaxes application requirements for trial environmental authorities for prescribed environmentally relevant activities.

There are a range of small amendments in the bill which have not gained much attention but will still contribute a lot of efficiencies for industry. By providing greater clarity of process throughout the different parts of the legislation, the bill will benefit industry.

I want to reflect on some of the speakers and talk about the LNP's hypocritical support for the environment when they are the party of climate change deniers et cetera. We can reflect on the former Newman government's record. Their environment minister at the time, who is not speaking on this bill, delivered the second worst land-clearing record after Brazil. I support the Palaszczuk Labor government in its efforts to support our environment and change legislation to support industry. I commend the bill to the House.


 **Ms CAMM** (Whitsunday—LNP) (6.59 pm): I would like to contribute to this debate by outlining the lack of consultation that was given to the prawn farm industry, in particular Australian prawn farmers in my community, and Tassal, our largest prawn farm producers in Australia, who at this stage have still not received an acceptance by the environment minister to visit their world-class facility. I certainly encourage the minister to come and see the best-practice aquaculture facility in Australia in my electorate of the Whitsundays, the Tassal prawn farm. It was very disappointing to see the lack of consultation and time frame that was given to industry to submit to this bill. I hear those opposite criticise the LNP for not standing up for the environment when I had the shadow minister for agriculture and the shadow minister for water in my electorate visiting the Tassal prawn farm. I see the minister for agriculture over there who—

(Time expired)

Debate, on motion of Ms Camm, adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

Beaudesert PCYC; Canungra Development

 **Mr KRAUSE** (Scenic Rim—LNP) (7.00 pm): On Sunday I attended the Beaudesert PCYC Organising Committee Family Fun Day in Beaudesert. It was a great day where the community came together in support of a PCYC for Beaudesert. I want to congratulate the people who put the hard yards in to organise the event. I also congratulate everyone in the community who came along and the heaps of community organisations and stall holders to support that effort, including a very senior person from PCYC Queensland who is certainly keen to establish a centre in Beaudesert. I am aware that the Scenic Rim Regional Council has written to the state government in order to seek their consent for a particular parcel of land to be dedicated to that PCYC. I urge the government to get behind that, not only from a land management point of view but also when that is done and the land is dedicated from a funding perspective as well, because it is a facility that is well overdue, not only for the services it will bring but also for the social initiatives and programs that PCYC Queensland could bring to our growing area around Beaudesert.

Speaking about development, there is plenty of it going on around Canungra at the moment. It is causing a great deal of angst amongst locals, particularly when it comes to water resources and the fact that the only water source for Canungra and all the new homes that are going in there is the Canungra Creek which has run dry several times in the last few years.


I call again on the government, and Seqwater in particular—I have been raising this issue with them for years now—to try to put together a long-term plan that will give Canungra water security. Just relying on the creek and trucking in water when the creek runs dry is not a viable long-term solution.

I previously called on the state to make sure there is less development in Canungra but that has been ignored repeatedly. As a result, our roads are continuing to be clogged more and more, and the water resources will suffer into the future. There needs to be better thought put into planning around Canungra and more investment put into the road network as well, not only in the town itself but also on both sides of town, on the Jimboomba or Beaudesert side and the Nerang side, especially through the gorge road, the Beaudesert Nerang Road heading through Clagiraba and Maudsland, which is taking more and more traffic every day, but is quite narrow in some parts and could really use upgrades to support the growing population that goes through there every day, not just from Canungra but from places in the member for Logan's electorate as well. Many people use that road to commute to the Gold Coast for work every day.

Talking about roads, the neglect of this government and the Labor Party in general for the Cunningham Highway at Willowbank is a disgrace. They still have not put a viable plan on the table to fix the Amberley interchange. Shayne Neumann, the member for Blair, cannot waste this opportunity. Labor is in power in Canberra and in Brisbane. Let's fix it once and for all.

(Time expired)

The Gap, Community Battery

 **Ms BUSH** (Cooper—ALP) (7.03 pm): I would like to use this opportunity tonight to update the House on one of our local federal election commitments that was made to our electorate during the Albanese federal campaign. Our electorate regrettably did not benefit from our Labor candidates being elected. I would like to commend Peter Cossar and Madonna Jarret who both worked so hard along with me to negotiate what I think are some really meaningful election commitments with the Albanese government. Regrettably, despite being a community that is so vibrant and has so much going on to celebrate, our two federal members who were elected have chosen almost exclusively to focus their time on criticising the government which I do find extremely disappointing since they were elected on a promise to do politics differently.


Since they have been elected, I have received conservatively four pieces of mail between them, all of which have focused on criticising the current Labor government. To put that into context, across both electorates it is about 628,000—more than half a million—individual pieces of printed mail, printed and distributed in a nine-month period, which I think is a really curious way to use public funds and particularly to communicate with an electorate who does care so much about the environment and about minimising reckless waste.

Unlike our federal members, I have really loved the change of government and the momentum that we are creating on important issues like housing and climate change. The most exciting election commitment that I like to talk about was the announcement for a community battery scheme in The Gap. The suburb of The Gap has a really high uptake of rooftop solar, but only one in five households have battery storage capacity. We know that batteries are so essential for storing energy for use overnight and that it is critical if we are going to transition away from coal-fire and gas energy. The community battery will support around 250 households with solar energy storage and use, and will provide a great opportunity to test and try how community battery infrastructure like this works in practice. Expressions of interest for distributed network providers have occurred throughout February.

I have been supporting a really exciting local group, The Gap Sustainability Initiative, to work with Energex around the implementation of the project. We are still waiting to hear the outcome of that expression of interest, but, once announced, consultation with neighbours certainly will begin on how best to operationalise the project. I look forward to the opportunity that it will bring our community to demonstrate how suburbs can collectively bargain to get off the electricity grid and have far more energy ownership and autonomy.

I look forward to continuing to work collaboratively and constructively with the Albanese government to ensure our Cooper community gets its fair share of investment and funding.

Animal Welfare

 **Mr HEAD** (Callide—LNP) (7.06 pm): I refer to recent media reports that prove animal activists are up to their old tricks, rearing their heads within only 48 hours of every mainland state being ruled by Labor governments. Self-confessed criminal Chris Delforce yet again appears in sensationalist footage, this time of pig abattoirs, where he openly states that he is breaking the law. I cannot ignore the fact that these criminals are back to haunt the industries that feed our nation. The scars on families from their terrorising farm invasions of years past are yet to heal. The outrageous, dangerous and illegal actions of these activists blatantly ignore good biosecurity practices, and place food safety at risk.

Through publicising this footage, criminal behaviour and the terrorisation of our food and fibre producers across this nation is being actively encouraged. We in the bush remember the distress, pain and anxiety caused by the atrocious live export ban in 2011, which was triggered by sensationalised footage released in an ABC *Four Corners* report.

Chris Delforce founded Aussie Farms, a politically motivated animal activist website that encouraged and promoted those illegal farm invasions. This recent footage neglects so many facts and fails to answer so many questions. Firstly, where are these abattoirs? For all we know they could well be in another country. Secondly, the story suggested he was filming all day, yet there were only a couple of clips shown. What happened to the rest of the footage? It is possible that Chris himself, or another party, intentionally stressed these animals for this sensationalist footage, as has been done by animal activists in the past.

I table this statement from Australian Pork released today, and note they are seeking to receive and review the full footage. Given they have had to ask for this proves that these activists are more concerned about getting media and attention than animal welfare.

Tabled paper: Statement by Australian Pork, dated 28 March 2023, titled 'ABC's 7.30 Report: CO2 stunning in pigs' [\[380\]](#).

The data originally published on the Aussie Farms website at the time of its launch was not readily available, in quantity, on the public record. There were a number of well-founded accusations that this information was leaked from government departments by the very people who are meant to serve the public in a fair and unbiased manner. As Chris's mother was a senior member of a government department, I also suggest these accusations are likely true.


For the record, no farmer in this country spends their day, from sunrise to sunset, raising animals in a humane manner, to see them dispatched in a way that is not as humane as possible. That is simply not the Australian way. We lead the world with animal welfare standards, and we are proud to do so. For the record, I also table a printout of Australian Pork's Virtual Tour website which shows the entire pork supply chain.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Australian Pork: Virtual Tour of the Australian pork supply chain' [\[381\]](#).

I warn all primary producers of this—

(Time expired)

Multiculturalism

 **Mr WHITING** (Bancroft—ALP) (7.09 pm): The word the member who just resumed his seat was looking for was 'conspiracy'. I rise to speak about a special event in my electorate on Sunday. The Brisbane North Chinese Association and Multicultural Queensland Social Network held a 'We are Australian' citizenship ceremony at The Corso in North Lakes. I commend Lewis Lee, Michael Huang and Carl Wu for their initiative and a very interesting ceremony.


I was very fortunate to deliver a speech on behalf of the state government. I used the opportunity to talk about what will be the first opportunity for these new citizens to cast a vote. I said that as new citizens they will have the chance to be involved in the next important step of reconciliation with our First Nations people. I was talking about the referendum coming later this year about the Voice to federal parliament. I told the new citizens that the Voice is a recognition that the First Nations peoples have guided stewardship of our land for countless generations. They have created or shaped the amazing land, the amazing productive land, that we all share today.

There will be many more steps such as the Voice that we will take such as truth and treaty as we create a nation in which we are one people, a nation that embraces all of our history, all of our stories. These stories become all our stories. I said to them, 'Your experiences, your voice, your stories, they will join with those from the rest of us. They count, and we will listen to your wisdom and it will become part of all of our shared lived experience. That is what the Voice to Parliament is about,' I explained. 'We will value the wisdom, the experiences and the stories of our First Nations peoples.'

I finished with this point: there is a reason we are called a Commonwealth. We have joined together of our own free will to make a nation. We have joined together to create common wealth we can all share and we can use to build better lives for all of our families.

This is a message about the Voice I wanted to give all our new citizens. I hope they now better understand why it is important to me that we all vote yes in this referendum. I know that message was very much appreciated by Aunty Brenda Kanofski. She is a Bidjara-Wakka Wakka elder and she has Chinese ancestors as well. Aunty wanted me to take these words and spread them around. I am doing it. I hope it meets with her expectations and I hope that is fine.

Currumbin Wildlife Hospital

 **Mrs GERBER** (Currumbin—LNP) (7.12 pm): The Currumbin Wildlife Hospital is an iconic part of the southern Gold Coast, contributing enormously to our community. It is one of the busiest wildlife hospitals in the world. With a mission to treat, rehabilitate and release Australian wildlife, it plays an integral part in conservation and saving animals in our region. There is huge demand on them to treat injured and sick animals as well as prevent disease in order to protect our wildlife for future generations to come.


The importance of Currumbin Wildlife Hospital cannot be overstated. In the last 20 years over 140,000 wildlife patients have been helped as a direct result of the Currumbin Wildlife Hospital, their volunteers and their carers. I recently brought the Leader of the Opposition and our shadow minister for the environment to the hospital to see firsthand the amazing work they are doing and to discuss what the future might hold for Currumbin Wildlife Hospital. We talked about their koala chlamydia vaccination research program. We talked about the hospital's 'back from the brink of extinction' breeding program and their world-leading proposal for the Currumbin Wildlife Hospital research and training precinct.

This is an exciting proposal that would elevate Currumbin Wildlife Hospital's ability to care for our wildlife and their ability to be a centre of excellence for research. It would be absolutely world leading. Not only will this benefit local animals, but the training and education aspect of this expansion would provide further expertise to the hospital and attract great minds from all over the world. However, a funding commitment is necessary to see it happen.

Today the Currumbin Wildlife Sanctuary presented their proposal to the Gold Coast city council, which supported it in principle. Now it is time for the state government to come to the table. It is time for the state government to get serious about protecting our threatened species. The Palaszczuk Labor government talks a big game when it comes to conservation, but we all know that it is outcomes that matter. Conservation is not about saying the right things; it is about achieving genuine outcomes. Our unique biodiversity needs to be valued and safeguarded for future generations to come, and the Currumbin Wildlife Hospital research and training precinct will achieve this.

The expansion will also provide significant economic benefits for our region. The construction phase is expected to create a number of jobs and over a thousand students are expected to pass through its training facility on an annual basis. This training facility will allow Currumbin Wildlife Hospital to continue its critical research programs and deliver vital training programs. The benefits of this project are enormous. It is time for the Palaszczuk Labor government to put their money where their mouth is, come to the table and commit to helping Currumbin Wildlife Hospital build their hospital research and training precinct. Help the Currumbin Wildlife Hospital build the hospital for the future for our wildlife and conservation.

Jordan Electorate, Community Events

 **Mrs MULLEN** (Jordan—ALP) (7.15 pm): The past weekend was a very busy one in the Jordan electorate. I had the privilege of sharing in some wonderful and significant community events that showcased the very best of our wonderful and diverse community.

On Saturday morning along with the member for Logan, I was honoured to join local families to celebrate the 40th anniversary of the Greenbank Scout Group. This is such a large and active scout group. In fact, it is one of Queensland's largest, with a wonderful history and a strong engagement in the local Greenbank community. There are around 130 youth involved in the Greenbank scouts and they have been very fortunate to have had incredible volunteers leading the group over four decades.


The weekend event included a range of fun activities for the kids and a terrific display of memorabilia including original uniforms and photos. Chief Commissioner of Scouts Queensland Geoff Doo presented 30-year service recognition certificates to Sue and Brian Randall. I was also pleased to present some new water coolers for the Joeys. Congratulations to group leader Tony Langler and all of the leaders and scouts of Greenbank. Here is to the next 40 years.

On Sunday morning I joined a number of local community members and the federal member for Oxley for the launch of a very exciting project for our community in greater Springfield. Springfield Lakes Nature Care Inc. is a wonderful and dedicated group that undertakes significant environmental projects in our community and I have been a proud member of the group for a number of years. It was so exciting to see that they were successful in the Australian government's Planting Trees for the Queen's Jubilee Project with a \$20,000 grant. This will allow them to plant around 2,000 trees to see the revegetation of Opossum Creek, a critical wildlife and nature reserve in our region. I want to particularly thank Luise and David Manning, two very passionate champions for the environment in our community, who secured this important grant.

I was also really pleased to attend a number of Neighbour Day events over the weekend including in Flagstone. The Neighbour Day event, organised by local developers Peet, coincided with the official opening of Vista Park, Flagstone's newest park. We know how important local parks are in our communities and this new park, which includes a flying fox, half basketball court and expansive green space, provides another opportunity for local families and young people to connect, play sport and enjoy the great outdoors. It was wonderful to see a really great game of cricket being played while we were there.

The Vista Park launch and Neighbour Day was a great event attended by the young and young at heart and it is a terrific new space for the Flagstone community. With more than 6,000 people now living in Flagstone, which is an important community within our greater Flagstone priority development area, I am always pleased to see any additional investment in community facilities and amenities as required by local developers which improves the livability for our local residents. I might have also had a bit of a go at the flying fox. It was really good fun.

Policelink, Crime Statistics

 **Mr KATTER** (Traeger—KAP) (7.18 pm): I rise on a serious issue. To put it bluntly, it equates to a systemic, chronic and I fear possibly deliberate underreporting of crime across the state, that is, the flaws of the Policelink crime-reporting system. Anyone who has had any interaction with Policelink in recent years probably would not need to listen to this speech because they would understand it all too well.


Policelink is designed to deal with non-emergency calls where law enforcement is required to attend or need to provide support for the community. Basically, if there is no emergency or threat to life or property, people would ring Policelink. If they are broken into they would ring Policelink. If someone is assaulted by a person in the street who then runs off, they would call Policelink. If a person's home is vandalised they would call Policelink. If someone throws rocks at a person's car in Mount Isa they would ring Policelink.

We know that police time is precious and they need to be free to respond to emergencies, so you try and ring Policelink. Don't worry, triple-O has some foes at times as well. The police minister does not release the figures as a matter of course. The best estimates are that more than a million calls and more than a million online contacts are made to the service each year. In 2021, this resulted in 72,700 actual phone crime reports and 183,000 online reports being made. Out of this number—a total of 256,000—only 31,000 charges were laid. Out of more than a million calls made a year, the estimates are that around one-fifth of them are unanswered and abandoned due to long wait times.

There are nightmare stories. I have some myself. There was a baker in Ravenshoe who had his business broken into. He rang triple-O. The operator asked if it was occurring. He said, 'No, they've just left.' He was told to ring Policelink. He hung up on triple-O and called Policelink, but they told him to go online and report it. The report could not be logged by the operator over the phone, so after three attempts he has given up.

A 78-year-old woman at Tolga had a wait time of 30 minutes. Another elderly woman had two incidents at her place and no-one came to follow up. Someone in Cairns the other day told me that he waited about 30 minutes and ended up just calling someone he knew. I have done the same thing myself. Not everyone has the benefit of having those police contacts as we do as members of parliament. I rang Policelink just to test it out. Once while driving to the airport I drove past a fight occurring on Abel Smith Parade in Mount Isa. I had to race onto the plane so I had to hang up on Policelink about 15 minutes later. They were still trying to take the details, so no-one reported that I guess. Not only are crimes not being reported so they are not being recorded in statistics; we are also not doing our job out there. They have removed the call centres. We have big problems and we are not collecting correct data on what is happening in the state.

Bundaberg and Wide Bay


 **Mr SMITH** (Bundaberg—ALP) (7.21 pm): The bogeyman, the Loch Ness monster and the LNP caring about social housing—myths and ideas that are completely false. Continuing on the theme of housing today, I thought I would touch on not only the LNP's record of social housing but also what the Palaszczuk Labor government is doing for the good people of Bundaberg and the whole Wide Bay region. The QuickStarts program will see 175 new social homes commence in the Wide Bay region by mid June 2025. A planned \$53.8 million investment will support over 160 full-time-equivalent jobs. Unlike the LNP caring about vulnerable people, those jobs are not myths; they are real. This is in addition to 75 new social homes already commenced under the Queensland Housing Strategy 2017-2027. Between 2017-18 and the end of February this year, 90 new homes have been delivered in the Wide Bay region by the Palaszczuk Labor government.

As of the end of February this year, the QuickStarts program has seen the awarding of 83 contracts for new homes across the Wide Bay region. There are a couple of highlights in Bundaberg, specifically. We have delivered 16 two-bedroom unit blocks; four units with two bedrooms in them; a four-bedroom house in Avoca; a four-bedroom house in Kalkie; a five-bedroom house in Kepnock; and a five-bedroom house in Avenell Heights—and that is only in the last two years. We are absolutely delivering.

Let us look at the LNP's record. They cut social housing construction by 94 per cent and there were 428 fewer dwellings by the end of the Newman term. They had no major construction in populated areas like Logan, Gold Coast, Sunshine Coast or Ipswich. In Bundaberg from 2012 to 2014 the LNP delivered a whopping 10 social homes. That is what they did in three years. Between 2012 and 2014 they delivered 10 homes. In fact, they only commenced the 10 homes in that time. In 2021-22, the Palaszczuk Labor government has delivered 18 social houses. That is 18 social houses in one financial year while the LNP delivered 10 in three. That is an absolute shame and a blight on the LNP.

At the same time, the LNP was sacking nurses from the Bundaberg Hospital. Not only were they not delivering for vulnerable people; they were making people vulnerable by sacking them. We have restored housing; we have restored the nurses. These are the same nurses that the member for Burnett said in front of the media were deliberately overdosing dementia patients and killing them. That is what the LNP stand for: making people vulnerable and accusing our hardworking nurses of being killers.

Body Corporate Legislation

 **Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (7.24 pm): Another week, another thought bubble by Premier Palaszczuk trying to put media spin on a problem she has no idea how to solve. The proposal to allow bodies corporate with 75 per cent of resident agreement to compulsorily sell the other unit owners defies belief, if it was not so tragically possible. The Premier's answer to the housing and homelessness problem is a gratuity to the greedy real estate and development industry who, by this stealth legislation, will have the amalgamation of development sites done by the government. Already we have evidence of the real estate coercion displayed by predatory agents on the Gold Coast who are using the Premier's ill-advised public statement as law already to force unit owners to sell. I table that evidence.

Tabled paper: Email, dated 15 March 2023, from Sales, Marketing and Acquisitions Consultant, Ray White, Mr Alex Day, to Professionals John Henderson Real Estate, Mr Luke Henderson, regarding Yallambee Lodge Unit Holders [\[382\]](#).


I cannot believe that the Premier would condone the forced removal of an aged widow who has lived in the same unit for 40 years. Her husband passed away 10 years ago.

Your home is your castle. To have ownership of your unit ripped away from you to satisfy a greedy developer's profit-making foray beggars belief. What was the Premier thinking? The sanctity of private home ownership is the aspiration people work their whole lives for, and to turn that belief into a dodgy, unstable real estate gamble is plain un-Australian. I have always been known as a development supporter, and I am proud to wear that moniker, but I respect and revere the rights of private ownership. That right should only be divested from the owner by any government when it is for the greater and wider community good and definitely not by seriously rich, greedy developers forcing acquisitions of sites from people who just do not want to sell.

To open the can of worms of private entities compulsorily acquiring other privately owned homes is a floodgate to uncertainty in real estate ownership and a body blow to community title protection. To say that the little old widow will have legal recourse to prevent the sale of her home by the body corporate is absolute nonsense when many of these residents are asset rich by owning their own home but live solely on the pension and have no spare money to pay exorbitant legal and court costs.

This proposed legislation is another example of a tired, fourth-term Labor government out of ideas making ridiculous media-grab inspired solutions when they have no idea what the ramifications will be. It is reminiscent of the Treasurer's new land tax on interstate investors that the Premier had to kick into touch. I hope that the Labor government has the good sense to kick the Premier's ill-founded thought bubble on private compulsory acquisition of people's homes into touch as well. If there are obstructionist owners holding out for reasons such as land banking, views or extortionate demands, that can be addressed by other legislation.

Nundah Women of the Year Awards

 **Hon. LM LINARD** (Nudgee—ALP) (Minister for Children and Youth Justice and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (7.27 pm): I am very proud to share with the House today the achievements of some truly impressive locals across my electorate of Nudgee. Recently Setty Fardousian, the marketing manager of our local Nundah Village Shopping Centre, contacted my office with an idea I could not help but get behind. Setty is constantly thinking of ways to support and celebrate our local community, and we often work together on shared initiatives to support local businesses and vulnerable people in the community. We are very lucky to have her. Setty's latest initiative was to launch the Nundah Women of the Year Awards for International Women's Day earlier this month. I had the great pleasure of nominating a number of outstanding women across our community for recognition of the invaluable work they do. I know that every one of them would have been a worthy winner, and I also know that every one of them would have shied away from the recognition.

The first of these was Olive Volavola, the coordinator of Compassion 4 Community, an organisation that works hard every day with a small team of volunteers to cook and serve three-course meals to those in need—not just those going hungry but also those who may need a place to connect with others, to feel safe, to feel part of a community and have a sense of belonging. That is what Olive and her team provide to our community, and I thank them deeply for it. It is also why Olive was rightly recognised as the winner of this year's Nundah Woman of the Year. Well done to Olive and all of her lovely team.

I also nominated runner-up Robin Rizzo, who runs the Northside Community Sewing Group—a learn-to-sew volunteer group that donates its finished products to the needy in our community. When Robin and this exceptional group of women found out that a local housing provider needed more warm blankets, they responded by sewing 20 new blankets for those living in DV crisis housing. This is just one example of their compassion and generosity to those most in need and I thank them sincerely for all they do for our community locally and vulnerable Queenslanders.

Finally, Patricia McArthur was another runner-up for the Nundah Woman of the Year Award and equally deserving of this recognition for her work for community. Trish is a longstanding volunteer of the local Neighbourhood Centre and DV service provider Northside Connect. For over 10 years Trish has volunteered her time to help Northside Connect deliver its vital services to our community, helping out at reception, serving on its board and anything else that might support it in its work. It is truly my privilege to shine a well-deserved light on these fantastic women and their contributions. There are so many local people doing extraordinary things and the electorate of Nudgee, my local community, is the better for their heart, contribution and service.

The House adjourned at 7.30 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Andrew, Bailey, Bates, Bennett, Berkman, Bleijie, Bolton, Boothman, Boyd, Brown, Bush, Camm, Crandon, Crawford, Crisafulli, D'Ath, Dametto, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Frecklington, Furner, Gerber, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hart, Head, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Hunt, Janetzki, Katter, Kelly, King A, King S, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Linard, Lister, Lui, MacMahon, Madden, Mander, Martin, McCallum, McDonald, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Mickelberg, Miles, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Mullen, Nicholls, O'Connor, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Perrett, Pitt, Powell, Power, Pugh, Purdie, Richards, Robinson, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Simpson, Skelton, Smith, Stevens, Stewart, Sullivan, Tantari, Walker, Watts, Whiting